PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 10 a.m.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the junior Senator from West Virginia will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which the Senate will proceed to consider the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, H.R. 8917, under a time limitation of 2 hours on the bill, with one-half hour on any amendment. It is anticipated that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on final passage of that bill.

Upon the disposition of the Interior appropriation bill, the Senate will take up the conference report on Federal aid to highways, under a time limitation of 1½ hours; and it is anticipated that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the conference report.

Upon the disposition of the conference report on the Federal highway bill, the Senate will go into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. William E. Colby to be Director of Central Intelligence. There is a time limitation on that nomination of approximately 3½ to 4 hours, but it is not anticipated that that much time will be consumed. I would anticipate that it would be a fairly good guess to say that the nomination would require 2 hours, a little more or a little less. I anticipate a yea-and-nay vote on that nomination.

Under the order that was entered by the distinguished majority leader earlier today, there will then be a vote on an amendment by Mr. FANNIN to the bill H.R. 577, the so-called Hobby Protection Act, at no later than 6 p.m. tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. President, there will be at least four yea-and-nay votes tomorrow and possibly more.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 7:18 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 1, 1973, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 31, 1973:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John J. Hennessey, [redacted] U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Bernard A. Clarey, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roger Kirk, of Michigan, a Foreign Service Officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Somali Democratic Republic.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Karl E. Bakke, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, vice William N. Letson, resigned.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Herbert Salzman, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for the remainder of the term expiring December 17, 1974, vice J. D. Stetson Coleman, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 31, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jerome J. Nedelka, vicar, Christ the King Church, East Meadow, Long Island, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father in heaven, we thank You for the gift You have given us in this free country governed by the people through their elected representatives in Congress. We ask Your blessing today upon these men and women assembled here in the House of Representatives whose responsibility it is to fulfill the sacred trust given to them by the people. Lord, we ask You to direct their consultations and deliberations. Fill them with Your spirit so that Your glory may be revealed; that the safety, honor, and welfare of Your people here in the United States of America may be served; and that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and most sure foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, may be established among us for all generations. And this we ask in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8947) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes."

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

S.J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to establish a nonpartisan commission of Federal election reform.

THE REVEREND JEROME J. NEDELKA

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

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and appreciation that I acknowledge that our prayer this morning was offered by the Reverend Jerome J. Nedelka, vicar of Christ the King Episcopal Church in East Meadow, N.Y. For the past 5 years, Father Nedelka has creatively dealt with his administrative duties at Christ the King, effectively using his marketing and business background obtained prior to entering the seminary.

As a leader in ecumenical affairs, Father Nedelka has organized and is the convener of the East Meadow Clergy Association which has brought together in fellowship clergy of the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Lutheran, Methodist, Polish National Catholic, and Jewish faiths. He is also his bishop's representative to the Committee on Soviet Jewry.

Concerned not only for his parishioners' spiritual well-being, but their physical well-being and that of our environment as well, Father Nedelka has become involved in the ecology and conservation movement on Long Island and was recently appointed chairman of the Commission on Environment and Ecology of the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island.

Father Nedelka's community involvement and concern for his fellow man is shared by his wife, Ruth, a registered nurse, their two children, Andrew and Nicholas, and by his nephew, Larry Nedelka, a recent high school graduate who has volunteered his time and energies serving my constituents in my New York congressional office. The presence of the Frank and Jerome Nedelka families in the House gallery today, indicates

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the importance of familial support in Father Nedelka's life and work.

It is with great pleasure that I thank Father Nedelka for his inspiration this morning, and express my gratitude to my colleagues for their courtesy in extending the privilege of the rostrum of the U.S. House of Representatives to Father Nedelka, a distinguished vicar from the fabulous Fifth Congressional District of New York.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 512, EXTENDING AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT WITH RESPECT TO INSURANCE OF LOANS AND MORTGAGES

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 512) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93–417)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 512) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, and 6.

That the Houes recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 7, and 8, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$664,000,000 on July 1, 1973"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 4 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 9 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Government National Mortgage Association is authorized and directed to utilize the authorization provided by section 305(c) of the National Housing Act to make commitments to purchase mortgages with respect to which commitments to insure under the National Housing Act were issued prior to July 1, 1973, and such commitments to purchase shall be made in the same manner and on the same terms and conditions as commitments to purchase were made by such Association prior to June 1, 1973.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 4, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, before the semicolon insert the following: ", and redesignating clauses (1) and (2) as clauses (A) and (B), respectively".

On page 5, lines 3 and 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "insured under section 235 of this Act and" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "which was insured under section 235 of this Act more than 6 months prior to the date of enactment of this paragraph and".

On page 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the quotation marks in line 7, and insert after line 7 the following:

"(3) In any case where the Secretary determines that the correction of defects is feasible, he shall take appropriate steps to assure that expenditures made under this subsection are used solely for the purpose of correction of defects. Expenditures made pursuant to this subsection shall be made from the insurance fund obligated for the insurance of the particular mortgage involved. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the insurance funds for expenditures or anticipated expenditures under this subsection."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 6, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "and approving"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
W. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR SULLIVAN,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr.,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
HENRY D. GONZALEZ,
HENRY S. REUSS,
MARGARET M. HECKLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
ADLAI E. STEVSNSON,
JOHN TOWER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 512) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, to extend authorizations under laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS (AMENDMENTS 1–8)

The House resolution provided "open end" authorizations for Fiscal Year 1974 for the following HUD programs: urban renewal, model cities, open-space-urban beautification-historic preservation and neighborhood facilities. The Senate amendment authorized for Fiscal Year 1974 additional amounts of $29 million in contract authority for the section 236 rental assistance program; $140 million for annual contributions under the public housing program; $1.328 billion for grants under the urban renewal program; $232.5 million for grants under the model cities program; $63 million for grants under the open space program; and $40 million for grants under the neighborhood facilities program.

The conference report contains the Senate amendments with the following changes:

(1) no additional authorization for section 236 rental assistance in lieu of the $29 million contained in the Senate amendment;

(2) an additional authorization of $664 million for the urban renewal program in lieu of the $1.328 billion contained in the Senate amendment; and

(3) no additional authorization for the model cities program in lieu of the $235.5 million contained in the Senate amendment.

TERMINATION OF MORATORIUM ON FEDERAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (AMENDMENT 9)

The Senate amendment required the HUD Secretary to cease the suspension of Federal housing assistance programs or the withholding of funds for the current or any succeeding fiscal year, and to carry out such programs to the full extent possible pursuant to the contract authority or other funds appropriated or otherwise made available by the Congress. The amendment included similar provisions for the housing assistance programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration. The House resolution contained no such provisions. The conference report contains the Senate amendments.

GNMA—PURCHASE OF FHA MORTGAGES (AMENDMENT 9)

The Senate amendment required the Government National Mortgage Association to purchase FHA mortgages for which commitments to insure were issued prior to July 1, 1973, in the same manner and on the same terms and condition as GNMA purchased such mortgages prior to June 1, 1973. The House resolution contained no such provision. The conference report contains the Senate amendment with clarifying technical language.

EXPENDITURES TO CORRECT OR COMPENSATE FOR SUBSTANTIAL DEFECTS IN FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURED MORTGAGED HOMES (AMENDMENT 10)

The Senate amendment authorized the HUD Secretary to make expenditures for correcting serious defects in one- and two-family homes financed under FHA's sections 203 and 221(d) mortgage insurance programs, provided that:

(1) the original mortgage amount was no greater than the statutory ceiling permitted under the section 235 program;

(2) the defect is one which existed on the date of the insurance commitment;

(3) a proper inspection would have revealed the defect; and

(4) the mortgage was insured no earlier than three years prior to enactment of this resolution.

The House resolution contained no such provision.

The conference report contains the Senate amendment with two amendments. The first amendment clarifies the authority of the Secretary of HUD to make expenditures for the correction of defects out of the insurance funds obligated for insurance of the mortgages involved. The amendment also authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary to reimburse the insurance funds for expenditures or anticipated expenditures. The second amendment makes clear that payments made to or on behalf of owners of homes with defects are to ' used to pay the costs of correcting those defects, where correction is feasible, and not for other purposes.

The necessity to provide compensation to owners of FHA-insured homes was brought on by a massive failure of FHA over the past several years in adequately inspecting homes prior to FHA approval. Large numbers of low- and moderate-income families purchased overpriced and defective homes in reliance on FHA approvals and inspections. The conferees expect that this pattern of negligence will not be repeated in the future. The conferees also expect the Secretary of HUD to recognize fully his responsibility to provide a

thorough and adequate inspection of homes prior to the approval of mortgage insurance, not only to protect the financial interests of the Government but also the interests of the buyers.

PRIORITY FOR APPLICATIONS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY BASE CLOSINGS (AMENDMENT 11)

The Senate amendment required the HUD Secretary to give priority in processing and approving applications for certain housing and community development programs to State and local units of government seriously and adversely affected by Department of Defense base closings. The House resolution contained no such provision. The conference report contains the Senate amendment with an amendment limiting the priority to the processing of applications.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
W. A. BARRETT,
LEONOR SULLIVAN,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
HENRY S. REUSS,
MARGARET M. HECKLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
JOHN TOWER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1672, AMENDING THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1672) to amend the Small Business Act, together with the House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PATMAN, STEPHENS, GONZALEZ, GETTYS, ANNUNZIO, HANLEY, BRASCO, KOCH, MITCHELL of Maryland, WIDNALL, J. WILLIAM STANTON, WILLIAMS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Messrs. ROUSSELOT and BURGENER.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6370, EXTENDING LAWS RELATING TO PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON TIME AND SAVINGS DEPOSITS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 6370) to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, to prohibit depository institutions from permitting negotiable orders of withdrawal to be made with respect to any deposit or account on which any interest or dividend is paid, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-418)

[To accompany H.R. 6370]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6370) to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, to prohibit depository institutions from permitting negotiable orders of withdrawal to be made with respect to any deposit or account on which any interest or dividend is paid, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

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

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE FLEXIBLE REGULATION OF INTEREST RATES ON DEPOSITS AND SHARE ACCOUNTS IN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SECTION 1. Section 7 of the Act of September 21, 1966 (Public Law 89-597), is amended by striking out "August 1, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1974".

PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN ACTIVITIES BY DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 2. (a) No depository institution shall allow the owner of a deposit or account on which interest or dividends are paid to make withdrawals by negotiable or transferable instruments for the purpose of making transfers to third parties, except that such withdrawals may be made in the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "depository institution" means—

(1) any insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

(2) any State bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

(3) any mutual savings bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

(4) any savings bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

(5) any insured institution as defined in section 401 of the National Housing Act; and

(6) any building and loan association or savings and loan association organized and operated according to the laws of the State in which it is chartered or organized; and, for purposes of this paragraph, the term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

(c) Any depository institution which violates this section shall be fined $1,000 for each violation.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION OVER INTEREST RATES PAID ON DEPOSITS BY NONINSURED BANKS

SEC. 3. Section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended by—

(1) inserting in the second sentence thereof "or dividends" immediately after "the payment and advertisement of interest"; and

(2) striking out in the tenth sentence thereof "(1)", and by further striking out in such sentence ", and (2) there does not exist under the laws of such State a bank supervisory agency with authority comparable to that conferred by this subsection, including specifically the authority to regulate the rates of interest and dividends paid by such noninsured banks on time and savings deposits, or if such agency exists it has not issued regulations in the exercise of that authority".

CONVERSION OF MUTUAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS INTO STOCK ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 4. Section 402 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1725) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), until June 30, 1974, the Corporation shall not approve, under regulations adopted pursuant to this title or section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, by order or otherwise, a conversion from the mutual to the stock form of organization involving or to involve an insured institution, including approval of any application for such conversion pending on the date of enactment of this subsection, except that this sentence shall not be deemed to limit now or hereafter the authority of the Corporation to approve conversions in supervisory cases. The Corporation may by rule, regulation, or otherwise and under such civil penalties (which shall be cumulative to any other remedies) as it may prescribe take whatever action it deems necessary or appropriate to implement or enforce this subsection.

"(2) After December 31, 1973, the Corporation may approve any study application filed prior to May 22, 1973, pursuant to regulations in effect and adopted pursuant to this title or section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933."

AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSTITUTIONS AND NATIONAL BANKS TO INVEST IN STATE HOUSING CORPORATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The Congress finds that Federal savings and loan associations and national banks should have the authority to assist in financing the organization and operation of any State housing corporation established under the laws of the State in which the corporation will carry on its operations. It is the purpose of this section to provide a means whereby private financial institutions can assist in providing housing, particularly for families of low- or moderate-income, by purchasing stock of and investing in loans to any such State housing corporation situated in the particular State in which the Federal savings and loan association or national bank involved is located.

(b) Section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Subject to regulation by the Board but without regard to any other provisions of this subsection, any such association whose general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits aggregate a sum in excess of 5 per centum of its withdrawable accounts is authorized to invest in, to lend to, or to commit itself to lend to any State housing corporation incorporated in the State in which the home office of such association is situated, in the same manner and to the same extent as the statutes of such State authorize a savings and loan association organized under the laws of such State to invest in, to lend to, or commit itself to lend to such State housing corporation, but loans and loan commitments under this sentence shall be subject to appropriate limitations prescribed by the Board, and no association may make any investment, other than loans and loan commitments, under this sentence of its aggregate outstanding direct investment under this sentence, determined as prescribed by the Board, would thereupon exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum of its assets."

(c) Paragraph seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) is amend-

ed by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the association may purchase for its own account shares of stock issued by any State housing corporation incorporated in the State in which the association is located and may make investments in loans and commitments for loans to any such corporation: *Provided,* That in no event shall the total amount of such stock held for its own account and such investments in loans and commitments made by the association exceed at any time 5 per centum of its capital stock actually paid in and unimpaired plus 5 per centum of its unimpaired surplus fund."

(d) (1) The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation with respect to insured institutions, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System with respect to State member insured banks, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to State nonmember insured banks shall by appropriate rule, regulation, order, or otherwise regulate investment in State housing corporations.

(2) A State housing corporation in which financial institutions invest under the authority of this section shall make available to the appropriate Federal supervisory agency referred to in paragraph (1) such information as may be necessary to insure that investments are properly made in accordance with this section.

(e) For the purposes of this section and any Act amended by this section—

(1) The term "insured institution" has the same meaning as in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act.

(2) The terms "State member insured banks" and "State nonmember insured banks" have the same meaning as when used in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(3) The term "State housing corporation" means a corporation established by a State for the limited purpose of providing housing and incidental services, particularly for families of low or moderate income.

(4) The term "State" means any State, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

PREMIUM PAYMENTS BY INSURED SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS TO THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

SEC. 6. The text of section 404 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1727) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. (a) (1) The Corporation shall established a primary reserve which shall be the general reserve of the Corporation and a secondary reserve to which shall be credited the amounts of the prepayments made by insured institutions pursuant to former provisions of subsection (d) and the credits made pursuant to the first sentence of subsection (e).

"(2) The Corporation may accomplish the purposes and provisions of this section by rules, regulations, orders, or otherwise as it may consider necessary or appropriate.

"(b) (1) Each institution whose application for insurance is approved by the Corporation shall pay to the Corporation, in such manner as it shall prescribe, a premium for such insurance equal to one-twelfth of 1 per centum of the total amount of all accounts of the insured members of such institution. Such premium shall be paid at the time the certificate is issued by the Corporation under section 403, and thereafter annually, except that under regulations prescribed by the Corporation such premium may be paid semiannually.

"(2) If, at the close of any December 31, the primary reserve equals or exceeds 2 per centum of the total amount of all accounts of insured members of all insured institutions as of such close, no premium under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be payable by any insured institution with respect to its premium year beginning during the year commencing on May 1 next succeeding such December 31, except that the foregoing provisions of this sentence shall not be applicable to any insured institution with respect to any of the twenty premium years beginning with the premium year commencing with the date on which such certificate is issued.

"(c) The Corporation is further authorized to assess against each insured institution additional premiums for insurance until the amount of such premiums equals the amount of all losses and expenses of the Corporation; except that the total amount so assessed in any one year against any such institution shall not exceed one-eighth of 1 per centum of the total amount of the accounts of its insured members.

"(d) (1) The Corporation shall not, on or after the date of enactment of this sentence, accept or receive further payments in the nature of prepayments of future premiums as was formerly required by this subsection (including any such payments which have accrued or are payable under such former provisions). When no insured institution has any pro rata share of the secondary reserve, other than any such share immediately payable to it, the Corporation may take such steps as it may deem appropriate to close out and discontinue the secondary reserve.

"(2) The Corporation may provide for the adjustment of payments made under former provisions of this subsection or made or to be made under subsections (b) and (c) of this section in cases of merger or consolidation, transfer of bulk assets or assumption of liabilities, and similar transactions, as defined by the Corporation for the purposes of this paragraph.

"(e) The Corporation shall credit to the secondary reserve, as of the close of each calendar year a return on the outstanding balances of the secondary reserve, during such calendar year, as determined by the Corporation, at a rate equal to the average annual rate of return to the Corporation during the year ending at the close of November 30 of such calendar year, as determined by the Corporation, on the investments held by the Corporation in obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. Except as provided in subsections (f) and (g), the secondary reserve shall be available to the Corporation only for losses of the Corporation and shall be so available only to such extent as other accounts of the Corporation which are available therefor are insufficient for such losses. No right, title, or interest of any institution in or with respect to its pro rata share of the secondary reserve shall be assignable or transferable whether by operation of law or otherwise, except to such extent as the Corporation may provide for transfer of such pro rata share in cases of merger or consolidation, transfer of bulk assets or assumption of liabilities, and similar transactions, as defined by the Corporation for purposes of this sentence.

"(f) If (i) the status of an insured institution as an insured institution is terminated pursuant to any provision of section 407 or the insurance of accounts of an insured institution is otherwise terminated, (ii) a conservator, receiver, or other legal custodian is appointed for an insured institution under the circumstances and for the purpose set forth in subsection (d) of section 401, or (iii) the Corporation makes a determination that for the purposes of this subsection an insured institution has gone into liquidation, the Corporation shall pay in cash to such institution its pro rata share of the secondary reserve, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Corporation may prescribe, or, at the option of the Corporation, the Corporation may apply the whole or any part of the amount which would otherwise be paid in cash toward the payment of any indebtedness or obligation, whether matured or not, of such institution to the Corporation, then existing or arising before such payment in cash: *Provided,* That such payment or such application need not be made to the extent that the provisions of the exception in the last sentence of subsection (e) are applicable.

"(g) If, at the close of December 31 in any year after 1971, the aggregate of the primary reserve and the secondary reserve equals or exceeds 1¼ per centum of the total amount of all accounts of insured members of all insured institutions but the primary reserve does not equal or exceed 2 per centum of such base, each insured institution's pro rata share of the secondary reserve shall, during the year beginning with May 1 next succeeding such close, be used, to the extent available, to discharge such institution's obligation for its premium under subsection (b) for the premium year beginning in such year, but only to the extent of such percentage, to be the same for all insured institutions and to be not less than 30 nor more than 70 per centum of such premium, as the Corporation may determine; and the use of such pro rata shares as provided in this sentence shall continue unless and until the next sentence or the last sentence of this subsection shall become operative. If, at the close of any December 31 occurring before the last sentence of this subsection shall become operative, the aggregate of the primary reserve and the secondary reserve is not at least equal to 1¼ per centum of the total amount of all accounts of insured members of all insured institutions, the use of any insured institution's pro rata share of the secondary reserve under the first sentence of this subsection shall terminate with respect to its premium under subsection (b) for the premium year beginning during the calendar year commencing on May 1 next succeeding such December 31, and such termination shall continue unless and until the first sentence of this subsection shall become operative. If, at the close of any December 31, the primary reserve equals or exceeds such 2 per centum, the Corporation shall, at such time (which shall be the same for all insured institutions and shall not be later than May 1 next succeeding such close) and in such manner as the Corporation shall determine, pay in cash to each insured institution its pro rata share of the secondary reserve.

"(h) (1) Each insured institution shall make such deposits in the Corporation as may from time to time be required by call of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Any such call shall be calculated by applying a specified percentage, which shall be the same for all insured institutions, to the total amount of all withdrawable or repurchasable shares, investment certificates, and deposits in each insured institution. No such call shall be made unless such Board determines that the total amount of such call, plus the outstanding deposits previously made pursuant to such calls, does not exceed 1 per centum of the total amount of all withdrawable or repurchasable shares, investment certificates, and deposits in all insured institutions. For the purposes of this subsection, the total amounts hereinabove referred to shall be determined or estimated by such Board or in such manner as it may prescribe.

"(2) The Corporation shall credit as of the close of each calendar year, to each deposit outstanding at such close, a return on the outstanding balance, as determined by the Corporation, of such deposit during such calendar year, at a rate equal to the average annual rate of return, as determined by the Corporation, to the Corporation during the year ending at the close of November 30 of such calendar year, on the investments held by the Corporation in obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"(3) The Corporation in its discretion may at any time repay all such deposits, or repay pro rata a portion of each of such deposits, in such manner and under such procedure as the Corporation may prescribe. Any procedure for such pro rata repayment may provide for total repayment of any deposit, if total repayment of any and all deposits of equal or smaller amount is likewise provided for.

"(4) The provisions of subsection (f) of this section and of the last sentence of subsection (e) of this section shall be applicable to deposits under this subsection, and for the purposes of this subsection the references in such subsection (f) and such last sentence to the prepayments and the pro rata shares therein mentioned shall be deemed instead to be references respectively to the deposits under this subsection and the pro rata shares of the holders thereof, and the reference in such subsection (f) to that subsection shall be deemed instead to be a reference to this subsection."

STATE TAXATION OF FEDERALLY INSURED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) This section may be cited as the "State Taxation of Depositories Act".

(b) The Congress finds that the national goals of fostering an efficient banking system and the free flow of commerce among the States will be furthered by clarifying the principles governing State taxation of interstate transactions of banks and other depositories. Application of taxes measured by income or receipts, or other "doing business" taxes, in States other than the States in which depositories have their principal offices should be deferred until such time as uniform and equitable methods are developed for determining jurisdiction to tax and for dividing the tax base among States.

(c) With respect to any taxable year or other taxable period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this section and before January 1, 1976, no State or political subdivision thereof may impose any tax measured by income or receipts or any other "doing business" tax on any insured depository not having its principal office within such State.

(d) For the purpose of this section—

(1) The term "insured depository" means any bank the deposits of which are insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, any institution the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or any thrift and home financing institution which is a member of a Federal home loan bank.

(2) The term "State" means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(c)(1) The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations shall make a study of all pertinent matters relating to the application of State "doing business" taxes on out-of-State commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations. Such study shall include recommendations for legislation which will provide equitable State taxation of out-of-State commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations. Such recommendations shall include, but shall not be limited to, the matter of the proper allocation, apportionment, or other division of tax bases and such other matters relating to the question of multistate taxation of commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations as the Commission shall determine to be pertinent. In conducting the study, the Commission shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, appropriate State banking and taxing authorities, and others as needed.

(2) The Commission shall make a report to the Congress of the results of its study and recommendations not later than December 31, 1974.

(3) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of its enactment, except that the amendments made by sections 1 and 5 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
FRANK ANNUNZIO,
W. A. BARRETT,
JIM HANLEY,
FRANK J. BRASCO,
WILLIAM R. COTTER,
JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
JOHN H. ROUSSELOT,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
J. WILLIAM STANTON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
H. A. WILLIAMS,
THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
JOHN TOWER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6370) to extend certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, to prohibit depository institutions from permitting negotiable orders of withdrawal to be made with respect to any deposit or account on which any interest or dividened is paid, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations and national banks to own stock in and invest in loans to certain State housing corporations, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill extended until September 30, 1975, the authority of various Federal financial regulatory agencies to establish flexible ceilings that may be paid by most banks on time and savings deposits, and by most building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations and cooperative banks on deposits, shares, and withdrawable accounts. The Senate amendment extended the same authority until June 1, 1974. The conferees accepted the compromise date of December 31, 1974.

The House bill prohibited depository institutions from allowing the owner of a deposit or account on which interest or dividends is paid to make withdrawals by negotiable or transferrable instruments for the purpose of making transfers to third parties. The Senate amendment differed from the House bill in that it did not prohibit such withdrawals with respect to depository institutions in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. The Senate amendment also differed in that its prohibition on such withdrawals with respect to depository institutions in 48 States and its exception with respect to Massachusetts and New Hampshire expired on the same date as is prescribed in Section 7 of the Act of September 21, 1966. The conferees accepted a compromise which prohibits such withdrawals in depository institutions in 48 States, making an exception for such withdrawals in depository institutions in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. The compromise also deletes credit unions from the definition of "depository institution".

The House bill extended the authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation over interest rates paid by non-insured banks, except to non-insured banks in any State where total deposits of non-insured financial institutions in such State are less than 20% of total deposits of all financial institutions in such State. The Senate amendment extended the authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation over interest rates paid by non-insured banks to NOW accounts in such banks. The conferees accepted the House provision.

The House bill extended the authority of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in the same manner as it extended the authority of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conferees receded to the Senate position.

The House bill amended section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act and paragraph seven of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes in order to permit national banks and certain savings and loan associations chartered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to invest in, lend to, and to commit themselves to lend to State housing corporations incorporated in the State in which the head office of the association is located. The investments of any such association may not exceed ¼ of 1 percent of its assets, and its loans and loan commitments may not exceed 1 percent of the total outstanding loans which it makes or purchases. The Senate amendment differed from the House bill in that it: (1) had no ceiling on the amount of loans and loan commitments that any such association may make to State housing corporations other than whatever ceiling the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may, by rule, prescribe; (2) placed the same aggregate limitation on investments which any such association may make to State housing corporations, as does the House bill, except that in the Senate amendment the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may, by rule, set a smaller aggregate limitation; (3) directed the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to regulate investment in State housing corporations; and (4) defined the terms "insured institution", "State member insured banks", "State nonmember insured banks", "State housing corporation", and "State". The House receded to the Senate provision.

The Senate amendment amended section 402 of title IV of the National Housing Act to direct the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation not to approve until December 31, 1973, conversions from the mutual to stock form by savings and loan associations the accounts of which are insured or would become insured by the Corporation. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The House conferees accepted the Senate provision with an amendment. Under the provision adopted by the conferees, the Corporation is directed not to grant approval to applications for conversion from the mutual to stock form until June 30, 1974; with the exception that study applications filed with the Corporation before Senate passage of S. 1798 on May 22, 1973, may be considered on the merits after December 31, 1973, in accordance with regulations then in effect and adopted pursuant to Title IV of the National Housing Act or Section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.

The Senate amendment amended section 404 of title IV of the National Housing Act to establish a new procedure for payment by insured savings and loan associations of premiums into the reserve fund of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The House bill had no comparable pro-

vision. The conferees accepted the Senate provision.

The Senate amendment directed the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to make a study with respect to the application by the States of "doing business" taxes on out-of-State commercial banks, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations and to report the results of such study together with its recommendations to Congress not later than December 31, 1974. The Senate amendment also contained a list of specific types of taxes which the States and political subdivisions thereof may impose on insured depositories on or after the date of enactment of the section of the amendment containing such provision and before January 1, 1976. Such list did not include taxes measured by income or receipts or other "doing business" taxes. The Senate amendment defined insured depositories to mean banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and thrift and home financing institutions which are members of any Federal home loan bank. The House bill had no comparable provision. The conferees adopted a version which does not alter the study in any way, which eliminates the list of permissible State taxes and in lieu thereof explicitly states that no State or political subdivision thereof may impose any tax measured by income or receipts or any other "doing business" tax on any insured depository not having its principal office within such State, and which alters the effective date provision so that the prohibition on State taxation discussed above is with respect to any taxable year or period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this section of the conference substitute and before January 1, 1976. The effective date was altered so that the prohibition would not affect a State or political subdivision thereof in the middle of a taxable year or period.

The House bill and the amendments made by it took effect 30 days after enactment, except the Regulation Q extension amendment and the State Housing Corporation amendment took effect on enactment. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision, and, therefore, it took effect on enactment. The Senate receded to the House provision.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
FRANK ANNUNZIO,
W. A. BARRETT,
JIM HANLEY,
FRANK J. BRASCO,
WILLIAM R. COTTER,
JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
JOHN H. ROUSSELOT,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
J. WILLIAM STANTON,
GARRY BROWN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
H. A. WILLIAMS,
THOMAS J. MCINTYRE,
JOHN TOWER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6912, AMENDING PAR VALUE MODIFICATION ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 6912) to amend the Par Value Modification Act, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 93-424)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6912) to amend the Par Value Modification Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That the first sentence of section 2 of the Par Value Modification Act is amended by striking out the words "one thirty-eighth of a fine troy ounce of gold" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "0.828948 Special Drawing Right or, the equivalent in terms of gold, of forty-two and two-ninths dollars per fine troy ounce of gold".

SEC. 2. The Par Value Modification Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that the President shall take all appropriate action to expedite realization of the international monetary reform noted at the Smithsonian on December 18, 1971."

SEC. 3. (a) Sections 3 and 4 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 442 and 443) are repealed.

(b) No provision of any law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and no rule, regulation, or order under authority of any such law, may be construed to prohibit any person from purchasing, holding, selling, or otherwise dealing with gold.

(c) The provisions of this section, pertaining to gold, shall take effect when the President finds and reports to the Congress that international monetary reform shall have proceeded to the point where elimination of regulations on private ownership of gold will not adversely affect the United States' international monetary position.

TITLE II—FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SEC. 201. The Congress finds that—

(1) movements of mobile capital can have a significant impact on the proper functioning of the international monetary system;

(2) it is important to have as complete and current data as feasible on the nature and source of these capital flows, including transactions by large United States business enterprises and their foreign affiliates;

(3) it is desirable to emphasize this objective by supplementing existing legal authority for the collection of data on capital flows contained in section 5(b) of the Emergency Banking Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 95a) and section 8 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 286f).

AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE REGULATIONS

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed, under the authority of this title and any other authority conferred by law, to supplement regulations requiring the submission of reports on foreign currency transactions consistent with the statement of findings under section 201. Regulations prescribed under this title shall require that such reports contain such information and be submitted in such manner and at such times, with reasonable exceptions and classifications, as may be necessary to carry out the policy of this title.

(b) Reports required under this title shall cover foreign currency transactions conducted by any United States person and by any foreign person controlled by a United States person as such terms are defined in section 7(f)(2)(A) and 7(f)(2)(C) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 203. (a) Whoever fails to submit a report required under any rule or regulation issued under this title may be assessed a civil penalty not exceeding $10,000 in a proceeding brought under subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Whenever it appears to the Secretary that any person has failed to submit a report required under any rule or regulation issued under this title or has violated any rule or regulation issued hereunder, the Secretary may in his discretion bring an action, in the proper district court of the United States or the proper United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, seeking a mandatory injunction commanding such person to comply with such rule or regulation, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond, and additionally the sanction provided for failure to submit a report under subsection (a).

And the Senate agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
H. S. REUSS,
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
THOMAS M. REES,
RICHARD T. HANNA,
ANDREW YOUNG,
PETE STARK,
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
J. WILLIAM STANTON,
BILL FRENZEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
JOHN TOWER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CHARLES H. PERCY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6912) to amend the Par Value Modification Act, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill amended section 2 of the Par Value Modification Act to establish a new par value of the dollar, one dollar equal to 0.828948 Special Drawing Right or, in terms of gold, forty-two and two-ninths dollars per fine troy ounce of gold. The House bill stated the definition of the dollar as a fraction. The Senate amendment made the same change in the definition of the dollar but stated it in terms of a decimal. The conferees accepted the House provision.

The House bill contained a sense of Congress statement concerning international monetary reform. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. The conferees accepted the House provision.

The House bill legalized private ownership of gold as of the date when the President reports to Congress that elimination of regulation on private ownership will not adversely affect the international monetary position of the United States. The Senate amendment legalized private ownership of gold as of December 31, 1973. The conferees accepted the House provision.

The Senate amendment contained impoundment control procedures. The House bill had no comparable provision. The Senate receded to the House.

The Senate amendment established a ceiling on fiscal year 1974 expenditures. The House bill had no comparable provision. The Senate receded to the House.

The Senate amendment directed the Secretary of the Treasury, by rule, to require multinational corporations to submit reports of foreign currency transactions. The House bill had no comparable provision. The conferees agreed to the Senate provision with a clarifying change.

The Senate amendment prohibited assistance to North Vietnam unless specifically authorized by Congress. The House bill had no comparable provision. The Senate receded from its provision, although the conferees favored the Senate provision. The conferees believed that the matter should be handled in a different way procedurally.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
H. S. REUSS,
WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
THOMAS M. REES,
RICHARD T. HANNA,
ANDREW YOUNG,
PETE STARK,
ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr.
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,
BILL FRENZEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
JOHN TOWER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
CHARLES H. PERCY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

REFERRAL OF H.R. 4382 TO COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill H.R. 4382 and that such bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 542, WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 542) concerning the war powers of Congress and the President, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ZABLOCKI, MORGAN, HAYS, FRASER, FASCELL, MAILLIARD, FINDLEY, BROOMFIELD, and FRELINGHUYSEN.

THE AIR FORCE F–15 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

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

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, an integral part of developing the new B–1 bomber system as a first line of both offensive and defensive strike capability is in the procurement of a tactical fighter specifically designed to excel in the air-to-air combat role. It is my view the Air Force F–15 fighter aircraft, whose airframe is being manufactured by McDonnell-Douglas, meets the criteria for superiority in this role.

Although certain test requirements for engine performance remain to be met on the F–15, our committee has been assured that McDonnell-Douglas has satisfied all required specifications and performance tests for the airframe either on or ahead of schedule.

As the Air Force's first air superiority fighter in more than 25 years, the F–15 will be capable of performing tactical missions of fighter sweep, escort and combat air patrol. To perform such tasks, the F–15 must be able to acquire, identify, engage and destroy enemy aircraft in either contested or enemy airspace and in enemy-controlled radar environment.

McDonnell-Douglas, in its role as manufacturer of the airframe for the F–15, has met flight test milestones in less than one-third of the time allotted under its contract, and has produced the most trouble-free flight evaluation program ever experienced by the Air Force with a completely new aircraft system. The maneuverability and handling qualities of the airframe for the F–15 have met all estimates and the performance has exceeded all predictions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our House Armed Services Committee has made a reasonable and economic estimate in authorizing the procurement of 39 F–15 aircraft at a total cost of $587.6 million in fiscal year 1974, and I urge the House's support of this recommendation.

MR. EHRLICHMAN'S POSITION

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Kentucky took offense at what I had to say about Mr. Ehrlichman, and came to the defense of Mr. Ehrlichman.

I do not believe anybody in this Congress would think that Time magazine is biased against the Republican Party or against any Republican, and I would suggest that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) and other Members might like to read this week's issue of Time and what Time has to say about whether or not Mr. Ehrlichman believes in democracy or whether he does not. I believe my position of yesterday will be substantiated, because it is pretty obvious from his appearance on the witness stand that he does not believe in the Bill of Rights or the American democratic system.

And furthermore, I would just like to point out that neither he nor any of the rest of the people who are testifying over there were ever elected to any office whatever, from dogcatcher to whatever one cares to mention.

THE RESULT OF LAST NIGHT'S CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy duty to inform this Chamber of the results of last night's Congressional Baseball Game in Balitimore's Memorial Stadium.

Of course I will not boast nor gloat, but merely will report the facts of the game. And the chief fact is that, for the 10th consecutive year, my Republican charges rolled over what is laughingly called our Democratic opposition.

We beat them from the pitcher's mound and from the batter's box; we beat them in the field and on the basepaths. And when the carnage was over, the Republican team had rung up another smashing victory, 12 to 4—a score that, as the sportswriters say, could have been much worse.

As in the past, our team had many stars last night—Pitcher BOB MICHEL won his 11th game: LOU FREY rapped three hits: WILL HUDNUT and BILL KEATING hit the ball hard; and our glove-work at nearly every position was superior.

In addition, we unveiled a fire-balling new pitcher—BILL COHEN of Maine. When and if BOB MICHEL ever gets relegated to the bullpen, we have got another potential 11-game winner coming up.

With such a galaxy of stars to choose from, my GOP teammates nevertheless selected me as most valuable player for our club this year. Inspired by this great honor, I am already plotting the continuation of Republican supremacy next year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my opposite number from the Democratic team, Mr. CLARK, to rally the tattered remnants of his club and begin immediately to practice for next year's game. Like all great champions, the Republican team needs topflight competition.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the distinguished manager of the opposition team. I congratulate him also on being selected the outstanding player of the game.

I wish also to take note that the Democrats were confined to synthetic uniforms. I noted that the gentleman from Massachusetts was wearing a cotton one. I wonder if the amendments to the agriculture bill were for the benefits of the opposition baseball team.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman from South Carolina it was not a contribution from Cotton Inc. either.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE IN BEEF INDUSTRY

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

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to be calling on the Attorney General of the United States to start an investigation to study the possibility that meat producers and wholesalers are engaged in an illegal restraint of trade by withholding beef from the marketplace.

In the city of New York we are seeing a situation developing right now in which meat producers are refusing even to bid on contracts for the city for municipal hospitals for a 2-week period.

We in effect are being told by these suppliers that the Government is going to knuckle under to beef producers and the public be damned as far as getting any food is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that meat producers, both the wholesalers and the suppliers, should be abiding by the laws of the land. In effect, right now they are blackmailing us, and I believe the Attorney General should look into the situation.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what the gentleman from New York has said.

I want to point out that I have information that cold storage facilities in my community have been filled to capacity with beef and meat products. I have reports that they are being filled by speculators who are contemplating high profits. This withholding of meat supplies may constitute an illegal restraint of trade.

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

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER SPEAKING ON CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 271

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

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Concurrent Resolution No. 271, which is designed to get some action on the remaining missing-in-action cases in Southeast Asia. The bills I am placing in the "hopper" contain 48 cosponsors representing a broad cross section of the Congress, both politically and philosophically. I believe that this is truly a nonpartisan issue and I am certain most of the Members agree with me.

This last week I met with the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia who were here for their convention and fourth annual dinner. It was a moving evening and I came away feeling more strongly than ever that we have to make this one last effort for these families. They are truly desperate for some recognition that they have not been forgotten now that the fighting is scheduled to stop in 2 weeks and the POW's have returned.

I, myself, do not intend to give up on this issue and plan to circulate still another "Dear Colleague" letter on this matter after the August recess, as I feel that everyone here in the House will want to make this last effort on behalf of these families.

As some of my colleagues may know, Senator JOHN TOWER has introduced identical legislation in the other body and other Senators are joining him in this commendable effort. I invite and solicit your support.

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

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would certainly like to be associated with the gentleman's remarks. I also attended the meeting last week of the families of the missing in action. I am certainly proud to be a cosponsor of the resolution.

CHALLENGE TO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1973, I announced a Government Activities Subcommittee investigation of the expenditure of Federal funds for improvements on private property in the name of Presidential security. I have repeatedly attempted to obtain from the General Services Administration the pertinent facts and documents needed. It now appears that a systematic effort is underway to prevent the subcommittee, the Congress and the American people from learning the true facts.

I was informed yesterday by the Administrator of GSA that he had been instructed, following a 3-hour meeting at the White House on Sunday with Mr. Ron Ziegler and Mr. Leonard Garment, that no further information or materials would be made available to the subcommittee at this time.

Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing White House appointees. Attempting to hamper a congressional committee from performing its legitimate function. Consequently, I have asked the chairman of the Government Operations Committee to issue subpenas for the needed documents and testimony. Congress cannot permit this assault on its constitutional authority to go unchallenged.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device; and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 404]

Alexander	Fraser	Reid
Badillo	Gray	Roe
Bingham	Gubser	Roncalio, Wyo.
Boggs	Gunter	Rooney, N.Y.
Breckinridge	Hanna	Rose
Broyhill, Va.	Jones, N.C.	Ruth
Camp	Landgrebe	Smith, Iowa
Clark	Milford	Sullivan
Diggs	Mills, Ark.	Teague, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	Moorhead, Pa.	Towell, Nev.
Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.	Waggonner
Ford, William D.	Patman	Winn
	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

IS IT GOODBY LAOS?

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the headlines on yesterday said the Reds are to get 80 percent of Laos. The North Vietnamese were left undisturbed along the Ho Chi Minh Trail to South Vietnam. The agreement between contesting forces for Laos specifies a withdrawal of all foreign forces within 60 days. The Communists say there were no North Vietnamese in that country. Everyone knows this is not true, that means those who are to withdraw are the 17,000 Thai forces which are fighting for the Vientiane government and 350 American military advisers. This is the result of the treaty which our Mr. Kissinger worked out.

We can hope for the best. Hope is about all that is left in this case. It may be found that, for the sake of expediency and for getting the Reds to accept an agreement, the United States has virtually abandoned Laos.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 398, on Thursday, July 26, the RECORD shows me as not voting. I was on the floor throughout the evening debate and voted on every amendment and for the recommittal motion just previous to the vote on final passage.

I inserted my card in the electronic voting slot and pushed the "nay" button. Obviously, I failed to note that my vote did not record. But I would like the permanent RECORD to show that if it had, I would have been recorded as voting against final passage.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION, 1974

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 9286) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel

strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and the military training student loads, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 9286, with Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, it had agreed that title 1, ending on page 3, line 6 of the bill, would be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to be proposed to title 1?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer at this point an amendment to the bill H.R. 9286, which amendment was set forth in this morning's RECORD at page 26711 and following. It would have provided that the Central Intelligence Agency must stay out of internal security functions, and that it must stay out of paramilitary foreign operations.

The amendment is directed at certain practices which have been with us for some time. In the case of internal security functions, we have the recent revelations that the CIA is supplying burglary equipment. In the case of paramilitary foreign operations as opposed to the collection, coordination, and dissemination of intelligence, operations have taken place in as diverse places as Iran, Guatamala, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile and various countries in Indochina.

The amendment would have simply provided that the acts of 1947 and 1949, the basic Central Intelligence Agency legislation, meant what they said. I have had an opportunity to discuss my views and the amendment both with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee most concerned with the CIA, Mr. NEDZI. I believe that the general views which I have expressed are shared by those leaders.

I am well aware that the subcommittee concerned has been conducting hearings in depth on this problem. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI), the chairman of the subcommittee, that immediately after the recess it will start upon the task of evolving substantive legislation which will go to the two problems I have mentioned; the unauthorized foreign operations, and the unauthorized internal security conduct of the Central Intelligence Agency.

May I ask the gentleman from Michigan whether my understanding is substantially correct?

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI).

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to confirm what the gentleman from Wisconsin has said. There is unanimity that the National Security Act of 1947 should be amended. There is unanimity on the part of the subcommittee, and it is the intention of the chairman, as well as the full subcommittee, to get together immediately following the recess with specific legislation amending the Security Act of 1947.

At the present time, it is anticipated that the amendments and suggestions proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin may be considered. Indeed, the chairman himself has a number of suggestions which are going to be incorporated into the substantive changes.

Mr. REUSS. I am delighted to hear what the gentleman from Michigan just said.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would express my deep appreciation to the gentleman in the well for his understanding and cooperation in this area. I assure the gentleman the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. NEDZI, has been conducting a very excellent investigation in depth of the situation, and it will be brought to the attention of the gentleman at the appropriate time.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

In view of what has now been spread on the record, I have no intention of pressing my amendment at this time. I am confident that substantially similar substantive legislation will be forthcoming. Of course, I pledge my best efforts to help in its enactment.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. I should like to express the appreciation of the subcommittee for the gentleman's understanding and cooperation in this matter. I assure him that the subcommittee indeed will cooperate with him.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT: On page 2, line 11, after "Army" strike "$574,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$449,200,000."

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of a series of amendments that I intend to offer. Some of my colleagues on the committee intend to offer other amendments. I would suspect that they would involve in total perhaps $3 billion.

I said at the outset of my concurring remarks that I voted for this bill, as I have voted for each and every defense bill that has come to this floor, and that basically everyone is for motherhood, prosecution of the Watergate burglars, and national defense. There are degrees of enthusiasm as between reasonable people on all of these issues, which is the reason, at least on the defense issue, why we hold civilian oversight hearings on the Pentagon.

This particular amendment is one of five amendments I intend to offer.

One amendment is for $885 million, to reduce the Trident missile system.

There is an amendment of $169 million to delete the funds for the landing helicopter assault ship. I have an amendment to reduce Safeguard ABM by $175 million.

For the site defense of ABM there is an amendment to reduce the figure by $75 million.

On the Vietnam military assistance, including Laos, it would be $800 million.

I also have an amendment to reduce Sam–D by $100 million.

I want to say at the outset that I do not intend to kill any single one of these programs. Every program I support, I just do not support them to the extent, and with the enthusiasm of our current authorization.

I believe that if we want to save money we should do it in the authorization bill. This is a $21.5 billion authorization bill, the largest single authorization program, outside of the trust fund authorizations which are included in the HEW bill, that will come to this floor.

If we are concerned with reallocating priorities, and measuring one program against another, I believe we have to take a good, close look at some of these programs.

We have not looked at them all. There are probably only a half dozen programs we would ask the House to review in some detail here this afternoon. I would hope we could have some kind of reasonably long debate on some of these items.

Believe me when I say that there are more than 1,000 different programs we are not even glancing at, reviewing, or taking a look at.

I believe that Safeguard is one we can review quite closely. This program, of course, for the Safeguard ABM and the site defense program, is involved in my current amendment.

The only thing allowed under title I is a $100 million reduction for the procurement amounts in the ABM program.

Mr. Chairman, the Members might ask: "Are we killing the ABM program by taking out the $100 million here and the $150 million out of research and development which is included both in site defense and in the Safeguard antiballistic missile account?"

The answer to that, very simply is "No," because even after this amendment, we are going to have nearly a half a billion dollars in the program for antiballistic missile defense.

The committee has wisely taken some money out of the Safeguard account. The Pentagon originally wanted $215 million for research and development; the committee took out $25 million. They wanted $185 million for Safeguard procurement; the committee took out $25 million, which left a total Safeguard program of $350 million.

In the site defense program the Pentagon wanted $170 million; we took out $25 million, and there was $145 million left in that program. In addition, we have $190 million in the advance ballistic missile defense system. So our total current program is $685 million.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this total

program could be reduced by $258 million. The reason I say that is because the Pentagon admits that the Safeguard program is what we call the "Model T" of the antiballistic missile programs. We have already spent in this program $5 billion for the Safeguard and $4 billion for the NIKE X program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) has expired.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object; I will not object at this point—I merely wish to clarify whether the gentleman's amendment reduces this item $100 million or $125 million.

Mr. LEGGETT. No, Mr. Chairman, it reduces it $100 million.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the figure which we have here would indicate it would reduce it $125 million.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is a cataclysmic point whether the amendment at this time is for $100 million or $125 million, and I am not going to ask unanimous consent to conform the amendment, if that is the proper figure. I have not had an opportunity to check it myself.

We have spent $9 billion on the antiballistic program, and as of today we have 30 of the Spartans deployed at Grand Forks and 70 of the Sprints deployed at Grand Forks. We are authorized under the SALT I agreement to deploy another 81 missiles around Washington, but because of political reasons we are not doing anything on that program. That program is not offered by the Department of Defense this year.

So what we have to do is to rationalize this $9 billion of expenditures, taking into consideration the 100 missiles which we have at Grand Forks. That is $90 million per missile.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that it takes a master of defense theory to recognize that those 100 missiles at Grand Forks are not going to do very much, really, to protect our national deterrent capability. Even if the Soviets inflict or try to inflict a first strike, we will still have 656 missile tubes at sea, each missile tube having 10 separate targetable nuclear warheads, or about 6,560 deployed missiles at sea that are totally sacrosanct from any kind of an international conflagration. How the 100 ABM's at Grand Forks will measurably participate in the defense of this Nation is not really readily apparent.

I think we should go ahead and finish Grand Forks but at a leisurely pace of a half a billion dollar rate, maybe, and not the three-quarter billion dollar rate that the bill would call for.

The bill also calls for a 100-percent acceleration in what we call the site defense program. Last year we had a site defense program, which is an automated ABM. Bear in mind, all ABM's, Sprint and Spartan, are new except the 100 around Washington, and they are barred by the SALT agreement. Here we go with a new site agreement which accelerates it from $180 million to the new research level which was wisely reduced by Chairman PRICE to the $145-million level.

I think even this item can be very substantially reduced, because the only way the system can be deployed is to abort the SALT agreement. All we have to do is read on page 118 of our report where we quote the Committee on Appropriations last year in their report. It said:

> The Committee was also concerned as to the total cost of this program. The estimated total development cost of the program, as presented in the January budget, was from $700 to $800 million. As presented in support of the June 30th budget amendment, the development cost was estimated to be 100 percent more. It was further estimated that the cost of defending one Minuteman wing with this system will be from $1.6 to $2.4 billion, including only procurement and construction costs. There would be additional personnel and operation maintenance costs over and above this amount.
>
> It is not clear, considering the present treaty limiting the deployment of ABM systems, as to just where and how the proposed new system would be deployed. Until these matters are more clear, the Committee believes a more reasonable pace of development is appropriate.

As you recall, the Senate and the House Committees on Appropriations did slow it down last year. I think the total program should be slowed down this year. We can find out in a few years whether the Soviets will comply with the SALT agreements, and at that time we will not have spent another $2 billion getting ready for something that is going to be put concrete by further agreements at the executive level.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California does not reduce this item by $100 million but, rather, by $125 million.

The gentleman said he would not be opposed to the completion of the Grand Forks site but would suggest that we proceed in a more leisurely manner. I think if we did that and withheld $125 million out of this bill just to accomplish more leisurely programing, we would eventually add more, probably twice as much, to the cost of completion of this project.

We have had these arguments about the site program for a long time. There has been a bit of merit to some of the arguments, but one thing we overlook is that if we had not proceeded with these programs, me might not today have the SALT agreement signed, sealed, and delivered.

This program now is in keeping with the terms of that agreement. It was within a few days of our original announcement of the development of the ABM that the Soviets first advanced their willingness to take part in the strategic arms limitation talks. There is strong evidence that the development of the ABM led the Soviets to cooperate in some form of arms limitation.

The ABM treaty allows two systems, one around the Nation's Capital and one around the ICBM field. We have already indicated, as a result of congressional action last year, that we will not build a system around our Nation's Capital.

The Soviets have a system around their capital, and have indicated that they will deploy a system around the ICBM field. In providing defense for the ICBM we have to assume that some of the missiles can be fired from their silos following an attack, and Safeguard enhances the invulnerability of the ICBM field, and thus improves its potential deterrence.

The installation of our ABM system at Grand Forks is almost 90-percent complete. It would be sheer folly to adopt this particular amendment when we are within 10 percent of completion of this site. And I am certain that, as I said before, to proceed to do it in a leisurely manner by reducing this budget by $125 million is going to cost us twice as much in the long run, and maybe more than that.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I, too, like the chairman of the R. & D. Subcommittee, was concerned when the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) said he did not know whether his amendment reduced it $125 million or $100 million.

I would ask the distinguished gentleman in the well if it is not true that when we stretch out these development programs and proceed in a more leisurely manner, as the gentleman from California proposed, that we will in the long run spend more money than if we were to proceed on schedule?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman from Missouri is definitely correct.

One of the main reasons for many cost overruns in the military programs has been an effort to stretch out programs, and every one we do this to adds to the total cost of that program.

Mr. ICHORD. It looks good, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, to say that we can cut this and save some money, but in the long run we will spend more money.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman from Missouri is correct.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Is it not a fact that on the ABM program after we had negotiated the termination agreement at the Maelstrom site and the Whiteman site located in the district represented by the gentleman from Missouri that we had cancellation charges that exceeded $300 million? And so by accelerating the ABM program the year before last we in fact cost the country this extra money.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I do not see any connection between the statement made by the gentleman from California and the facts here. We are talking about the

Grand Forks site and not about sites we have already canceled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

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

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to correct a misimpression which the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) either intentionally or unintentionally left, and that was that I was interested in the Safeguard system because of Safeguard spending in my district. Let me say to the gentleman that the sites referred to are not in my district, and I am not interested in any development of the Safeguard system because of the financial impact upon my district.

Mr. LEGGETT. If the gentleman will yield, I meant to refer to the State of Missouri.

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

As it is, the Armed Services Committee has made a reduction in R.D.T. & E. funds for the Safeguard system which will require limiting the testing of the system that would normally be undertaken in fiscal 1974. Further cuts now would merely provide chaos in a program which has been severely cut back and which has had considerable termination costs because of the reductions in line with the ABM Treaty.

Its equipment readiness date is October 1974—a little more than a year away.

The Safeguard program has, over the past 4 years, survived some of the most detailed examination and severe criticism ever experienced by a defense program. Nevertheless, the Congress as a whole recognized the advantages of having such a capability. Over the years many arguments such as: It will not work; it is not safe; it is too complex, and so forth, have been used, then abandoned, primarily due to a remarkably successful system test program and a deployment that is on schedule.

Now with the limitation to a one-site deployment, one of the arguments of opponents to continued deployment and completion of the Grand Forks site is, "the limited capability provided by only 100 interceptors is not worth the cost to complete the site."

Let us keep several points in mind:

First, the Safeguard system will provide a limited defense of retaliatory forces in the Grand Forks area as well as protection of a portion of the United States against accidental or light ICBM attacks.

Second, the limited deployment at the Grand Forks site will complicate a potential attack planner's tasks and can create uncertainties in his confidence of destroying U.S. land-based retaliatory forces with a single strike—thus an effective deterrent.

Third, the Grand Forks deployment will provide for the first time experience in operating a complex ABM system and its support equipment which cannot be obtained during the R. & D. phase of a program. This experience base will be crucial in the new systems we might need in the future if there is not a follow-on SALT treaty on offensive weapons.

It is significant to recognize that the Soviets have made tremendous strides in ballistic missile related technology and are accumulating a wealth of experience in these fields. I have no doubt they will continue to focus major attention on ABM development and will deploy the maximum level of ABM permitted by the treaty. In addition, the threat posed by the Soviet strategic ballistic missile force, although numerically limited, can and probably will increase with qualitative improvements which are permitted under terms of the Interim Offensive Arms Limitation Agreement.

In summary, our ballistic missile defense capability is nearing reality. I urge you to think of the advantages of completing the Safeguard deployment at Grand Forks which, in my opinion, equate to strength, experience, deterrence, and a favorably balanced strategic nuclear equation.

I listened to a marked degree to the gentleman's discussion, and I came to one conclusion. When one starts to talk about "this leisurely method," I think we have been so leisurely in our attitudes that we have neglected the entire problem. We cannot see the forest for the trees. No offense is meant to my learned colleague, but if the gentleman cannot tell the difference between $100 million and $125 million, that, in my mind, raises a very serious question as to whether or not the adequacies of all his observations are correct. If one cannot detect a $25 million mistake—then what are the required qualifications to even discuss the matter. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time except to indicate what I have already stated before. I shall not indulge my colleagues too long.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is a typical example of what this committee is going to be confronted with in the constant offering of amendments. The gentleman from California, a very keen student and a very diligent, conscientious individual, does not even know how much money is involved when he offers this amendment. He does not know whether it is $100 million or $125 million. But it indicates what I am trying to stress, and that is the irresponsibility of these amendments, for the better part, that come up.

I say to the members of this committee that if the Armed Services Committee had brought into this House a zero bill, there would be some Members of the House who would offer amendments to have a minus bill.

It is kill, kill, kill, reduce and cut figures, without any thought except to reduce ad infinitum, and there is no practical logic to it.

The only reason I rise in opposition is to indicate that and to ask that the amendment be defeated as a forerunner of what we will be facing today.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER: Page 2, line 15, strike out "$3,788,200,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$3,131,200,000".

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask support in deleting from this bill the authorization of $657 million for further construction of the CVN–70 nuclear aircraft carrier.

This carrier is the least justifiable of all the Navy's weapons requests. Consider for a moment why this program should be stopped:

In the first place, the ship alone will ultimately cost $1 billion and one complement of aircraft will cost another $1 billion. In addition, the necessary nuclear support ships will cost a further $1 billion. So that altogether we are committing ourselves now to a future hardware expenditure of $3 billion minimum. With the ever-present possibility of cost overruns, the cost may well run higher.

In the second place, we already have, or will soon have, 15 attack carriers, three of which will be nuclear. This fleet is currently and in the foreseeable future more than adequate to meet assigned tasks and threats, even under "worst-case" conditions. This carrier fleet stands alone in the world in its strength and size. Not counting the CVN–70, it will soon have the nuclear carriers in operation, each one of which has twice the firepower of an old carrier.

Furthermore, this carrier, like all the others, has no strategic role to play. It contributes only marginally to any realistic, or desirable, mission. Indeed, it is a ship in search of a mission, and besides that, it is highly vulnerable to attack.

The Navy justifies the construction of ships like the CVN–70 on the basis of "sea control" and "power display and protection." Ignoring the questionable wisdom of these missions, and their undesirable foreign policy implications, the jobs can be done better and less expensively by other weapons now deployed or under active development.

I recall that during the Bangladesh crisis, the Navy sent an aircraft carrier into the Bay of Bengal, no doubt as a "power display." India, however, viewed the move as a menacing gesture, and as a result we lost a few more points with that great eastern power. Is this the kind of thing our carriers will be used for in the future?

If you need further evidence of the shallowness of the argument, I suggest you look on pages 36–38 of the Armed Services Committee's report on this bill. The committee cites three specific reasons why the CVN–70, and similar type aircraft carriers, are needed:

First, because we might be denied land-based airfields. Of course, the report fails to mention that when operating in defended areas only about 35 to 40 of its aircraft will be available for attack mis-

sions. One wonders how important this can really be—except perhaps in out of the way places in this world where we have no business in the first place.

Second, that it is needed to defend against a heavy attack on our naval forces from cruise missiles that could be launched by the Soviets. This is sheer hogwash, since in such a highly unlikely situation the carrier would be a sitting duck itself.

And third, that by going nuclear we will be saving on oil. Maybe this is an argument for the propulsion system, certainly not for the ship itself.

To cancel the CVN–70 boondoggle means that Congress might have to pay heavy termination costs to contractors. The total may run as high as $100 million. But I believe that it is worth it. After all, it makes good sense to get out if it only costs us 3 percent of the total projected cost. While I would have preferred that our military planners had been sufficiently foresighted not to have drawn us into this mess in the first place, I believe we would be doing everyone a service by stopping this project now. Let us use the taxpayers' money to build up areas where we are weak, not waste their money by overbuilding the portion of the fleet that is already the unquestioned world leader.

I humbly ask that you give me your support on this amendment.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, has the gentlewoman read the latest report of "Jane's Fighting Ships"?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I have read the statement of the editor of "Jane's Fighting Ships" stating the United States has too many large-type ships similar to this carrier.

Mr. HUNT. The gentlewoman was speaking in respect to the strength and the quality of the Navy. If she would pursue that a little bit further, I think she would find—and perhaps she already has—that they say that we are now second to the Soviet fleet. Has the gentlewoman read that?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Sir, I agree that we——

Mr. HUNT. Has the gentlewoman read that portion?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. They do not say that qualitatively; they say quantitatively. I think there is no question that the Soviets have more submarines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Colorado has expired.

(At the request of Mr. LEGGETT and by unanimous consent, Mrs. SCHROEDER was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the gentlewoman at this point. I do not believe anyone in the United States today, as far as I can tell, has got a copy of Jane's Fighting ships, inasmuch as it was just published in London last week, but we do have some newspaper articles.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. If the gentleman has the document, I would be glad to yield to him, but I think the best evidence we have got of Jane's Fighting Ships is the article that appeared by Peter Stuart in the Christian Science Monitor I talked about yesterday on the floor.

In that article the new editor, Capt. John E. Moore, retired deputy director of British Naval Intelligence, points a scolding finger at his own Royal Navy and the navies of other sea powers, including the United States.

"Are the navies getting value for money?" he asks skeptically.

"All too frequently concentration on massive aircraft carriers, cruisers, and assault ships," he says, "ties up too much money in too few ships of limited capacity."

A glaring example is the American Navy's planned aircraft carrier CVN 70, carrying a price tag of $1 billion.

I ask the gentlewoman, if it is true that the Soviet Union is No. 1 over the United States, do they do it with aircraft carriers?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. No. In carriers we have unquestioned superiority. Jane's Fighting Ships admits that we are far superior in the number of attack carriers, far more carriers. The one or two carriers that the Soviets have, land only hover craft, and we do not classify such ships as carriers in our fleet.

Mr. LEGGETT. These hover craft are only good for about a half an hour in the air and have a cruising radius of 125 or 150 miles. Is it not a fact that they only have one, not 16 like the United States currently possesses?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think that is very true.

Mr. LEGGETT. If it is true the Soviet navy, according to Jane's and the gentleman from New Jersey, is really No. 1, would the gentlewoman conclude that perhaps the aircraft carrier is not the best indication of the capability of an international navy?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think that is very true. It is ranked No. 1, and part of it is because of its submarines.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from California is going to try to knock out the Trident. That is a submarine, and is liable to be stationed at Mare Island in his district, so he had better do some thinking about that also.

Mr. LEGGETT. I say to the gentleman from New York that the Trident——

Mr. KING. They do not dock any of them in my district in the Adirondacks.

Mr. LEGGETT. If they do, I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. KING. Get them out to Mare Island, pull the plugs out of them. That is where they launch subs by sinking them.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentlewoman from Colorado yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. I say that with a 40-foot draft on that Trident, it can hardly get into San Francisco Bay. That is why we are going to have to build new bases for them. It cannot get into any existing base, so we have to build new bases up in Washington.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make several comments. I think the whole thing about the Soviet Navy we should be concerned about is the fact that they are ahead of us in submarines. I am not sure the carrier is the way to go. I think we should put our dollars where they are needed most.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, in earlier years the argument against the carrier, which was made a moment ago by the gentleman from California, has always been that the Soviet Navy has no carriers; so therefore, it has been argued that the carrier is really not an important war vessel.

Well, the fact of the matter is that the Soviet Navy not only has one carrier almost completed already but we now learn that they are building a second carrier.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But they are much smaller.

Mr. STRATTON. Obviously the Soviets believe that the carrier is important enough so they must make every effort to catch up. That is exactly what they are doing now.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The two Soviet carriers are nowhere near the 95,000-ton carrier we talk about when we talk about the CVN–7.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. When we start talking about who is No. 1, and if the gentleman from California now admits we are No. 2, as Jane's says, then why should we proceed to try to make ourselves No. 3? We do need the nuclear-powered carrier.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. But listen to what we are saying. The way to become No. 1 is not to put the funds in another carrier. We are No. 1 in that area. Put the money in areas where we are deficient.

Mr. HUNT. We have overage carriers now.

That is where we are deficient and I am pleased to note that the gentleman from Colorado concedes that point.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is very persuasive, but I am not persuaded and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The U.S. Navy of today is a little more than half its size of just a few years ago. The cutback includes aircraft carriers, which made our naval strength significant in all parts of the world. The carrier was the core of that strength.

We are prone to overlook the fact that despite the great buildup in nuclear capability in recent years no nation has fought an atomic war, and probably none

ever will. It would be the height of folly to engage in the wholesale death and destruction which nuclear war would bring.

We must maintain our conventional capability, too, and carriers can meet any challenge from nuclear weapons to conventional bombs. They are designed to operate in the face of any hostile attack. They are the key to America's maritime strength. They can help to protect our merchant vessels everywhere.

Seapower is the key to the maintenance of the U.S. presence abroad in time of war. It cannot be done by airpower alone.

Without strong and mobile conventional forces, we will have only two options when our national interests are threatened; either go to nuclear war or back down. Those were the options available to the Soviets in the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. The Soviets had a weak navy then. We had strategic nuclear superiority, and the Soviets backed down.

Since that time the Soviets have allocated vast resources to gain nuclear parity, and they now have it, and perhaps more.

They have placed equal emphasis on naval shipbuilding programs. They have built up and modernized their navy. Theirs is the most modern navy in the world, because it is the newest, and many of the experts will tell us in overall fighting power it is superior to ours, certainly in some respects.

Our Navy has been reduced by 45 percent of its ships, and the size of the American fleet next year will be the smallest since the 1930's.

We had 25 aircraft carriers at the time of the Cuban missile crisis. Now we have 16. We are going down to 15. Nearly half of them are World War II carriers. That means that they are suffering from physical deterioration and technical obsolescence, which comes from age. We cannot ignore that.

Where the number of ships is limited, quality is essential. Our number certainly is limited. We must have new ships and equipment.

We propose to build a nuclear-powered carrier, and this is doubly important in an age when energy fuels are getting scarcer and more difficult to supply, and when there are fewer supply ships. This ship can operate for 10 years—10 years without refueling. It is a must for American forces.

The amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debate, and I read with particular interest the minority view of the gentlewoman, and I listened to her comments in the well just a few minutes ago.

I think it is an interesting thing to see the kind of navy the Soviet Union has developed, because the Soviet Union has developed a navy directly as a result of the lesson it learned in the Cuban missile crisis 11 years ago.

Bear in mind that they knew they were beginning from scratch, and so what they were starting with was the assumption that they should build first a fleet that would be able to challenge the United States on the high seas, not to control the seas, but to challenge us in a way that would deny us the control of the seas.

Hence the large submarine fleet, and hence the surface units with which they began the development of the Styx missile. In other words, they began to develop those kinds of vessels which would not run them into a great expense and which would enable them at the same time to pose a definite surface challenge to us. There has just been made the mention of the construction of two additional new carriers by the U.S.S.R. Admiral Gorshkov himself has admitted that they have got to go this route because the Soviet Union knows that without attack carriers they cannot, in fact, finally and effectively challenge the United States on the high seas.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if we are to learn any lesson, it is the lesson the Soviet Union has learned from us. So this afternoon, as I stand in this well, I do not argue about what we have got right now; it is what we have got to have in 1980 and in the decades to follow.

What is going to be the situation? Shall we rely on bases abroad? Indeed not. We had 500 airbases abroad at the end of World War II; today we have got 37. We can try to operate from those bases if we get into a critical situation and see if we have permission to use them; we will not have them.

The Soviet Union, being a continental landpower, does not have to worry about this as we do. We rely absolutely on the rest of the world for our raw materials. Sixty percent of the vital strategic materials that we use in our industry comes from abroad, and over 90 percent of the items to which we are accustomed at some point are derived from resources that we get from overseas.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very important statement, particularly with regard to the possible lack of overseas land airbases in time of emergency.

Is it not true that in the Mediterranean today the Soviets usually have more ships in the Mediterranean than we have, and so the only measure of our superiority and of our ability to be effective in the Mediterranean if anything develops in the Middle East lies in the fact that our force contains two aircraft carriers?

Mr. WHITEHURST. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The gentleman will remember 2 years ago or 3 years ago, when we went to the Mediterranean, the conversation we had there with Admiral Kidd.

Mr. STRATTON. And the situation is even more critical today, is it not, since we now have to depend more and more upon that Middle Eastern oil?

Mr. WHITEHURST. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. In a moment I will to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it will take or would take over the period of time for the period that this vessel operated under nuclear power 11 million barrels of fuel oil that will not be used because this vessel will have nuclear propulsion.

Because of this, we will have 90 percent greater aviation fuel capacity than with a conventionally powered *Forrestal* type.

It will have 50 percent greater ordnance capacity than a conventionally powered *Forrestal*-type ship.

The gentlewoman made reference to the cost of the ship. Of course it is costly; all great weapons systems are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITEHURST was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITEHURST. Her figures are not incorrect. If you count the aircraft that would be put aboard it and the escorts, the total cost in this period we are talking about for the 30-year life of the ship, will come to about $9 billion, but that is the equivalent of an annual cost of $300 million or about 1 percent of the Navy budget or less than 0.17 percent of the total U.S. budget. For Heaven's sake, let us see it in perspective.

Mr. LEGGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITEHURST. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the gentleman made a very good argument in favor of nuclear carriers. As you will recall, we were all out in the Mediterranean together getting the same statistics on the pragmatism of the nuclear carrier over the oil-burning carrier. I agree with the gentleman that we are going to have areas where it will be most cost effective, but the gentleman's argument in talking about all of these logistics and such as that is really an excellent argument to build carriers forever.

I do not believe there is anybody in the Department of the Navy or in the Pentagon who is serious today in contemplating a CVN after 1971 or 1972. The whole argument is, have we built the last nuclear carrier, or will we build CVN–70, which is the last nuclear carrier?

I am sure the gentleman well understands the fact that carriers do have some vulnerability considering the fact that we are as blind as we are in areas like the Mediterranean and other seas and are in fact developing longer range missiles all the time for our submarines which pose a considerable threat.

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

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WHITEHURST was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WHITEHURST. Go ahead. What is your question?

Mr. LEGGETT. Does the gentleman question whether or not this is the last proposed carrier of the Pentagon?

Mr. WHITEHURST. It may well be. This is a subjective judgment.

Mr. LEGGETT. The gentlewoman's argument is not really too inane. If the Pentagon itself suggests winding up this program and if this is the last ship, then should not——

Mr. WHITEHURST. Let us ask the gentlewoman if this is the last ship which she supported. She still would not support it. That makes your argument more specious, I think.

Mr. LEGGETT. I think the gentleman's time expired.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1974 military procurement authorization bill before the House today includes $657 million for the balance of funds to allow the Navy to build its fourth nuclear powered aircraft carrier CVN–70. Last year's Department of Defense budget as approved by Congress contained $299 million for advance procurement for CVN–70 to allow the start of procurement for the long leadtime nuclear propulsion plant components for this ship. I support the need to build this ship for our Navy.

My service on both the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy provides me a unique vantage point from which to view our defense.

Every American must recognize that the United States no longer has a nuclear weapons capability superior to that of the Soviets. Therefore, the United States cannot resort to nuclear retaliation over any issue for which we are not willing to risk our own annihilation. In my view, this situation dictates that we must maintain sufficient nonnuclear forces to provide a credible deterrent to lesser conflicts. All of the branches of our military services have such capabilities. A primary mission of our Navy is to insure that our first-line naval striking forces can carry out their mission against the threats the Soviets are presently developing.

Our major surface warships must have this capability, or we may end up without a credible deterrent to Communist encroachments which do not warrant escalation to a nuclear war. The all-nuclear carrier task force, with nuclear powered carriers as the heart of the task force, has the best chance of countering the nonnuclear naval threat the Soviets are developing.

For the foreseeable future the aircraft carrier will be the principal offensive striking arm of the Navy in a nonnuclear war. No other weapon system under development can replace the long-range, sustained, concentrated firepower of the carrier air wing. Torpedo-firing nuclear submarines, cruise missile-firing nuclear submarines, nuclear frigates with antiair and antisubmarine capabilities, all are needed to supplement and augment the capabilities of the nuclear carrier. But it is the carrier which provides the offensive punch.

It is widely understood that American nuclear superiority over the past 25 years has deterred nuclear war; it is not as widely understood that our naval superiority over this period has deterred lesser wars. If we do not maintain the capability to operate our first-line naval striking forces in all areas required by our national interests, we will have given up the ability to carry out sustained military operations away from our shores, not only by the Navy but by the other services as well. And in such a circumstance, where can we look for help? This country has friends, and this country has allies; let us hope that we never have to find out whether they are the same people. Every day there are more indications that we must not be placed in a position where we must make such a test.

We may well discover—because of the fault of no one—that we are alone. It is with no sense of frivolity that I liken our position in those circumstances, as we look around for help, to that of Adam in the Garden of Eden who, when asked by Eve, "Do you love me?" responded, "Who else?" Who else, indeed, can we look to to help us? We may well have at that time as little choice as Adam; and this has one simple moral: We must be independently capable of taking care of ourselves. We must avoid dependence on foreign bases including the overseas land airbases so often cited by some who oppose building nuclear carriers.

That this country has the choice of building nuclear-powered submarines and surface warships is a story in itself. At one time we were the only such nation. Of course, other nations quickly recognized that you cannot have a creditable naval force without nuclear propulsion. Accordingly, we were joined in having this special capability by the nations who do not want to be second. But if we do not continue to utilize our talents in this highly specialized technology, we will lose it.

I want all of us to recollect that the entire history of naval nuclear propulsion, starting with the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear submarine, required the leadership of the Congress, and the origin of which can be directly traced to the Congress.

At the beginning, the Congress was far from expert on nuclear matters, but it did have a sufficient understanding—an understanding lacking in the executive branch—to recognize the essentially clear message of the potential that was represented by nuclear propulsion. The Congress must follow through in its efforts to fuel for the propulsion if its first-line warships are taken advantage of.

I do not need to point out that nuclear propulsion is by no means restricted to submarines. A problem that faces the Congress this year, and may face us in years to come, is to get the Department of Defense to understand the importance of nuclear propulsion in our surface ships, too. I am referring, of course, to our aircraft carriers and the ships that accompany these carriers.

It took many years for the Congress to get the Department of Defense to understand the importance of providing nuclear propulsion in our new aircraft carriers. Regrettably, the two carriers following the *Enterprise*, which is our first nuclear carrier—the *America* and the *John F. Kennedy*—are oil fired despite the pleas of Congress to make them nuclear.

Finally, in 1966, the Defense Department came forward with a plan to build three nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. Two of these are now under construction, the *Nimitz* and the *Dwight D. Eisenhower*. For the 3 years starting in 1969 we tried to get the administration to make up its mind whether or not it is going to build the third ship of this class, the CVN–70. Last year the administration finally recognized the vital importance of proceeding with this ship and included funds for advance procurement in the budget. Unfortunately, the delay in making the decision to proceed has added unnecessarily to the cost of the ship. However, there is no point in crying over spilt milk—we have no choice now but to proceed without further delay. The ship, which even now will not be completed until 1980, is urgently needed in the fleet to replace aging World War II carriers which cannot cope with the Soviet threat of the 1980's and beyond. The CVN–70 will be able to operate the most advanced models of tactical aircraft. She will be operating with the fleet well into the 21st century.

Older carriers have no growth potential left. Even with the extensive modernization accomplished in each class, deficiencies remain in relation to carrier requirements for the 1980's.

If the Navy retires carriers at 30 years of age—the current Navy estimate of useful life of a carrier—we will have a carrier force of 11 to 12 carriers through 1985 with no new carrier construction. Funding CVN–70 now will allow a force of 12 to 13 carriers between 1980 and 1985. The range in force estimates depend on the age when the *Midway* is retired.

It is not clear how long the *Midway* can be retained in service, as no carrier has ever been extended in operation beyond 30 years. In my view, the rapid increase in technology makes many of our weapons systems obsolete much before the end of their physical lifetime. She underwent an extensive modernization between 1966 and 1970. When the CVN–70 joins the operating fleet in 1981, the *Midway* will be 36 years old.

Attack carriers are being operated harder than any surface ships in naval history. As the number of carriers is reduced, the requirements placed on each carrier are increased. The carriers in the fleet today were designed to specifications which assumed a 20-year ship life. Therefore, the assumption that all of our present carriers can provide 30 years or more of reliable operation is questionable.

The reasons for building the CVN–70 now are the acute need for force modernization and the fact that while carrier force levels have decreased sharply, the worldwide tactical air strike requirements have not. In addition, for the first time in the quarter century since World War II the United States is faced with a naval threat challenging our ability to maintain free use of the seas. The mobility and sustained firepower available only

in an all-nuclear carrier task force is required to counter this threat.

A special joint subcommittee of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees published a report and an 800-page hearing record on the CVAN–70 in April 1970. The subcommittee report concluded we should go ahead with this nuclear carrier. I thoroughly believe the events of the last 3 years reinforce the position taken by that special joint subcommittee. You will recall that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, testified that, in his view, 16 attack carriers were needed for the foreseeable future.

Subsequent to his testimony, due to fiscal constraints, the Navy has been forced to phase out all antisubmarine warfare carriers and assume the submarine role on the attack carriers. In addition, the number of attack carriers is planned to be reduced to 12 in the next few years. The number of ships in the Navy as a whole, by the end of fiscal year 1974, will be the smallest it has been since the mid-1930's.

Meanwhile, the Soviet naval threat continues to expand in quality and quantity. They have even started building aircraft carriers. This will enable them to extend the range of operation of their surface fleet.

All of these events emphasize the importance of modernizing our carrier forces and the importance of increasing the number of nuclear powered warships in the fleet. I agree with Admiral Zumwalt's statement:

> It would be difficult to overstate the importance of CVN–70 to our naval strength of the future. The range of naval missions made possible by the four nuclear powered aircraft carriers the United States will have when CVN–70 is completed in 1980 will be essential if we are to continue to insure our free access to the vital seas of the world in support of our national interests. I consider CVN–70 to be of unique importance among our general purpose weapon systems.

The nuclear surface warships I have talked about today will cost a lot of money. But the advancement of technology has caused all military hardware to become complex and costly. With the fiscal constraints placed on the economy and the desire of our people to devote their energies to solving the many internal problems of our Nation, it is onerous to make major investments for our future military security. It is tempting to conclude that we cannot afford to pay the high costs of the weapons needed to counter our potential enemies successfully. However, if the investment for our future military security is not made now, there may be no future. As President Truman so aptly said:

> All national security programs are expensive and we might as well face up to it.

The price we must pay to have an adequate defense is small compared to the price we will pay if we have an inadequate defense.

The statement by President Eisenhower quoted on the keel of the nuclear aircraft carrier now under construction which will bear his name sums up the situation:

> Until war is eliminated from international relations, unpreparedness for it is well nigh as a criminal as war itself.

The United States needs modern warships—ships with modern weapons and nuclear propulsion. Our fleet of ships designed in World War II is getting too old and outdated to match the modern weapons of the newly built Soviet fleet.

The choice we face is to embark on a vigorous program of fleet modernization including nuclear surface warships, both carriers and frigates, or accept the fact that we will soon find ourselves unable to defend our national interests. I hope history will record that the American people have the courage and determination to do what is necessary to maintain the strength of our great Nation.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest a few thoughts concerning the A–7D, for which authorizations will be included in the Senate bill, but those authorizations are not included in this committee bill. Permit me to suggest one valid reason why some additional A–7D procurement should be considered.

With the advent of the "all-volunteer force" for the armed services and the increasing cost of providing an adequate defense for the country, the "Total Force Concept" for the Air Force becomes more and more important. Under this concept it is imperative that the 400-odd 18-year-old F–100's in the Air National Guard be replaced. Current plans call for the transfer of the first three squadrons of A–7D's into the ANG in the first and second quarters of next year as a first step in implementing this much needed modernization program.

However, it must be recognized that modernization of the Air National Guard cannot be done at the expense of the active forces. Since the replacement aircraft for the A–7D is not scheduled into the active force inventory until late in 1977 at the earliest, the first line active force strength must be protected either by buying additional A–7D aircraft to replace those being transferred to the ANG or by buying additional aircraft specifically for use by the ANG. I am sure that these facts are what led to the action by the Senate Armed Services Committee to amend the defense appropriation authorization bill for fiscal 1974 to add the procurement of 24 A–7D aircraft.

In view of the above facts, I should like to urge the House conferees to give serious consideration to supporting this Senate amendment in conference.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by my colleague from Colorado. In my judgment, the gentlewoman has proceeded from a mistaken premise; the conclusion is therefore wrong.

The sponsor of this amendment argues there is no strategic role for CVN–70 and this ship contributes only marginally to other missions.

I respectfully disagree. As other members of the committee have pointed out, the Soviet Navy has been growing rapidly. Indeed, testimony before the Sea Power Subcommittee underscores the grim reality that the United States can no longer claim more than parity with Soviet naval strength. Many knowledgeable observers contend that the United States has already become a second-rate naval power.

We need a strong nuclear carrier capability in order to maintain naval parity and to keep alive our hope of recapturing naval superiority. To eliminate CVN–70 under these circumstances would be a grave mistake.

A modern carrier fleet is required to protect freedom of the sea. And, as Mr. WHITEHURST has pointed out, keeping the sealanes open is essential to the security of this Nation—not merely for theoretical or esoteric reasons, but plainly freedom of the sea is essential for the very survival of our country.

I have never been one who believes that the weight of an argument depends upon its length. So for that reason, and since other speakers have already pointed out the need of CVN–70 and the essential weakness of the arguments advanced in support of the amendment, I will not take the time of the committee to further discuss the overall mission of this carrier

But there is one aspect of the debate which I think should be clarified. My colleague from Colorado has raised a proper question as to the number of carriers which this Nation should maintain. I would like to respond by quoting from Admiral Linder's statement before the Sea Power Subcommittee:

> The number of aircraft carriers the United States should maintain in active service is not an easily derivable single quantity resulting from a simple equation. Rather, it is a matter of careful and deliberate judgment, balancing projected wartime requirements against current budget limitations.
>
> The number of aircraft carriers maintained in active service is an annual compromise between the military judgment of wartime requirements and the level of budgetary support that can actually be allocated to those requirements in peacetime. The Joint Chiefs of Staff annually develop strategic and general purpose force requirements to meet the objectives of the national strategy, based on the stated wartime needs of commanders of unified and specified commands around the world. These force levels are based on the current and projected threat posed by potentially hostile power, strength of our allies, and probable wartime situations. Fiscal guidance issued by the Secretary of Defense, in consideration of total national objectives and resources available, establishes the limiting parameters within which the services and the Joint Chiefs of Staff then formulate their recommendations as to force levels. The Secretary of Defense makes the final decisions which are reflected in the budget submission. The FY 1974 budget provides for 15 aircraft carriers.
>
> When it is remembered that we had 98 aircraft carriers in active service in the closing months of World War II, when our total national assets were mobilized for war, it is evident that peacetime active force levels, constrained by peacetime fiscal considera-

tions, provide fewer aircraft carriers than the numbers needed to meet all situations that might possibly develop in wartime.

In conclusion, I recommend the House reject this ill-considered amendment.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to serve on this committee as a first term Member, I came with an open mind and with a commitment to cut out waste and inefficiency in the Department of Defense or any department of the Government.

When I was appointed to the Subcommittee on Naval Affairs, I had had some doubts about the need for a large expenditure for a weapons system such as the CVN–70. Frankly, I carried these doubts until the testimony before our subcommittee. I was persuaded, in large measure, by the testimony of a gentleman whom I have grown to respect for his independence and for his commitment to reduce waste and inefficiency, and that is Admiral Rickover.

I regret that the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) was not present at the subcommittee hearings when Admiral Rickover presented the case for the CVN–70, so that she could get answers to some of the questions she raises today.

I think some facts have been presented which do need to be discussed, and set in perspective.

First of all, the gentlewoman from Colorado mentioned that the CVN–70's aircraft would have only about a 35-percent offensive capability. I am unable to detect where the gentlewoman from Colorado gets these figures. I have checked again with the Department of Defense and other sources to try to verify those figures, and those figures cannot be verified.

Approximately two thirds of the aircraft carried on the CVN–70 would have an offensive attack capability and an additional 15 percent would have a support capability to support the bombing aircraft, or about 85 percent would be of an offensive capability.

I think if we look at the use of the aircraft carriers in Southeast Asia we find that in some cases as much as 80 percent of the aircraft carried were committed to offensive attack operations. Perhaps the aircraft carrier has the most flexibility as far as carrying out its specific missions as any weapons system in the Navy. I think it is fallacious to say that this particular aircraft carrier does not have a mission. It has the most flexible mission both in a nuclear situation and in the conventional sense. And as a deterrent, I think we should not overlook the fact that the deterrent capability of our aircraft carrier force has been unmistakable. It has been one of the major reasons why we have not been engaged in major sea warfare in the past 25 years. And that is a moneysaver right there.

When one considers that at the close of World War II, it was costing the United States $300 million a day to conduct that war, and in today's dollar, it would be over $650 million, any deterrent capability of any weapons system will be a savings in money in the long run.

I think it is also well to consider the comments made by the gentlewoman from Colorado about land based air facilities, and that these can carry out the mission of the Navy without need for carriers. This is a fond hope at best.

At the present time, we have 37 bases overseas, and of those at least 11 probably could not be used in time of war for various political reasons. Also, we have reason to believe that there will be further reductions in overseas bases and, frankly, I would support such a move. Now when you look at cost effectiveness, we see it would cost $1 billion for the CVN–70 and the aircraft thereon would cost another billion dollars. Of course, the aircraft costs will be there, regardless of whether we have the CVN–70 or not. If we look at that cost compared to what we are spending on land bases in Spain alone, we find that it is less expensive to build the CVN–70 than to maintain the land base. Since the 1950's, when we have had our bases in Spain, the United States has spent a little over $3 billion in aid to Spain to have the rights to those bases, and that cost does not include, for instance, such items as foreign exchange spent in Spain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

(On request of Mr. HUNT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, on his very excellent research and rationale that he has applied to his amendment. It is most refreshing to find someone like the gentleman from Oklahoma who takes so much time to delve into the real and actual value of the carrier that we need so very badly, who is not to be swayed by emotional factors but who simply states the facts as they really are. I think at this stage of the game his argument which he has just made is very conclusive, and I am certain that his contribution will do much to defeat this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I will say that we would all like to live in a world in which human kindness flows freely, but I think if we are realistic, we have to recognize the fact that we live in a world where aggression is possible and where the greatest deterrent to aggression is the flexible power of this country to deter it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are many points in which reductions can be made in this bill, and I shall support other efforts at reduction. But I honestly do not know of any case where I think there is more outrageous waste than in this particular case of the CVN–70.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Colorado for her amendment. She has well stated the case.

Let me just mention a few points. We are talking here about 12 attack carriers in 1980 as against 11 carriers. The case that is to be made for this carrier—and I do not care whether it is nuclear or not—has to be for that increment. Do we need 12 as against 11 in 1980?

The gentleman who just spoke, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, mentioned deterrents. There is no nuclear deterrent in a carrier force. The Navy does not claim there is such a deterrent. The carrier has to do only with conventional warfare. In a nuclear war, the carrier is known to be vulnerable and has no significance whatever.

Now let us compare the carrier strength of the United States with that of the Soviet Union. We have today 14 or 15 carriers. We will have 11, according to the Navy's schedule, by 1980 without CVN–70. These are attack carriers in every sense of the word, major vessels.

The Soviets have only one carrier and it is only half the size of ours or less, capable of accommodating, not the kind of aircraft that operate from our carriers, but a V/STOL-type of aircraft with limited capabilities. The Soviets appear to be building a second carrier of the same type. That is the state of the comparison today. Even the most ardent proponents of the theory that the buildup of the Soviet Navy represents a grave threat to our security cannot make a case in terms of the relative strengths of the carrier fleets.

What does the Navy say are the missions of the attack carriers? There are three. First, sea control. I happen to believe that in talking about sea control, the Navy is talking in obsolete concepts of 19th century and early 20th century warfare, but let us pass that point. Surely there are more effective and economical ways of providing sea control or the safety of sea lanes than by huge and vulnerable carriers that themselves require escort vessels for protection and that have to devote a large proportion of their aircraft to their own defense. The sea control ships that are proposed would appear to be a far more economical and efficient way of accomplishing the objective of sea control.

The projection of power ashore is the second mission. We have seen such operations off North Vietnam. One can argue about how effective they have been, but, aside from this essential point to vote them in the Vietnam war our carriers were never subjected to effective air or missile or sea-borne opposition. Thus there remains a big query as to whether they could have operated effectively if there had been such opposition.

In any case, the Vietnam war conflict seems to be the type of conflict in which carriers would be most useful, that is to say conflicts in the third world—not a conflict with the Soviet Union, not a matter of direct threat to our national security, but the kind of war that we have been involved in Southeast Asia and which we have had very grave reason to question.

The third mission for carriers is "peacetime presence" or show-the-flag" operations.

I would submit to the Members that

there are very grave doubts as to the importance of such operations. Certainly we do not need a $3 billion vessel—and I use that figure because of the need for aircraft and escort vessels to accompany the CVN–70—for good-will visits to foreign ports. Indeed I am told the carriers are wearing out their welcome in the Mediterranean ports. There is indeed a serious question as to whether such visits are not overdone.

Certainly the Navy's sending of the aircraft carrier to the Bay of Bengal during the Indian-Pakistan war was generally considered to be a counterproductive gesture, a type of gunboat diplomacy which was of no use to the Pakistanis and was deeply resented by the Indians.

The gentle lady from Colorado has properly stressed the tremendous expense of the CVN–70, its aircraft and escort vessel. If we look at the 30-year expected life of this carrier and the number of times the planes would have to be replaced, the cost is even more staggering—it could well amount to $9 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to carriers as such. While they are probably doomed to extinction—just like the battleships of the past—but no doubt they still have their uses in today's world.

The point I want to stress is that in my view the Navy has completely failed to prove its case that 11 carriers as of 1980 will not be enough.

I urge support of the Schroeder amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

There are a number of things we need some clarification upon. One is ambiguity in the use of the word "strategy." I do not want to belabor it but I do think we ought to look at it. It has been stated the carrier has no strategic use. As a matter of fact, before the Polaris and Poseidon it was our most important strategic weapon in the sense that we are talking about; that is, a deterrent by a second strike capability.

Some people do not realize the total strategy of America with regard to this. Our strategy is that we design some of our weapons to prevent war of a nuclear type from arising by the presence of strength in our own nuclear forces, to wipe out an enemy if they attack us with nuclear weapons. That kind of war we hope always to prevent, and the fact that we have had the carriers in the past decades is probably the chief reason why we have not had that kind of war. To say carriers have no strategic value is obviously absurd.

It has been said we have too many of these carriers, but they are absolutely essential to the overall strategy for America, because we do need to have at least two of these in each of the two major oceans; that, is the Pacific and the Atlantic. They are important also from the standpoint of bringing into our forces the modern, up-to-date type carrier rather than those which are going out, not only because of the age of some carriers we use today and when they were built, in World War II, but also because of the fact that the older carriers have become obsolescent in some degree in the details of their configuration.

As we look at these modern nuclear carriers we find their tremendous value is also from the standpoint of being able to keep the seas free so that we can move troops and materiel. We also see they do in fact have even a second strike capability, not as great now as our Polaris and Trident but significant.

The major fact is that if in our day we did have nuclear war or a conventional war we would be able to move troops and material. We would be hard put to find a more important place to put our defense money. In fact, Admiral Zumwalt on page 3645 in the hearings said:

> I think the first thing to counter is the statement that aircraft carriers are a waste of money. Their value to sea control is critical and is also recognized by the Soviets.

He goes on to talk about the war in Jordan and how we prevented a type of war there from expanding.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

It is unfortunate that there are those who believe conventional war does not also need a strong deterrent force. The gentleman mentioned the Syrian tank invasion of Jordan, I believe in September of 1970, and he was exactly right in pointing out to our colleagues that at the time our President sent the 6th Fleet into the Mediterranean as a deterrent to larger war. In fact the Syrian tanks were withdrawn and the chances of war negated and the peace, fragile as it is, still exists in that troubled area of the world.

The same thing happened when President Johnson in the 6-day war vis-a-vis the Soviet threat of getting involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict used the 6th Fleet as a deterrent. It was a deterrent to conventional war and the extension of warfare in the Indian-Pakistan dispute.

The gentleman makes an excellent point. I associate myself with his remarks and with those of the gentleman from Oklahoma who made the point that as costly as an arms race is, there is one thing costlier, and that is arms inferiority. This Nation can ill afford to be arms inferior at a time like this when we are truly in a position to negotiate a reduction of tensions rather than by confrontation. I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this continuation of funding for this carrier is for the continuation of a ship we authorized in the last Congress.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to yield in order to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this amendment was originally offered and discussed in the Armed Services Committee. If the gentleman recalls, it was thoroughly discussed in the subcommittee which he so ably handles. What was the vote in that subcommittee?

Mr. BENNETT. It was not unanimous. The gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) was there.

Mr. HÉBERT. Only the gentlewoman from Colorado, from Denver, supported the amendment. When it came to the full committee, the vote was 29 to 5 against the amendment.

I merely make this statement of fact for the benefit of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 88, noes 323, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

AYES—88

Abzug	Eckhardt	Moakley
Adams	Edwards, Calif.	Moorhead, Pa.
Addabbo	Forsythe	Moss
Anderson, Calif.	Fraser	Owens
Ashley	Frenzel	Rangel
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Rees
Badillo	Griffiths	Reuss
Bergland	Gude	Riegle
Bingham	Harrington	Rodino
Blatnik	Hawkins	Rosenthal
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Roybal
Brown, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Ruppe
Burke, Calif.	Helstoski	St Germain
Burke, Mass.	Holtzman	Sarbanes
Burlison, Mo.	Howard	Schroeder
Burton	Hungate	Seiberling
Carey, N.Y.	Jordan	Stark
Carney, Ohio	Kastenmeier	Stokes
Chisholm	Koch	Studds
Clay	Leggett	Symington
Collins, Ill.	Lehman	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Long, Md.	Tiernan
Corman	McCloskey	Vanik
Culver	Macdonald	Vigorito
Danielson	Matsunaga	Waldie
Dellenback	Meeds	Whalen
Dellums	Metcalfe	Yates
Diggs	Mezvinsky	Young, Ga.
Drinan	Mink	Zwach
	Mitchell, Md.	

NOES—323

Abdnor	Breaux	Cleveland
Anderson, Ill.	Breckinridge	Cochran
Andrews, N.C.	Brinkley	Cohen
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brooks	Collier
Annunzio	Broomfield	Collins, Tex.
Archer	Brotzman	Conable
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Conlan
Armstrong	Brown, Ohio	Conte
Ashbrook	Broyhill, N.C.	Cotter
Bafalis	Broyhill, Va.	Coughlin
Baker	Buchanan	Crane
Barrett	Burgener	Cronin
Beard	Burke, Fla.	Daniel, Dan
Bell	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Bennett	Butler	Daniels, Dominick V.
Bevill	Byron	Davis, Ga.
Biaggi	Carter	Davis, S.C.
Biester	Casey, Tex.	Davis, Wis.
Blackburn	Cederberg	de la Garza
Boggs	Chamberlain	Delaney
Boland	Chappell	Denholm
Bolling	Clancy	Dennis
Bowen	Clark	Dent
Brasco	Clausen, Don H.	Derwinski
Bray	Clawson, Del	

Devine	Kuykendall	Rousselot
Dickinson	Kyros	Roy
Dingell	Landrum	Runnels
Donohue	Latta	Ruth
Dorn	Lent	Ryan
Downing	Litton	Sandman
Dulski	Long, La.	Sarasin
Duncan	Lott	Satterfield
du Pont	Lujan	Saylor
Edwards, Ala.	McClory	Scherle
Eilberg	McCollister	Schneebeli
Erlenborn	McCormack	Sebelius
Esch	McDade	Shipley
Eshleman	McEwen	Shoup
Evans, Colo.	McFall	Shriver
Fascell	McKay	Shuster
Findley	McKinney	Sikes
Fish	McSpadden	Sisk
Flood	Madden	Skubitz
Flowers	Madigan	Slack
Flynt	Mahon	Smith, N.Y.
Ford, Gerald R.	Mailliard	Snyder
Fountain	Mallary	Spence
Frelinghuysen	Mann	Staggers
Frey	Maraziti	Stanton,
Froehlich	Martin, N.C.	J. William
Fulton	Mathias, Calif.	Stanton,
Fuqua	Mathis, Ga.	James V.
Gaydos	Mayne	Steed
Gettys	Mazzoli	Steele
Giaimo	Melcher	Steelman
Gibbons	Michel	Steiger, Ariz.
Gilman	Miller	Steiger, Wis.
Ginn	Minish	Stephens
Goldwater	Minshall, Ohio	Stratton
Gonzalez	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Goodling	Mizell	Stuckey
Grasso	Mollohan	Sullivan
Gray	Montgomery	Symms
Green, Oreg.	Moorhead,	Talcott
Gross	Calif.	Taylor, Mo.
Grover	Morgan	Taylor, N.C.
Gubser	Mosher	Teague, Calif.
Guyer	Murphy, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Haley	Myers	Thomson, Wis.
Hamilton	Natcher	Thone
Hammer-	Nedzi	Thornton
schmidt	Nichols	Towell, Nev.
Hanley	Nix	Treen
Hanrahan	Obey	Udall
Hansen, Idaho	O'Brien	Ullman
Hansen, Wash.	O'Hara	Van Deerlin
Harsha	O'Neill	Vander Jagt
Harvey	Parris	Veysey
Hastings	Passman	Waggonner
Hays	Patman	Walsh
Hébert	Patten	Wampler
Heinz	Perkins	Ware
Henderson	Pettis	White
Hicks	Peyser	Whitehurst
Hillis	Pickle	Whitten
Hinshaw	Pike	Widnall
Hogan	Poage	Wiggins
Holifield	Podell	Williams
Holt	Powell, Ohio	Wilson, Bob
Horton	Preyer	Wilson,
Hosmer	Price, Ill.	Charles H.,
Huber	Price, Tex.	Calif.
Hudnut	Pritchard	Wilson,
Hunt	Quie	Charles, Tex.
Hutchinson	Quillen	Wolff
Ichord	Railsback	Wright
Jarman	Randall	Wyatt
Johnson, Calif.	Rarick	Wydler
Johnson, Colo.	Regula	Wylie
Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes	Wyman
Jones, Ala.	Rinaldo	Yatron
Jones, Okla.	Roberts	Young, Alaska
Jones, Tenn.	Robinson, Va.	Young, Fla.
Karth	Robison, N.Y.	Young, Ill.
Kazen	Rogers	Young, S.C.
Keating	Roncalio, Wyo.	Young, Tex.
Kemp	Roncallo, N.Y.	Zablocki
Ketchum	Rooney, Pa.	Zion
King	Rostenkowski	
Kluczynski	Roush	

NOT VOTING—22

Alexander	Hanna	Pepper
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Reid
Evins, Tenn.	Landgrebe	Roe
Fisher	Martin, Nebr.	Rooney, N.Y.
Foley	Milford	Rose
Ford,	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Iowa
William D.	Murphy, N.Y.	Winn
Gunter	Nelsen	

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT: Page 2, line 15, strike out "$3,788,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,619,000,000".

Page 2, line 21, insert immediately after "interest" the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the funds available to the Navy shall be available for the landing helicopter assault ships (LHA) program".

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I must comment that the House has had an opportunity to readjust priorities to the amendments that have already been offered to the extent of about $1 billion, but you have not chosen to exercise the options given to you. However, we are going to continue to offer these opportunities

This particular amendment we are offering at this time is to reduce the total funding for the landing helicopter assault program by $169 million.

The amendment is very simple. You might say "Well, why reduce Litton's program in Pascagoula by $169 million and terminate the LHA program?"

The fact of the matter is this did not terminate the program. We have already appropriated and authorized better than $950 million for the landing helicopter assault program, and to date the only thing that we can see is that one LHA is 38 percent complete.

When we were in here a year ago we had one LHA that was 2 percent complete. Admittedly, we have gone into planning and R. & D. in a great number of other items, but the fact remains that when this House approved $950 million for the LHA program a few years ago we had every intention of approving a nine-ship program at a total cost of about $1.4 billion. But now we find that due to cost overruns, the fact that the Navy has tried to get $55 million in payments back from Litton and has been restrained from doing this by the court, we have converted this program to a cost reimbursement program rather than payments according to the original contract.

We find that in addition to the $951 million that we have authorized and appropriated, and in spite of the fact that we are only 38 percent complete with one ship, that the Navy is asking for a funding of $169 million which is the purported tail end of the program. And if I can give you the termination dates on these ships, the first ship was supposed to be completed on the 30th of March of this year, and that ship has now been extended to the 14th of March of 1975.

Rather than building nine ships, they have converted the program to a five-ship program.

The second ship is going to be completed not in June of this year, but in September of 1975. The third ship is not going to be completed in October of this year, but in February of 1976. The fourth ship is not going to be completed in November of this year, but in July of 1976. And the fifth ship is not going to be completed next April, but will be completed in December of 1976.

And so what I see, and what the writers in national defense have said in a number of articles that were written in national periodicals, there is no purpose in approving the last 10 percent of the LHA program because it is not going to be earned for at least 3 years. And they indicate that the total program now for five ships is $1.14 billion. But the case is in court. We do not know whether the court is going to approve a $100 million claim for Litton, a $200 million claim for Litton, or more.

So, considering the fact that we well might be spending——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LEGGETT was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, considering the fact that we might be spending the same amount for five ships that we thought last year and the year before we would be spending for nine ships, I think that we would be foolhardy to give up the last straw of control that we have over this program. Because it will not breach the contract. It has nothing to do with the problems of the shipyard down at Pascagoula, and it gives better bargaining power to the contractor as far as settlement.

It gives better bargaining power to the contractor as far as settlement, and I do not think that these funds are going to be appropriated. I do not think that our committee ought to authorize them. I think we ought to keep a handle on this contract for next year and the next year, and even in two years if we authorize it, we will be authorizing funds a year earlier.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Referring back to the discussion on the litigation between the United States against Litton, is it not true, too, that the courts might decide, and conceivably so, in favor of the Government and pay nothing?

Mr. LEGGETT. Exactly.

Mr. HUNT. Just one more question which I am a little bit interested in. Can the gentleman really assure the House that the reducing figures in this amendment, as I figure, at $169.2 million are accurate? I am still a little dubious about the gentleman's figures. He was $25 million off on the last one, and I want to make sure the gentleman is correct on this one.

Mr. LEGGETT. I think the gentleman's apprehensions are warranted, but I made these compilations myself, and I can assure him that the differences in the amendment do correspond with the representations here on the floor.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, we all agree that Congress must exercise firm control over ex-

penditures. But we must also guard against indiscriminately slashing funds from military programs. I am afraid that is just what we would be doing if we approve this amendment. The five LHA's under contract to Litton represent the heart of our amphibious assault capability for the rest of this century.

Obviously, there have been scheduling problems and cost increases. But there is an explanation for this that we should know and understand. The Department of the Navy awarded the LHA contract to Litton because this company offered the best proposal for building the LHA's the way the Navy wants them built. The basic objective is to devise an automated assembly line process and to reduce costs.

During World War II, America successfully used assembly line shipbuilding techniques. But, after the war, ships were built "one here" and "one there" to divide limited business among the Nation's shipyards. The end result was higher costs. In the meantime, Sweden, Japan, and the Soviet Union have taken our World War II mass production techniques and successfully refined them. This is what we are attempting to do at Pascagoula where the LHA's are under construction.

The latest Navy audit of Litton's operations at Pascagoula reveals that the company is overcoming the problems it has experienced. According to the Navy Report—

The company has merged and reorganized operations, which has resulted in more efficient management.

Planning and scheduling have improved.

Productivity has increased.

Manpower and skill shortages have mostly been overcome. Now while delivery of the LHA's is 2 years behind schedule, it is imperative to note that the first ship contract is 47 percent complete, and the others are well on the way.

The amendment under consideration refers to supposed cost overruns. However, there really are not any cost overruns. On every contract of this kind there is a target price. There is also a ceiling price—which means costs cannot exceed a specific amount. The special problems Litton has encountered in devising an automated process warrant payment of the ceiling price.

Escalation clauses were also written into both the target and ceiling contracts for the LHA's. And this is not unusual. Escalation clauses are added to most Government shipbuilding contracts to compensate for increased, long-term labor and material costs. So it is not factual to infer that the escalation costs in this contract constitute cost overruns. The Cost of Living Index has risen 27.1 percent since January of 1968—ample evidence that these escalation costs are justifiable, not imaginary.

The Navy has also emphatically enforced its contract with Litton. The ceiling price has not been violated and the Navy assures us that it will not be. To deny funding at this point would violate the Navy's contract with Litton, which would allow the company to demand a renegotiated contract. The result would be even higher costs or do without the LHA's, which the Navy must have to maintain a minimum of assault readiness. The Navy is adamant that its contract still represents the cheapest, quickest, and most promisingly efficient way to obtain these vessels.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment in the national interest and urge that it be defeated.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to belabor the point, but I just want to point out a few things that I think should be brought to the attention of the Members.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my remarks here today is to share with my colleagues some of the facts about the landing heavy assault—LHA—ship, and explain why I feel that its authorization is not only appropriate and justified, but also vital to our military posture.

First, for those of you who are not familiar with the LHA and its mission as a weapon system, here is some background information.

Amphibious assault ships have one basic purpose; that is, to transport and land Marines or other combat troops. An efficient amphibious assault force is necessary for two reasons. First, it provides a flexible force for use in smaller scale conflicts, such as insurrections. Second, it provides us with the capability to seize footholds on heavily defended territory, where sealift or airlift would be impossible.

Currently, a naval amphibious assault is accomplished by sending landing forces to the target area in a group of specialized ships, and then launching the assault by using the vehicles from these ships to transport the landing force to the beach.

The problem with the present approach is twofold. One, it is too slow. The obsolete and aging World War II ships which now comprise our amphibious assault force have speeds ranging from 11 to 17 knot, whereas a 20 knot capability is considered a minimum requirement. Two, the specialized nature of the ships we now have severely restrict the effectiveness of the operations. An extensive study carried out jointly by the Navy and the Secretary of Defense indicated that fewer large general purpose ships were more economical for the amphibious assault program than a larger number of small specialized ships. It was from this determination that the concept and design of the LHA was developed.

The LHA is an entirely new class of ships which will carry a balanced load of troops, combat vehicles, and combat cargo; land these forces under assault conditions by helicopters, amphibian vehicles, and landing craft; and provide command and control facilities for the assault operations.

The LHA will be a 40,000-ton ship, slightly more than 800 feet in length. It combines the characteristics of several current amphibious ship designs, including a full length flight deck, a docking facility for landing craft, a large garage for trucks and other vehicles, and sleeping area for an entire battalion. With these facilities, it will combine the features of the amphibious assault ship—LPH—the amphibious cargo ship—LKA—and the amphibious transport dock—LPD—in a single hull. In most categories, the LHA will exceed the capabilities of each of these ships. In other words, we are buying a ship which will not only do everything that three different specialized ships will now do, but it will also do them better.

It is especially important to note during this debate, in which economy is such a large factor, that upon approval of the LHA construction program in 1966, it was possible for 18 specialized assault ships to be dropped from the approved building program by the Secretary of Defense. In addition, three active amphibious ships were subsequently retired.

Concern has been expressed in the minority report you now hold, and elsewhere, about whether or not the LHA program should be continued. Some of my colleagues believe that the funds your committee has recommended for five LHA's, which are now well into production, should be deleted. In an attempt to discredit the ship itself, they are using the general dissatisfaction with the manner in which Litton systems has carried out its obligation under its contract. They say that since the unit cost has increased, and the ships are late in delivery, Congress should call it quits on the LHA. This would be a tragic mistake.

Cancellation of the LHA program would not only mean a loss of substantial funds already spent or obligated, but also—and more importantly—it would mean the loss of the capability to carry on versatile operations in far-flung parts of the world. As I noted earlier, the LHA will effectively meet both our peacetime and wartime amphibious requirements with modern ships. The LHA is advanced in concept, and being built with equipment and techniques which will greatly improve the effectiveness of the whole amphibious force.

It should be remembered that Congress first authorized the ships in a multiyear contract that began in fiscal year 1969. The contract had a ceiling price, though only the target price was funded. Under this type of contract, the Government is obligated to pay the ceiling if costs legitimately rise to that point, or else pay termination costs. So far, the costs are estimated to be more than $750 million. This means that if the contract is terminated, the Government will lose at least three quarters of a billion dollars and still not get the ships it critically needs to round out a credible assault force.

It is true that Litton has been plagued by labor and management problems since being awarded the contract for the LHA program. However, it would be misleading to attribute the entire cost growth to mismanagement, as many have attempted to do. In 1970, there was a reduction in the number of ships con-

tracted for from nine to five, because of a lessening in amphibious force requirements. As any businessman knows, the unit cost for an expensive item is bound to increase as the number ordered decreases. It is completely reasonable, therefore, that a contract adjustment be made when four of the nine ships originally ordered were canceled.

There is an especially important factor involved in the cost and management problems which most critics overlook. That is, with the construction of the LHA we are witnessing the advent of a shipbuilding technique which is entirely new to this country. Termed "series production," this modular assembly method involves extensive use of automation. It has been employed with great success in Europe and Japan, and the expectation is that it will mean huge savings in this country in the future. Meanwhile, we must realize that, being the first attempt by an American shipyard, there were certain to be design problems and resulting extra expenses.

As the ship was designed, therefore, numerous changes had to be made, and additional work had to be accomplished. Even so, the additional charges for design changes amounted to less than 5 percent of the original price, which is an exceptionally low amount for a highly complex 40,000-ton ship of a design never before built.

Finally, there is the omnipresent problem of inflation, which pervades the shipbuilding industry, as it does all segments of our economy.

The situation today is bright. All five LHA's are under construction in varying degrees. While all of the production problems have not yet been solved, significant progress has been made and the ships are taking shape. The Navy has taken a firm stance with respect to cost overruns on this project. In hearings before the Armed Services Committee they reaffirmed their intent to hold Litton to the terms of the contract.

If Congress should renege on its commitment to provide the Navy with these ships, it will be taking an action which would result in the loss of many millions of dollars. This would be a double blow to the taxpayer, since it could seriously affect the ability of his country to respond to emergencies throughout the world.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from South Carolina in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when I heard that a few of my colleagues in the House would once again take a potshot at Litton Industries' "shipyard of the future" in Pascagoula, Miss., I had to shake my head in amusement. I now know how Billy Kilmer must have felt when his detractors repeatedly suggested that he was not qualified to lead the Redskins. I also sense his immense pride when he responded by leading the Redskins to the Super Bowl, always keeping a step ahead of his critics who were reminding him every day that he would not be able to produce.

It seems, Mr. Chairman, that some people refuse to look at the facts—no matter how positive and productive those facts might be.

Such is the case with Litton's shipyard and its LHA program. Those who were against the concept of this modern shipyard from the beginning are the ones who continue to criticize the yard—even while production continues to climb, even when one milestone after another is being met.

I think these critics need to be reminded that this is the first shipyard of its kind—the only one of its kind—in the entire United States. By what yardstick are we measuring the progress of this only child? How can we compare it to something else when there is nothing else to compare it to? We have a steak in a plateful of beans and some of us are complaining that it does not taste like beans.

Let me cite just a few figures, if I might, to cement my case. The overall LHA program—including design, engineering, procurement, and production of all five ships—is approximately 51 percent complete. Keels have been laid for three. Fabrication on the keels of LHA's 4 and 5 is underway. The first LHA is scheduled for launching in December and approximately 81 percent of its steel has been erected. The entire electronic suit for LHA 1 has already been tested prior to installation aboard the ship. Two weeks ago the 343-ton superstructure for the deckhouse of LHA 1 was placed aboard the ship.

The General Accounting Office report in March of this year pointed out that the present management, since being installed in July of 1972, has responded to 12 major milestones on the first LHA set by the Navy in August of 1972, by completing them all on time or early.

The report, while suggesting that there is little doubt that Litton and the Navy substantially underestimated the problems involved in starting a new facility, stressed the fact that Litton has taken very aggressive action to bring the yard to its full production capabilities. Present management has also moved up the DD–963 construction schedule to the point where they are now operating on an advance schedule. And while the DD–963 program is in no way related to the LHA program, it does reinforce the fact that the shipyard of the future is functioning effectively today.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that Litton's critics look at the full picture rather than at negative bits and pieces of a report that, indeed, recognizes and praises the giant steps made at the shipyard of the future.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I also associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman. In the last 12 months much progress has been made in the construction of the LHA's. LHA No. 1 will be launched in December and work has begun on the other four LHA's contracted for.

It just does not make sense to stop a program which is from 47 to 51 percent completed and this is what the amendment would do if adopted, stop the construction. The Navy and Marine Corps need these assault ships and it is up to Litton to push even stronger to complete these ships in a reasonable time. And I urge the Navy to work with Litton and Litton work with the Navy to settle their differences in order that we get good ships at contract prices and within a certain time frame.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to clarify something that was brought up during the general debate yesterday. I am sorry I was not on the floor at the time the matter came up. This had to do with the meeting held at my invitation—along with five other Members—to hear from Rear Admiral LaRocque, retired, Director of the Center for Defense Information, and Mr. Norman Polmar, U.S. editor of Jane's Fighting Ships.

The origin of that meeting was as follows. At the request of one of the officers in the liaison group of the Navy I hosted a breakfast for Admiral Zumwalt to which were invited some 30 or 40 Members. At the breakfast Admiral Zumwalt outlined very forcefully his views about the growing threat of the Soviet Navy. At the close of the breakfast, I asked Admiral Zumwalt if he would be willing to have a joint discussion of matter with Admiral LaRocque, because having discussed these matters with Admiral LaRocque I knew he had a different point of view. Admiral Zumwalt said he would be glad to. We tried for several weeks to arrange a time when such a joint meeting could be held, but we apparently could not find a time that would be convenient for Admiral Zumwalt.

I then suggested to the Navy's representative that we set a date for the meeting and that if Admiral Zumwalt could not attend he could send a representative. I understood that this procedure was acceptable to the Navy.

The meeting was duly scheduled. I was told that Admiral Zumwalt would not be available and that Mr. Norman Polmar would speak in his place.

I was later told that the Navy wanted it understood that Mr. Polmar would not represent Admiral Zumwalt or the Navy, and that the statement to the contrary contained in our invitation to the meeting was incorrect. However, Mr. Polmar was invited by the representatives of the Navy to speak at the meeting so as to present a point of view that they thought would be appropriate.

The meeting was held. All Members of the House were invited to it in a letter

signed by six Members. It was held in one of the rooms here at the Capitol.

The chairman of the committee mentioned yesterday that he had heard there were TV and klieg lights there. This was not by my arrangement. One Member, who apparently had been cooperating in the making of a documentary film, asked if it would be all right to have a TV camera there, and it was there, but not for the purpose of publicizing the meeting. We issued no publicity or press releases. The meeting was intended to educate the Members and so that they might hear conflicting points of view.

There were indeed conflicting points of view. Since the meeting, I have circulated to all Members charts which were presented at that meeting by Admiral LaRocque, and as I suggested in my letter, it might be interesting to note the Navy's point of view on those charts. The Navy's point of view has now indeed been duly presented in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to the request by the chairman of the committee.

That is the story of the meeting. There was nothing insidious about it. All Members were invited.

I think it is part of our obligation as Members of Congress to try to find out as much about these matters as we can. The men who spoke were experts. Admiral LaRocque has a distinguished record in the Navy. He retired in 1972 and is now director of the Center for Defense Information.

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for clearing up the record. However, I think it best that the record show that on July 17, 1973, a communication was directed to the gentleman from New York by E. K. Snyder, rear admiral, U.S. Navy, Chief of Legislative Affairs, which reads:

CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
July 17, 1973.

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: I must clarify and correct an error in your Dear Colleague letter announcing the appearance of Mr. Norman Polmar and Rear Admiral (retired) Gene LaRoque in a discussion of the "Navy's budgetary requests." Mr. Polmar was suggested as a substitute for Admiral Zumwalt in these discussions because he is considered one of the foremost independent experts in the composition and strengths of the Navys of the world. He is considered an ideal participant for the type of discussion envisioned in which the need for a strong U. S. Navy may be questioned; however, one point must be made abundantly clear. Mr. Polmar will be speaking strictly for himself and his personal views do not necessarily represent those of the Navy Department or Admiral Zumwalt.

Any misunderstanding that may have led you to believe that Mr. Polmar was a representative of Admiral Zumwalt is regretted. However, I feel certain that Mr. Polmar will provide the group with a very stimulating and interesting perspective at this important juncture in time.

Sincerely,

E. K. SNYDER,
Rear Admiral, U. S. Navy,
Chief of Legislative Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BINGHAM was allowed to proceed for an additional one-half minute.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for reading Admiral Snyder's letter. I would just point out that I did call attention to the substance of the letter at the meeting itself. Members who attended will testify that I did so and that I said I had misunderstood. I had thought Mr. Polmar was there as a "representative" of Admiral Zumwalt, but it turned out he was there as a "substitute" for the admiral, and I pointed that out.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT: Page 2, line 12, strike out "$680,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$675,200,000".

Page 2, line 15, strike out "$3,788,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,960,400,000".

Page 2, line 21, immediately after "interest" insert the following: ": *Provided*, That $40,000,000 of the funds available to the Navy shall be available for the Trident program".

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, when we compute the addition, if it has been done correctly, will reduce the procurement for the Trident missile and submarine program by $832.8 million, and would be in conjunction with a $52.6 million reduction in research and development, for an approximate total program reduction of $885 million.

This is a rather large amendment. If Members will look at page 110 of the committee report, the figures are set forth there on the total program, as to where we are.

As Members will recall, last year we approved in excess of $350 million for the Trident program. I did not object to the Trident program at that time. Since that time things have happened. We have negotiated agreements. Particularly we have had an acceleration in the Trident program from a $350 million plus level to a total level of $2,042 million. That is the amount of money we are talking about in this bill, in the atomic energy bill and in the military construction bill for this total program.

What is the Trident submarine program? It is a program which is scheduled to cost $13.5 billion for ten 24-tube submarines. It does not take a master mathematician to recognize that if we divide 13½ by 10 we get $1.3 billion per submarine.

We are not just authorizing a submarine and a half in this bill with the $2.1 billion program I have talked about. If Members will look at the report and the backup materials provided by the Navy Department, they will see they indicate, in what they call the long-lead time component money, which our amendment proposes to strike, there are funds for the second, for the third, for the fourth, for the fifth, for the sixth, and for the seventh Trident submarine.

Consider this. The Trident submarine costs one-third more than the most expensive aircraft carrier this Nation has ever authorized and tried to build. It costs one-third more than the CVAN–70, about which we just had the rather extensive debate.

Here we are approving in this bill money for seven Trident submarines, all costing one-third more than the aircraft carrier, if the program proceeds as it is originally scheduled.

The other body had very severe reservations about the speed of this program. The other body unanimously, Republicans and Democrats alike, supported in subcommittee an amendment to strike $885 million from the R. & D. and procurement accounts because of the fact that they did not want to waste money.

What they were concerned about was the report, which is classified, from the General Accounting Office, which has this to say about the missile, and this is the unclassified portion I shall read:

In addition, we found indications that the Trident I missile cost estimate was prepared in a hurried atmosphere and that it may significantly understate the actual cost of deploying this weapon. The original cost estimate for the Trident I missile contained the caveat that it might be as much as 50 percent understated. This estimate was the basis for the amount reported to the Congress as the total cost to deploy the Trident I missile.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) has expired.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, in addition, GAO reported on the shipbuilding program as follows:

We were informed that this was a class F, or "ball park," type best estimate prepared in the absence of adequate design and cost data, and based on gross approximate parameters. The bases for this estimate were bid data from prior attack submarine and ballistic missile submarine development. Returned (actual) cost data from these acquisitions were not used. The estimate was also made for the less desirable of two candidate hull types. Furthermore, this estimate was initially made for a 20-missile tube submarine and later adjusted to a 24-tube configuration by the addition of a fixed amount to the shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, estimates for each ship. Agency officials could not document the basis for this portion of the Trident submarine shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, estimate.

The GAO further states in the unclassified section:

Navy officials stated that the original Trident shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, estimate was revised in May 1972 to reflect a single-hull, 24-missile tube configured submarine, and was based on actual cost data from prior 640 class ballistic missile submarines. Navy officials stated that the revised estimate has been improved from a class F ball park type to a class D "feasibility estimate". This estimate was reported in the June 1972 SAR. We were informed that a budget quality (class C) type Trident shipbuilding and conversion, Navy, estimate cannot be made until firm submarine characterisitcs are issued by the CNO, et cetera.

Those are the unclassified analyses contained in a secret document prepared by the General Accounting Office. Those are not my figures. I believe that they would certainly justify our going slow on this program.

Of course, in addition to the GAO analysis, the thing they did not touch on was the fact that by building 240 new tubes in 10 Trident submarines, replacing 160 tubes in 10 old-style A–3 submarines, we will, in fact, be breaching the SALT agreement which was recently negotiated just a year ago, because at that time we were limited to the existing 656 tubes, and if we wanted to transfer to the water some of our Titans, we had the option to do that. But the Air Force and the Department of Defense have opted against that particular option.

Over the past 2 weeks, President Nixon and Mr. Brezhnev have entered into an agreement, and they have said as follows:

Over the course of the next year the two sides will make serious efforts to work out the provisions of the permanent agreement on more complete measures on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments will be based of signing it in 1974.

Second. New agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments will be based on the principles of the American-Soviet documents adopted in Moscow in May 1972 and the agreements reached in Washington in June 1973; and in particular, both sides will be guided by the recognition of each other's equal security interests and by the recognition that efforts to obtain unilateral advantage, directly or indirectly, would be inconsistent with the strengthening of peaceful relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Third. The limitations placed on strategic offensive weapons can apply both to their quantitative aspects as well as to their qualitative improvement.

Of course, what the President is saying and what they have in mind is the putting of limitations on MIRV's and putting limitations on numbers and continuing the limitations we have got on numbers, and that they do not intend to abort the agreements we made last year. These agreements made between Brezhnev and President Nixon were made after this particular submission was sent to the Congress of the United States, and this would certainly justify our going slow on this program.

It would certainly justify our going slow on this program. I would think the Senate when they unanimously acted in subcommittee to slow down the program had in mind exactly the understandings between our President and Mr. Brezhnev in the recently executed agreements and also had in mind the policy statement of the General Accounting Office which was delivered to our committee and which was elaborately set forth in the first 30 to 40 pages of our supporting document and which states——

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I do not object, but I am inclined to object—I think the gentleman has had 10 minutes already, and there are many, many Members who would like to have the opportunity to speak on this subject. We have a long day ahead of us, and I hope the gentleman would give consideration to the extending of his remarks for the remainder of the time.

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman for not objecting.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, what they say is, when you accelerate these programs too fast, they cost money. The argument will be made that we will lose $100 million unless we go ahead and move forward with this program at the rate of seven ships a year. I do not think that argument can be substantiated. I say let us build one of the Tridents and take a look at it and, if we want to, we can authorize more.

Mr. HUNT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNT. Will the gentleman give us the exact figure of the amount of money he is trying to reduce this bill by?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes. The total amount both in research and development and in procurement will be $885 million.

Mr. HUNT. $885 million. Is it factual and can we assure the House that these figures are correct, bearing in mind the $25 million error the gentleman made before?

Mr. LEGGETT. As I say, those apprehensions are warranted, but I want to assure the gentleman we will have $1.2 billion left in this and accompanying bills to build the Trident system if we enact this amendment with these figures as I have represented.

Mr. HUNT. And those figures are now correct?

Mr. LEGGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. That is good.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(By unanimous consent Mr. YOUNG of Florida was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for a Member of Congress to serve on the House Committee on Armed Services for more than a few weeks without getting a very, very healthy respect for the destructive capability of U.S. Armed Forces and also, Mr. Chairman, of the destructive capability of the forces of the Soviet Union. It does not take a member of that committee many more weeks after that to become completely convinced in his own mind and heart, with every conviction that he has, that the best thing we can do is to avoid a war, to avoid a military confrontation, especially a nuclear war, when the Members compare what the two nations do have in the way of destructive capability and what they may be able to do to each other and to the rest of the world, their determination to prevent a war becomes very, very evident.

There is no question about the value of a deterrent. When we were little kids a number of years ago we always knew that the bully on the block did not pick on the kid who was able to defend himself. History is going to record time and time again that the big nations or the bully nations or the aggressor nations did not pick on another nation that they thought was going to be able to defend itself.

Look at World War II and Pearl Harbor and all of the information we have gathered on that. The Japanese would never have attacked Pearl Harbor, by their own admission, had they thought we would be able to rebuild and reclaim a position of military strength and go on to defeat them.

The Russians would never have moved into Czechoslovakia or Hungary if they thought those nations would have been able to resist.

So a deterrent is essential. There can be no question of that. We do not want to deter on a possible basis; we want to deter on a definite basis.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) who proposes this amendment, along with his "Dear Colleague" letter, sent a copy of an editorial which appeared in the New York Times. The editorial did not say a whole lot, but if you read it thoroughly you come to this last sentence where they say:

But against the possibility that such a weapon would not be needed the nation is spared the outlay of funds for which far better uses abound.

I submit, in response to the letter sent by the gentleman from California and this editorial, that the possession of a weapons system that will guarantee us or come close to guaranteeing us that we will deter an aggressor, that we will prevent the outbreak of war, is certainly money well spent. The fact that we have such a weapons system would be the most effective guarantee we have that it would never have to be used.

Actually, the most effective weapons concept that we have even contemplated as a deterrent, let alone as a strategic capability, is the triad, the bomber, the ICBM, and the missile-firing submarine. If the Soviet Union had a Congress like we have here in America where they had an opportunity to have free and open debate on the amounts of money that were going to be spent on defense, and on what that money was going to be spent for, and if I had, and if many of us had, the opportunity to serve in a body like that in the Soviet Union, and we were looking at the potential strength of the United States and we saw the U.S. triad system, with our bombers armed with nuclear devices, with our Minuteman, ICBM's, and our potential strength because of the Trident submarine that we were going to build, that is the one weapon that would scare me more than anything, the Trident submarine system. Because not only will it have the power and the strength to hit hard and accurately, and to run silent and fast and to run deep, but the Soviet Government, their military, as of today, does not have the state of the art to accurately detect the location of that submarine.

They know where our ICBM fields are. They can watch and they can tell if we make a launch. They know where our bombers are based, and they can tell when they are airborne and headed in

their direction, they can tell that, but as of today they are not exactly sure where that submarine is. They are having a difficult time with the Poseidon. But the state of the art is developing, and antisubmarine warfare techniques are improving. They are able, to a certain extent, to detect the Poseidon and the Polaris submarines, but the Trident is going to be a different story. It will be much more difficult to detect. The Trident submarine is going to be able to hide in four or five times the amount of ocean from which it could launch a ballistic missile. That is a deterrent, and certainly a weapon to be feared by the Soviet Union.

If I had to make a choice today, if I could only have one of the three of the triad, the Trident would be my choice because of that capability for survivability.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida on the statement the gentleman has made, and to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman. I also wish to announce my opposition to the amendment.

I also believe that the gentleman from Florida has made a very important point, and that is that there is no such debate going on in the Soviet Union about what to do to overcome our lead, and let us keep that lead. I think the gentleman from Florida has made a most important statement in recognizing the tremendous deterrent effect that will have.

Again I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida, and to associate myself with the gentleman's very cogent and important remarks.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to join in congratulating the gentleman from Florida because the gentleman has made a very important point. The gentleman has pointed out that so far as we know, the Polaris submarine and the Poseidon submarine are unable to be detected by the Soviet Union, but that the Soviets are making great advances and if we do not go to a larger submarine that will cover a larger area, we could be putting all of our eggs in one basket, and that could be a very dangerous basket.

I also want to mention the fact, in that connection, that in Monday's Washington Post it includes a report from Moscow that talks about their new fleet of missile submarines, and that the Soviet Union submarines are now circling the globe submerged, and at high speeds, with an all-seeing means of observation from which nothing can escape.

So they are making progress, and would it not be dangerous if we did not try to make the same kind of progress?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments, and the gentleman from New York is exactly correct, and again I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond, if I have the time, to several statements written by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) in his "Dear Colleague" letter.

After the conversation about the $25 million error earlier in his figures relative to Safeguard and the site defense program, I want to go to point No. 5 of his letter where he says:

> In 1976 without Trident, the U.S. nuclear arsenal will contain over 10,000 warheads, more than enough for a credible nuclear deterrent.

Mr. Chairman, there is no really reasonable way that we can deal with this assertion that the United States will have over 10,000 strategic warheads in 1976 without divulging material and information that is very highly classified; but I want to say this, that I have done some addition on my own and some detecting on my own, and if we add up every nuclear device that we have, every warhead that we have in the missile system, and add to all of the nuclear bombs that we might have in our stockpile, if we add them all together, including the bombs, we still do not come anywhere near the 10,000 figure that the gentlemen mentions in his "Dear Colleague" letter.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. If we multiply 16 times 10 times 41, do we not get over 6,000? If we multiply 3 by 1,000, do we not get 3,000? And if we multiply 450 by 2, do we not get nearly 1,000? Are not those all nonclassified items, and does not that add up to 10,000?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but my arithmetic and my addition do not come to 10,000 or anywhere near 10,000—and I am adding the bombs, and I do not understand that the gentleman included bombs in his remarks.

Now going to point No. 6, I think this is a question we ought to be concerned about. The gentleman says again in his letter:

> This bill authorizes long leadtime items for 7 Tridents, each costing more than our most expensive nuclear carrier.

He has apparently disregarded some of the facts that should be taken into consideration here, where, if you disregard the cost for the first Trident—we would admit that this includes several high-cost items, one-time lead ship costs that any new program is going to have—the average cost of the Trident without missiles for the remaining 10 ships is $483.1 million. With 24 Trident I missiles, average cost for nine follow ships is about $695 million. This is expressed in escalated dollars, taking into account the inflationary factor. The funding for the completion of the CVN carrier we just talked about contained in this year's bill is $657 million. So the Trident is not more expensive than the carrier. And the gentleman's math is once again in error.

Mr. Chairman, we are not here today participating in a debating society when the winners will be determined by applause of the audience. We are, in fact, making a decision that will determine the capability of our future effectiveness to deter war—yes, a decision that will determine the capability of our national defense in the year A.D. 2000 and beyond. By defeating this amendment we are buying a pound of prevention rather than accepting an ounce of cure.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, before I proceed may I digress to correct again the arithmetic of the gentleman from California? Up to this point the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT) has taken all of the credit for correcting the error of our colleague, Mr. LEGGETT, between $100 million and $125 million. Actually some of us on the east side of the aisle made the first calculation of error. I happened to find the error and handed a slip of paper to the ranking Member, the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. PRICE) to the effect that Mr. LEGGETT was really in error by $25 million. Just before I came to the well we have had another illustration of some pretty bad arithmetic, because just in the last few seconds the gentleman from California said that 450 plus 450 equals 1,000.

For a long while we had a military concept of assured destruction in this country which we call the Triad. We are talking about the mix of bombers, land-based missiles, and seapower. I want to take just a few minutes to discuss this, the old ULMS which we now call the Trident.

I may not take all of my 5 minutes. I do want to make a point of comparison between items in the Triad of our weapons. We know some Soviet submarine missiles might be able to reach and destroy some of our bomber bases. We have an alert time of only 15 minutes, and some of them could be hit. Some of them may just not be able to get off the ground. Then some of these undersea Soviet submarines could possibly destroy our Minuteman silos. They could do that by what we call a sudden, blinding attack, by destroying our radar and guidance systems and thereby delaying the launching of the Minuteman. This would give the Soviets time to deploy their SS–9's, being the big multiwarheads with heavy megatonage. It will take 20 to 30 minutes for these big missiles to arrive, but this delaying time will give us some time to fire our offensive weapons system.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that the gentleman referred to me earlier in his discussion. I take no pride of authorship and I never did that. The gentleman from California made a $25 million mistake. I do take pride of authorship in discussing it and I

will not let the gentleman from California forget it—$25 million is not a cheap mistake.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman. We will not let the gentleman from California forget it.

Mr. Chairman, with the Trident we are talking about a weapon which has high survivability. We have tried to increase the survivability of our bombers by dispersing them. We are trying to harden our Minuteman silos, but the fact remains that the Minuteman silos all across this country will be targets which the Soviets are going to try to destroy. They will put everything they have against them. I suggest to the Members they will do this. It is not hypothetical. It is possible. It is likely. Hopefully and prayerfully we say it will never happen.

But if they do our country could become a smoldering ruin, because that is where the targets are—in this country.

We are talking of a sophisticated sea-based weapons system, because the Trident is a great deal more than just another submarine. It has the advantage of moving the threat of Soviet setbacks away from the homeland. Any effort of the Soviets to detect the Trident while at sea is going to be difficult. But whatever attack is made on the Trident—the Soviets will not be attacking major population centers.

Most military analysts agree that as of now, today, our missile-carrying submarines are almost invulnerable. Of course there may continue to be technological developments. There may be a new defensive sonar. In any event into the foreseeable future, even into the 1980's we have in the Trident a weapon that based on current technology is simply immune from attack.

We have in the Trident submarine deterrent that patrols on antisubmarine warfare cannot destroy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, so the submarine we are talking about—that is, our Trident—will give us a system that can stay on station. It can send its radio transmissions. It can make its radar search. It will be almost impossible to find. That is not to say there may not be sometime in the future a system developed which can have such a thing as real time detection. If that time ever comes then, notwithstanding, we have a weapons system which is still far superior to any other in our Triad. The Trident has some components that some Members may not be fully advised of. It has a range of 6,000 miles. Think of that. That will permit targeting on the U.S.S.R. from such places as the South Atlantic, the South Pacific, or the Indian Ocean. Repeating, as to the Trident today, an effective antisubmarine effort is virtually impossible.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I want to make one more point and I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman who is an authority on submarine warfare.

Mr. Chairman, Members may ask what is the difference between the Trident and the old Polaris and the old Poseidon. There are two important differences. The real difference is the silence of the Trident with the resulting impossibility of detection. It has a high sea-to-port ratio and it has the most accurate firing capability of any weapon in our arsenal.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I would not want to interrupt his train of thought but there were several points he has mentioned which I would like to comment on. This Congress has already approved the Trident program. We authorized a certain amount last year and we are now asked to authorize a little bit more this year.

As the gentleman from Missouri has just pointed out, we are pushing the Trident program primarily in order to get a submarine missile that will go 4,000 miles, and perhaps even 6,000 miles. At the present time the best we have, with our Poseidon system, is a missile that can reach out only 2,500 miles.

Yet, the frightening thing, as the gentleman knows, is that while we hope, with this Trident program to get a submarine that can fire a 4,000-mile missile, we suddenly learned, because we have only about 2,500 miles with the Poseidon, just 6 months ago, that the Soviets have already leapfrogged with a 4,000-mile missile which they have on hand today, in 1973. They are way ahead of us in this field already, in other words, and that is another reason why we have got to press ahead with this Trident program rather than to delay it and to move "more leisurely," as the gentleman from California would have us do under his amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I yield back the balance of my time. Let the RECORD show that I did not use all of the additional 5 minutes granted by unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be to slow down the development of the Trident program, suggesting that there is no real hurry in this field. I will say that as of today, such an argument might seem to have merit, but from this day until the Trident becomes operational in the latter part of this decade or in the early 1980's, a lot can happen.

The Soviets are spending huge sums for antisubmarine warfare, land-based ASW aircraft, helicopter carriers, new destroyers, and cruisers with antisubmarine weapons. They have an attack submarine force which is much greater than ours. Theoretically, they could deploy several submarines or surface craft or a combination thereof to shadow each one of our strategic submarines.

With the stalemate in the ICBM race, and possible development of the fractional orbital bombardment system, giving us only 15 minutes' warning, our ICBM's and land-based bombers could fall victim to a vicious first strike. Then, only our strategic submarines would be left as an effective counter.

These systems are designed, not so much for use in war, but to prevent war; as a means of guaranteeing to any adversary his inability to win in any real sense of that word. The only way to assure such persuasion in the future is to improve the most survivable weapon, the strategic submarine.

Polaris submarines were designed for a 20-year life. They have been subjected to constant patrols since they were delivered. The first of the series were delivered 12 years ago. With each cruise, the chances for breakdowns and failures increase, as does the cost of making repairs. These submarines can only last so many years. The original 10 must be replaced by at least the early 1980's. Trident must be pushed with reasonable speed, and to me that means inclusion of the $885 million this year.

The gentleman from California questioned how we could build 10 new 24-tube submarines under SALT I. My response to that is that Trident is a qualitative improvement in weapons systems, not a quantitative one. As Trident submarines become operational, our Polaris submarines will be retired. We will stay within the 710 tube limit as prescribed in SALT I.

Further, SALT II with qualitative restraints has not been signed, and if signed, will not be signed until next year. The interim agreement signed this year in Washington would not be violated regarding unilateral advantage. There will be no good faith violation of this interim agreement as we press on with Trident. This system gives us no unilateral advantage over the Soviets.

It simply allows us to update our systems as the Soviets improve their antisubmarine warfare systems. At the same time, their qualitative improvement of antisubmarine warfare and strategic missiles is being pressed forward.

I would say parenthetically, in closing, that if the Trident were in violation of the 1972 agreement, it would seem proper that opponents of the Trident appropriation authorization as reported would oppose the entire program, and not just its timing. To me, this seems contradictory.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, there was a time when the U.S. Polaris submarine fleet was by far the most powerful in the world. The Russians possessed hundreds of submarines, but none comparable to the 30 or more nuclear-powered missile-launching submarines then in the U.S. Navy. Theirs could harass our coasts. They could play havoc with our shipping. But they did not possess the destructive power

to a nation's heartland which the Polaris-type submarine provides.

Now all of this has changed. A few years ago the Russians got back into the submarine business in a wholesale manner. They have or they are building many more modern submarines than we. They are rapidly catching up in all the capabilities for undersea-launched nuclear destruction that we possessed. They are building faster, quieter submarines.

And submarine detection methods are improving day by day. They, the Russians, will have the capability to find and destroy our submarines unless we stage other breakthroughs.

Mr. Chairman, the Trident submarine is a breakthrough. It will be one of the quietest, the most powerful, the longest range submarine in the sea. At the first hint of trouble the Trident can go to sea. It will not be a sitting duck at the dock. And at sea the Trident can use half the ocean areas of the world as a launch site. Its missiles can reach 6,000 miles. We can station Tridents anywhere within a 30-million-square-mile area of ocean, and be on station almost indefinitely.

This will present the Russians with an almost impossible tracking situation.

This is the kind of weapon the Russians respect, and as more and more American cities and military installations come under the threat of Russian missiles, we need new power, additional power, with which to strike back, with which to deter that first strike.

Remember, we gave away our hopes for an effective antiballistic missile system in the SALT talks. Now deterrence is our principal weapon, and deterrence can be built into the Trident submarine.

The Trident is a solid bargaining chip for the upcoming SALT talks.

The Trident system is one of the best hopes of mankind for peace. It is the Russians who want it sunk now, not the American people. The American people want this country to be able to defend itself. Trident gives us new capability to do it.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to reduce the Trident program.

It is generally accepted that the Cuban missile crisis was brought to a successful conclusion because the United States had the strategic nuclear weapons and the military capability to insure that in a showdown the Soviet Union would be decisively defeated. That is the basic reason why the Soviet Union pulled their missiles out of Cuba. Since that time despite the thaw in the relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. the Soviets have continued an aggressive buildup of their offensive land-based striking power. They also have continued to build up their nuclear powered submarine fleet.

As Soviet nuclear submarine strength has increased, our supremacy under the seas of the world has gradually diminished. We must modernize our nuclear submarines and keep pace with Soviet advances in this field or be willing to accept the consequences of being second best.

If we stand still, then 5 or 10 years from now we may have a rerun of the Cuban missile crisis except next time we might finish a poor second.

The budget proposed by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1974 requests funds to build the first Trident ballistic missile submarine and procure long leadtime items for succeeding ships. I strongly support the Trident program and I strongly urge that we proceed now with building these important submarines.

The Trident submarines and missiles are needed to increase the survivability of our seaborne deterrent in the 1980's and beyond, and to provide for replacement of our aging Polaris submarines. No talks or understandings with the Soviets can change the fact that our Polaris submarines are simply wearing out and must be replaced if we are going to have a sea-based strategic deterrent. Even under the Trident program recommended by the Department of Defense, the oldest Polaris submarine will be 19 years old when the first Trident submarine is scheduled to join the fleet. The Polaris submarines were designed for an operating life of 20 years and it is unreasonable to expect them to operate for a longer life without having major breakdowns. This fact cannot be ignored. Even though our dedicated people have done an outstanding job of designing, building and maintaining our first missile launching submarines they are aging day by day and will wear out. There is a limit to what can be replaced in these ships and therefore new ones must be started.

Our existing 41 ballistic missile submarines were designed using the technology of the 1950's. The Trident submarines are being designed with all the latest technology. They will be much more difficult to detect and attack than our Polaris submarines. Recently developed noise reduction features which cannot be backfitted in the Polaris submarines will be included in the Trident submarines to make these ships much quieter. The longer range of the new Trident missiles and the capabilities of the Trident submarines will give them vastly more ocean area to hide in. The limited range of our Polaris and Poseidon missiles forces our existing ballistic missile submarines to operate in areas in which the Soviets can concentrate their rapidly improving antisubmarine warfare forces.

The Trident submarines and their longer range missiles will permit basing our ballistic missile submarines in the U.S. ports. I want to emphasize this important advantage of the Trident program—no foreign basing will be required. I believe the Members of Congress understand the desirability of having our deterrent forces invulnerable to international political actions. This is becoming a more and more sensitive matter day by day. It cannot be ignored any longer. It is indeed fortuitous that Trident provides us with a solution.

Proposals to delay the Trident program merely put off the time we must construct new ballistic missile submarines and result in large added cost. The Navy has estimated that the cost of delaying for a year the planned 10-ship Trident program would be over $1 billion. Last year Congress approved funds to buy the long leadtime items for the first Trident submarine and three fellow ships. Construction of the first Trident submarine in fiscal year 1974 will allow the program to continue in an orderly manner. Delaying the first ship would cause a major disruption and saddle the program with much higher costs in the future. This point to many may be rather subtle. To those familiar with complex technology programs it will be readily understandable. It concerns the need for maintaining organizations of highly specialized talents and manufacturing and construction organizations of specialized nature viable. Proficiency in such matters degrades fast if active challenges are not maintained on the organizations involved. We cannot afford atrophy in areas which are so critical to the defense and security of our Nation.

The Soviets have shown no inclination to delay their submarine ballistic missile program. They well understand the value of these powerful weapons. The Soviets have tested an improved missile with a range of about 4,000 miles. In essence, they already have their equivalent of the Trident. It is surprising to me that this critical fact has not been more generally recognized.

We were once preeminent in submarine ballistic missiles. Cutbacks proposed in advanced submarine programs such as Trident will result in loss of the special position our Nation has had in this field. Unless we proceed with construction of the Trident submarines and their missiles we will be faced with having only old, obsolete ships compared to the modern, larger Soviet force. The Trident program is one of the most important items in the proposed budget and I recommend the Congress approve proceeding with the program without delay.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I have been doing a lot of reading and listening on the needs of our national defense. The theme that runs through all of it is the Russian menace. We have heard the theme of the Russian menace again and again here in this forum.

To meet this menace we are asked greatly to expand our bomber system, our aircraft carrier system, our submarine program. For this we are asked to continue to spend more money than we have. We are forced to continue to deny all kinds of domestic needs, including water and sewerage systems and health care, and adequate defense against street crime. For this we continue to pour fuel on the fires of inflation.

Is this menace as great as it is claimed to be?

Is all this expenditure on armament the proper response?

I do not know. I doubt whether very many Members in this room know just how great this menace is supposed to be

and what we must have in order to answer it.

Mr. Chairman, I must say there are moments when I am frightened at the possibility of the Russians pouring nuclear missiles on us, from the sea and across the North Pole, and I want to be just as safe as money can make us be.

I believe that is the feeling of most of the Members here in this room.

We want to spend what we must spend. We do not want to spend any more than we need to spend.

But there is one thing that puzzles. If the Russian menace is as great as the Nixon administration in its military budget request claims it to be then why has the Nixon administration consummated all kinds of deals to help the Russians with their grain problem, with their technical problems, and to engage with them in all kinds of trade?

Only a couple of weeks ago, commodity credit loans were proposed in order to help the Russians buy on credit so they would not even have to touch their gold and dollar reserves.

This was a foreign aid program to Russia I voted against but which passed 2 to 1 in this body that claims to be so frightened of the Russians. By a vote of 2 to 1 we approved this economic help to the Russians. Now, why all this arms buildup?

They have been able to do it because for 30 years they have starved every domestic program they had. They have denied their agriculture. They have taken their best minds, their scientists, they have taken capital and all their equipment away from their domestic programs, including agriculture, and they have put them into armaments. And just at the time when the shoe begins to pinch, the Nixon administration and the Congress came to their help. Then, having done that, we come back in this body and say, "We must have more weapons to meet the Russian menace"—a menace which we have proceeded over the last few years to subsidize.

What kind of sense does this make? Shouldn't we make up our minds whether the Russians are a menace or whether they are not?

Voltaire said a couple of hundred years ago, speaking about a different subject: "If it did not exist, it would be necessary to invent it."

I sometimes think that is true of the Russian menace. If it did not exist, it would be necessary to invent it. There are a lot of Members in this room who are representing a lot of people who are making money by it. It has become convenient to subsidize the Russian menace, because this will make it all the more necessary for us to turn around and expand all of our industrial-military complex to meet that menace.

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement, and I would particularly point out that it is a fact that presently the United States has 41 Polaris-Poseidon submarines, the Soviets have 25 Yankees submarines, and we both have 16 tube missiles, and their average range is 2,500 miles.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I am stunned by the quantities.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of full funding for the Trident program.

There are few who would dispute the view that the avoidance of nuclear war depends importantly on the ability of the United States to maintain a credible second-strike nuclear capability. In short, it is essential for both our Nation's security and world peace that no potential nuclear enemy ever doubt the ability of our strategic forces to survive a nuclear attack and retaliate in a manner which would inflict unacceptable damage on the aggressor country.

It is increasingly accepted that our sea-based deterrent has the best prospects of all strategic offensive systems for long-term survivability and therefore for preserving the strategic balance of power and with it peace in the world.

Trident is designed to become the most survivable element in our sea-based deterrent force and therefore the keystone of all our strategic forces in the 1980's and beyond. Trident, moreover, promises to provide the United States with increased flexibility in the strategic arms limitation talks which could lead to a new round of agreements substantially reducing the total number of nuclear weapons allowed on each side.

Mr. Chairman, the Trident program is on schedule, following the plan which this House wisely approved last year. Now, however, there are those who desire to slow the pace by at least 2 years by cutting funds. While having the best intentions, the supporters of this amendment are, in effect, declaring their willingness to gamble with the adequacy of the U.S. nuclear deterrent in the future. I simply cannot responsibly join in this gamble. The stakes are too high and the consequences too certain should it be lost. I therefore urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment and against any reduction of the momentum in the Trident program.

Mr. Chairman, while I believe that the majority of the Members of this House support the Polaris-Poseidon program, there are some members who question the need for the accelerated Trident program which we mandated last year. They allege that the relative superiority and invulnerability of our existing submarines, sufficiency of existing weapons in destructive capability, and the unpredictable nature of future threats to our systems preclude the necessity of maintaining the Trident schedule.

I am pleased that even many of these Members have expressed their belief in the importance of maintaining a highly survivable sea-based strategic deterrent. Their major question seems not to be "why Trident?" but rather "why Trident now?"

It is true that our Polaris-Poseidon force today is an awesome sea-based deterrent which has been relatively free from worry about a serious, Soviet Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) threat. Moreover, the completion of our Poseidon conversion will provide us with an increased number of warheads. However, numbers in themselves mean absolutely nothing unless survivability goes hand in hand with those numbers.

Our present submarines were built with the technology of the 1950's. They possess inherent weaknesses which in time, our Navy experts believe, will make them vulnerable to a degree far greater than today. The exact moment of vulnerability of course is not precise, but Soviet technology is and has been moving with increasing speed and effect. Complacency in light of this progress is not warranted.

We originally built the Polaris submarine as a relatively makeshift ship by cutting in half an attack submarine on the building ways. The result was highly satisfactory and came at an opportune time. The first Polaris missile was a short-range 1,200-mile missile. Fortunately we proceeded to develop a series of more sophisticated and longer-range missiles which have led to the current Poseidon missile. Had we been content to live with that earliest submarine and its missiles, without improvement, we would be almost forcing our submarines to operate on the very coasts of the Soviet Union to reach targets.

Moreover, in view of the steady improvement of today's antimissile technology, failure to improve on that first missile system would have placed us in an increasingly awkward and weakened position both in world politics and strategic arms negotiations. In short, it is necessary in this business of strategic deterrence to keep ahead of the game—to do otherwise is to invite the adversary to develop a counter. In the present case, the combination of providing the Trident submarine with a very large patrol area and quieter operating systems can make the development of an effective anti-submarine warfare counter to Trident virtually prohibitive economically. Such a degree of survivability is stabilizing in that it does not invite a counter.

THE BASIC OBJECTIVE

The basic objective of our strategic policy is to preserve the sufficiency of our deterrent in order to make nuclear attack unattractive. That sufficiency has been placed in serious doubt by Soviet momentum in building up their already powerful strategic forces, particularly their sea-based forces. The strides that the Soviet Union has been making in naval power is evidenced by the assertion by Capt. John Moore, one of the world's foremost experts on naval matters, that the Soviet Navy is now the most powerful in the world. Captain Moore's statement is included in his foreword to what many individuals consider the most authorita-

tive annual on the world's navies, Jane's Fighting Ships, of which he is editor.

Soviet strategic momentum was only partially arrested by the strategic arms limitation agreements. It is imperative that the United States have a credible and logical means of insuring that the Soviets do not gain a position of nuclear superiority. The Trident program is an essential part of that credible and logical means.

The Trident system will be capable of either replacing in part or augmenting existing systems and will be virtually invulnerable to the broadest spectrum of possible future threats. I believe that the best action we can take to preserve our nuclear sufficiency is to continue on schedule the Trident program.

The Trident submarine is being planned for introduction into the fleet in 1978. It will be equipped with the new Trident I missile which will have a range of over twice that of the present Poseidon missile. This will enable the Trident submarine to operate in over 4½ times the ocean area that the Polaris submarines can operate in.

When it enters the fleet, the Trident system will give our country the equivalent of what the Soviets reportedly already have—a deployed 4,000-mile sea-launched ballistic missile. Moreover, the Trident is being designed to operate much more quietly than our present SSBN's as well as to operate faster and last longer.

THE POLARIS/POSEIDON PROGRAM

For years the Polaris/Poseidon program has served as the bulwark of our Nation's strategic deterrent. And it has done the job superbly. But these ships cannot be expected to perform their vital mission indefinitely.

Our present fleet of 41 Polaris/Poseidon submarines was built in a relatively short period during the late 1950's and the early 1960's. In fact, all of our present SSBN's were deployed in the 7-year period between 1960 and 1967. At the peak of the Polaris building program, 13 submarines appeared in 1 year.

The first of these submarines represented an accelerated effort to attain a sea-based deterrent at the soonest possible moment. As I noted, smaller attack submarines then under construction were literally cut in half to permit the addition of a missile compartment, thus providing for the earliest possible introduction into the fleet. Subsequent classes improved quieting, depth capability, and habitability, but the basic ship technology has otherwise not generally changed.

No ship in the fleet has been worked as hard as the Polaris/Poseidon with its blue and gold crews. Each submarine generally comes in from a mission, replenishes its supplies, and goes right back out on a new mission, leaving the old crew ashore. In the words of the House Armed Services Committee, the result has been that "these submarines have been subjected to more missions and have been longer on station than any other class of ship in the fleet."

When they were built, these submarines were not expected to have an operating life longer than 20 years. Yet, some of them are nearly a dozen years old today, and they are beginning to show the effects of age. While the Navy may be able to stretch the life of a few of these ships to 25 years, it would be foolhardy to permit this force to become either overage or technically obsolete.

Assuming that replacement will occur under guidelines similar to the existing strategic arms limitation agreement, the introduction of the first Trident submarine in 1980—as this amendment proposes—followed by 3 in the 3 succeeding years and thence 2 each year thereafter, would result in all Polaris/Poseidon ships exceeding 20 years before retirement; 13 would be 24 or more years old; and the oldest would be 26. This schedule would clearly jeopardize the Navy's ability to continue to discharge its vital strategic mission. It is a far wiser approach to get on with the procurement of the first 10 Trident submarines, as requested by the Department of Defense.

Moreover, there are absolute limits as to the improvements which can be made in the present ships. Growth potential provides only for modest improvements in quieting, sonar, or missiles. It is not economically realistic to convert the first 10 SSBN's to Poseidon, for example. And introduction of the Trident I missile in the remaining 31 ships would use all of their missile growth potential. Only a few noise reduction improvements are feasible in the existing ships. Significant noise reduction sufficient to maintain a lead against anticipated acoustic technology advances requires the radically different and quiet propulsion plant planned for the Trident submarines; this cannot be backfitted in existing SSBN's.

In short, the existing Polaris/Poseidon SSBN's do not have an indefinite life, and do not represent current technical capability in areas important to future sea-based strategic forces.

THE TRIDENT

Trident, on the other hand, is virtually synonymous with survivability. And in strategic deterrence, survivability is the name of the game. Through a combination of greater patrol area, greater missile range, and through a submarine which provides great improvements in quietness, mobility and self-defense, Trident promises to be the most invulnerable system in our arsenal for decades to come.

The entire program is being designed to markedly improve the at-sea to in-port ratio over that achieved by Polaris during the past 12 years. As a result of long-life reactor cores, optimized logistic support facilities, improved system maintainability, two-crew manning, and U.S. basing, the Trident ships will realize up to 15 percent or more time at sea than have their predecessors over the past years.

Effective targeting of today's 2,800-mile range sea-based systems denies the broad ocean areas to our SSBN's. However, the great ocean area that is available would provide an insurmountable obstacle to ASW forces of present and future years. Trident would put that area to use. The very long ranges provided by the Trident missiles will permit Trident submarines to patrol at least 4½ times and perhaps up to 10 times the total ocean area available to today's SSBN's, while maintaining the most important targets within range. Some key areas will become easily targetable from U.S. home bases in either the Atlantic or the Pacific. Availability of such vast areas provides operational flexibility to select patrol areas of prevailing seasonal storms, high biological noise and other phenomena to blunt attempts of acoustic ASW sensors to detect Trident.

Moreover, Trident will incorporate additional features which will provide marked advantages over our present submarines in what must be anticipated to be an increasingly hostile environment.

First, incorporation of a new, quieter reactor and propulsion plant design will provide quieting improvements to combat detection not possible in today's SSBN's. Second, Trident will be optimally configured to include an advanced sonar with a capability which far overshadows that available to today's SSBN's, and which cannot be backfitted into today's SSBN's because we have literally used up the growth margin available in that older design ship. The greater increased detection range of the new sonar alone will provide a giant step in survivability, permitting Trident to evade adversaries long before she herself becomes detectable by an enemy.

With the new propulsion plant, Trident will be provided with more power which can be used in the form of speed and/or mobility. The quieter Trident submarine will be capable of patrolling or transiting at higher speeds with equivalent degrees of quietness than can today's ships.

Finally, the Trident submarine will provide growth potential for missile advancements which may be required to accommodate future Soviet advances. Today's SSBN's which have so flexibly made the transition to Poseidon, will have exercised growth margin to the fullest possible degree if the decision is made to backfit the all-new Trident I missile. On the other hand, Trident incorporates growth margin to meet future threats by any number of possible avenues, and can readily accommodate new sensors and other defensive equipment.

THE BACKFIT OPTION

Some of my colleagues have advocated backfitting the Trident I missile into our existing Poseidon submarines in order to upgrade our deterrent forces and defer the Trident for 2 years. This, to my thinking, is false economy.

It is true that the backfit option provides for rapidly upgrading our sea-based missiles in response to a dramatic increase in the threat against our deterrent forces, or to a need to minimize our reliance on overseas bases. However, Trident is capable of increasing available ocean area for submarine operations by a multiple of 4 to 14 or more times over that available to Polaris/Poseidon missiles, depending upon concepts of targeting and selection of ocean areas. Backfit

submarines—today's SSBN's—can use only part of this expanded operating area in a normal patrol period because a requirement for higher speeds to permit coverage of the entire area would markedly increase the detectability of these submarines. Trident, with an improved, quiet propulsion plant, is not limited to area use. Furthermore, backfit submarines are space-limited and cannot accommodate the sonar and quieting improvements which will be inherent in Trident. And finally, backfitting into Poseidon submarines does not alter the aging problem facing the existing 41-ship force. To be a believable deterrent, SSBN's must be reliable as well as survivable. This is why backfit—alone—is not an amenable alternative.

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that we not permit the credibility of the most survivable element of our strategic forces to erode. While a short-term increase in survivability might be provided by installing the Trident I missile in our current SSBN's, such a measure does nothing to offset the ravages of time or technological advances which would threaten our aging ships as they advance into the 1980's and beyond. Prudence dictates that we update some portion of our submarines to stay abreast or ahead of anticipated Soviet advances.

WHY TRIDENT NOW

When one considers the rapidity with which the Soviets might deploy an antisubmarine warfare threat once the state of the art in sensors or kill mechanisms has been sufficiently advanced, it becomes clear why proceeding with Trident as quickly as possible is so essential. The Soviets have made tremendous advances in building a fleet of modern, high-speed surface ships and high-speed nuclear attack submarines. Thus they are acquiring vehicles which require only the adaptation of a new development in order to endanger our existing Polaris-Poseidon force. Thus we must cut the leadtime necessary to provide an adequate deterrent. Six to seven years are required to design, develop, and deploy a new SSBN in an orderly manner. With a building rate of three ships per year, it would be the early 1980's before 10 Trident submarines would be operational under even the current accelerated schedule. If need be, delivery dates of follow-on ships can be modified in future years. However, we cannot regain lost leadtime if we fail to continue our current Trident pace and find ourselves in a serious dilemma later.

Moreover, if we delay this program 2 years, we will have to pay the financial costs as well. Admiral Rickover has told the House Armed Services Committee that if the Trident submarines are not funded this year as required, the cost of the first Trident ship will increase by $100 million and the cost of the others will increase by comparable amounts. The nuclear components authorized last year and consisting of huge masses of metal being shaped and formed to meticulous reactor requirements are coming off the production line as planned. Any halt will not only delay the long leadtime items for the other submarines, but will increase the costs as well. In the event that the program is not funded, it is not unlikely that the manufacturers of these very complex components will find it better business to concentrate on the reactor program for private industry than to deal with the on-again, off-again programs of the Navy.

SALT

Some of our colleagues have implied that the present Trident schedule conflicts with the strategic arms limitation agreements with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the controlled modernization of our strategic deterrent is essential if we are to make further progress in the next round of strategic talks with the Russians. The Trident program is the keystone to such modernization, and as such, deserves full support.

What is more is that early Trident introduction will provide us with the flexibility needed to react to SALT in a manner which will assure us the strongest deterrent forces permissible under any new agreement. If "freedom-to-mix" results from SALT II, we can readily increase the sea-based systems which provide the greatest survivability. If SALT results in an overall lesser number of launchers—that is, a cutback on total land-based and sea-based missiles—we will be in a position to put more under the sea, and thereby enhance their survivability, as we phase out numbers of land-based weapons. If we were to delay the first ship, the long leadtime required to build nuclear ships would destroy our choice of options. We can always slow a building rate, but picking up the pace is very, very costly. We cannot afford to get into that kind of "catch-up" game.

SUMMARY

In essence, this debate boils down to a simple matter—should this Nation in light of the strategic reality today, proceed with the development of the next generation strategic missile system now, thereby providing for continued effectiveness of our deterrent forces for the future, or should we follow a wait-and-see approach. I firmly believe that we must go ahead now with the Trident program in order to insure the long-term survivability of our nuclear deterrent, which is the key to preserving the strategic balance of power and with it peace in the world. I urge my colleagues to support the full authorization for the Trident program.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of having this Trident program, of course, is to retain the credibility of the United States in its position to be a deterrent against nuclear conflict. Its purpose is to see to it that we never have a nuclear conflict by making it unrewarding to any nation to launch a nuclear attack.

When you look back a little bit in history, at the end of World War II, and think about what we were thinking at that time, and the probable events that might occur after that world war, and the fact that we might be forced into a nuclear war, and we realize in the decades that have followed the strength of the United States in this field, you can see that it was this strength which in fact preserved the deterrent.

That has been the greatest thrust to retain peace in that period of time.

There is no treaty conflict involved in the production of the Trident as planned in this bill. Over the weekend I read again the SALT agreements, and there is nothing at all in them that is in conflict with this bill. The gentleman proponent of this amendment may think that this bill will be added to the total of our submarine fleet; but when the Tridents come into existence they will come into existence when the existing fleet will be beyond the age of utilization. The old submarines will be put into the stockpile of our standby fleet rather than into actual utilization. Therefore, the Tridents are a follow-on for the programs which we already have in existence.

This is a replacement of the Poseidon program, replacing old vehicles of this nature. The Russians already have the Delta, which is comparable with the Trident.

It has been said many times by the proponents of this amendment that it will cost more than a nuclear carrier. It was interesting to see what opponents of this bill thought about the nuclear carrier cost a few minutes ago because then they were talking against the carrier. They made it sound as though it was going to cost $3 billion. But the cost now is $1 billion according to these same opponents of the bill as written.

Although they say each Trident submarine will cost $1 billion, that is not true. The figures show it will be less than $500 million for a submarine. The only way they arrive at the cost figure they cite for Trident is by the process of adding the facilities, the ports, the research and development, and everything else to it and dividing it by the number of submarines we presently intend to acquire. As far as I know, that has never been done for any other particular purchase.

The author of the amendment is not opposed to the idea of building these ships, but he thinks they are very expensive and he does not want to build them at the rate suggested. The gentleman says that he might save money by slowing down, but, to the contrary, we will expend more money by slowing down.

I would like to point out that this program is managed by Admiral Rickover, who has a program accomplishment record, in the Poseidon and Polaris field, of having no overruns. This is about the only place you can look at any place in defense of any construction effort, even nondefense, where you have no overruns. Although I cannot guarantee there will be no overruns, this dedicated and able man and his fine group working together have produced no overruns in the past on the expensive Polaris and Poseidon programs and I feel the past is the prophet of the future.

Admiral Rickover has estimated what it would cost. The chances of overruns are very small when he is the man making the estimates.

In concluding my remarks, I read to

the Members from a letter I received from Admiral Zumwalt, our able and dedicated C.N.O. In it he said:

In my judgment, the Soviets are pursuing a heavy program of ASW development . . . My judgment is strengthened by observing some of the following advancements:

Soviet deployment and sustained construction of improved quieter SSN's with improved ASW capability.

Second:

An obvious increase in emphasis in ASW, as evidenced by deployment of capable new ships and sensors, as well as increased participation in ASW exercises.

Third:

Increased confidence in reliability of ships and capability of crews as evidenced by increasing out-of-area deployments.

And I might say that the recitation in the press recently by the head of the Navy of Russia was along this same line, saying their Navy could detect anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENNETT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BENNETT. Then Admiral Zumwalt in that letter goes on to say, fourth:

Increasing experience with strengths and weaknesses as well as operating requirements or patterns of a deployed submarine missile system so similar to our own.

Then, finally, Admiral Zumwalt, summarized as follows on this Trident program:

Trident is being designed to meet the threat which is anticipated in the next decade, the precursors of which may be observed to be developing today. In the light of the extensive lead time required to develop and build a system which has greatly increased tolerance to an improved Soviet ASW capability, it is simply not prudent to delay commencement of Trident.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would quote to you what Admiral Zumwalt said before our committee. He did not say this in his prepared testimony. We just asked him what was the most dangerous thing we could do to the entire budget of the Navy, and this is what he said—and this is on page 3638 of the hearings, and you can read it there if you wish to. He said:

The most important thing we cannot do if the nation is to survive is to reduce the Trident program.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the name Trident has been given to a new generation of ballistic missile carrying submarines. This Trident system is being developed to insure that our Nation retains a viable strategic deterrent system in the 1980's and beyond.

The decision to proceed with Trident is not based on any single additional or recent threat; however, the Soviets have been working to attain a capability of neutralizing our Polaris submarines ever since the first one went to sea 12 years ago. Introduction of systems such as the MOSKVA class helicopter equipped ASW ships is indicative of the fact that the Soviets' significant R. & D. efforts are being translated into hardware systems. These signals indicate that we cannot afford inaction.

Trident submarines will meet the challenge of the future by reducing the phenomena, such as noise, which permit an enemy to detect and destroy our submarines. Additionally, the ship is being designed for ease of maintenance and operation. Improved logistic support, decreased "turn around time" and longer intervals between overhauls all increase the availability of this submarine for patrol while decreasing the life cycle drain on the taxpayer's dollar. A Trident submarine force will be less expensive to operate for a given number of missiles in a "ready on-station" status than current Poseidon submarines. First, since the Trident submarine can carry 50 percent more missiles, there can be 33 percent fewer Tridents on alert than would be required utilizing Poseidon submarines. Second, with the longer patrol period for Trident, there will be fewer refits required per year. Finally, the increased reliability of this new class submarine will allow shorter refit periods than for the older Poseidon submarine.

It is particularly desirable to have the flexibility of continental basing of a strategic deterrent force for both security and economic reasons. This option becomes available with the longer range Trident missile. Our submarines can be "on target" upon leaving port and transit times to patrol areas are avoided. We will not be forced to separate our crews from their families longer than is necessary due to the need to fly our people and material support overseas. This factor will aid retention efforts considerably and in the process help contain overall defense personnel training costs which have increased at an alarming rate in recent years.

In brief, we must support this Trident system, which will be quieter, faster, better equipped, and more cost-effective than her predecessors. By lending our support today, we can insure this Nation's survivability to threats which may emerge over the next 30 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1974 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $2,031,686,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $2,675,300,000;

For the Air Force, $3,110,811,000; and

For the Defense Agencies, $504,000,000, of which $24,600,000 is authorized for the activities of the Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: Page 3, line 16, after "Air Force" strike out "$3,110,811,000" and insert "$2,637,311,000, none of which shall be used for the B–1 bomber development program."

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I have not sent out any "Dear Colleague" letters, and I hope that the debate on this issue does not take too long. It does not delay the B–1 program, it kills it dead.

I hope the mathematics have been clear. I have struck $473.5 million from the Air Force procurement.

I have asked for the extra time because, while there are just 4½ lines in the 150-page committee report on the subject of the B–1 bomber, those 4½ lines represent $473.5 million. That is this year's bite in the development program. I ask the Members to visualize a B–1 bomber. This room, from the blue up there to the blue up there, is 139 feet long, and the B–1 is 4 feet longer than that. This room, from the blue wall there to the blue wall there is 93 feet wide, and the B–1 with its wings folded is 15 feet narrower, and with its wings extended, it is 44 feet wider.

Now that the Members can visualize it, color it gold, because if we were to take a lump of gold of the weight of the B–1 bombers which are being developed, the cost of the three development B–1 bombers, the lump of gold—and this is pricing gold at a price it has not even reached yet, $125 an ounce; it is getting close, but it has not gotten there—would be about 50 percent cheaper than the B–1 bomber.

The program, I am delighted to be able to say, has involved no cost overrun whatsoever, and the Pentagon has hit upon a unique device for avoiding cost overruns. They put out cost-plus contracts so there can never be a cost overrun on the B–1 bomber, because the B–1 bomber's cost is going to be whatever it costs.

What does it cost? Last year at this time they told us that if we would appropriate $444.5 million, the cost to complete the program would only be $9,978.8 million more. This year, having appropriated the $444.5 million last year, they tell us that if only we will appropriate $473.5 million this year the cost to complete the program has not gone down from $9.9 billion; it has gone up to $12,064,600,000. We have appropriated $444.5 million last year. We are asked to appropriate $473.5 million this year, and we are approximately $1.2 billion further behind, if we appropriate the money, than we were when we started.

I do not really know how many millions of Russians we have to be able to have the assured capability of killing in order to have what we deem to be an adequate deterrent force.

I happen to believe that with our Polaris submarines and with our Poseidon submarines and with our Trident submarines—which I do support and have supported—and with our ICBM's, we have the deterrent capability. I just believe very strongly, however, that the galloping cost of this program—and it changes faster than our hearings can keep up with it—it has changed by $80 million up since we concluded our hearings on this bill and concluded our markup on this bill.

We cannot keep up with the cost growth of this program. We never will be able to keep up with the cost growth of this program. I would like to hope that the argument made of all places in Aviation Week and Space Technology we might pay some attention to. Here is what an Air Force general said in Aviation Week and I am quoting from the issue of June 26, 1972:

"If we do not get the B–1, we can forget all else in the field of strategic offense manned systems," one Air Force planner told Aviation Week and Space Technology.

"Once the horse was replaced by something else," he noted, "they didn't go on improving horses."

I think this is where we have gotten to in the realm of manned strategic systems. I am sure that the last charge of the cavalry was a magnificent sight to see, but here we are charging and charging and charging in pursuit of an elusive bomber. We wasted $1.5 billion building two and a half B–70's and decided not to produce them. We are wasting what they tell us now is going to be $3 billion to produce three B–1's, and I firmly believe we are not going to produce them. They are going to cost $100 million each when we start production if we put the missiles in them and that does not count the cost of the nuclear warheads on the missiles. I just do not believe we are going into that kind of program. I do not believe we need that kind of program. I honestly think that the Air Force and this Nation would be stronger if we put the money somewhere else.

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

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the gentleman's remarks. I might point out that part of the B–1 bomber is made in my district. I voted against it the last time.

Mr. PIKE. The B–1 program is so big that part of the B–1 bomber is made in everybody's district.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I believe it.

Mr. PIKE. I want the gentleman to know no matter where one lives some little part of the B–1 bomber is made, and I have no doubt the gentleman has gotten a letter from someone saying he must support the program.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. And all the letters are alike.

The gentleman has not said much about the military effectiveness of the B–1 bomber.

Mr. PIKE. If all of our 1,046 ICBM missiles miss, and all of our Polaris missiles miss, and all of our missiles we have on the Poseidon miss, and all the Tridents miss, then perhaps the B–1 might have possibly some use.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. What other plane do we have to perform the military function if we do not have this plane?

Mr. PIKE. The basic job of the B–1 bomber is to carry the nuclear missiles called SRAM's and also carry nuclear weapons, and they also have the capability of carrying conventional bombs.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Does this take the place of the B–52?

Mr. PIKE. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The B–52 is supposed to be worn out although the Russians do not have a bomber anything like this good.

Are there any other aircraft such as the FB–111 that can do the job just as well?

Mr. PIKE. I would not say the FB–111 can do the job as well because it does not have the range or carrying capability but I do say the cost of the B–1 bomber compared to its utility makes buying it a real exercise in waste. I just do not believe it will ever get bought.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. So the gentleman puts the whole argument basically on the tremendous cost?

Mr. PIKE. Yes, and on the fact that in my judgment the winner of the next war is not going to be he who grinds his enemy into the finest powder.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no part of the B–1 is manufactured in my district.

In our deliberations, we must never forget that there is an unequivocal need for the B–1. We need it to modernize our heavy bomber force, and thus to maintain the effectiveness of that force. We cannot rely forever on our aging B–52's, which are based on the technology of the early 1950's and which were designed to counter a threat considerably less capable than the far more sophisticated threat expected in the 1980's and thereafter.

Without an effective bomber force in the future, we would find ourselves in an untenable position. Consider the following:

Five years ago, Russia had about 800 ICBM's, but today it has twice that number. Five years ago, the United States had 1,054 ICBM's; today we have the same number. In short, in the past 5 years, the U.S.S.R. has gone from a position of inferiority to a position of 3-to-2 advantage over the United States in terms of numbers of ICBM launchers, and also has a considerable advantage over the United States in terms of ICBM "throw weight." Also, the U.S.S.R. today is actively testing several new or significantly improved ICBM's, but the United States has no new ICBM under development.

Five years ago, Russia had fewer than 100 SLBM launchers, but today it has more than five times that number. And the Soviets are continuing to build new ballistic missile submarines. Five years ago, the United States had 656 SLBM's; today we have the same number.

Five years ago, we had twice as many delivery vehicles of all types—ICBM's, SLBM's, and bombers—as the Soviet Union. Today, the Soviet Union has the advantage in numbers of delivery vehicles. And this Soviet quantitative advantage over the United States is expected to widen further over the next 5 years as we continue to phase out some of our older B–52's and the Soviets complete the buildup of their SLBM force to the level permitted by the Interim Agreement on Strategic Offensive Arms.

What this means is that modernization of our strategic bomber force—which is extremely important in any event—takes on added significance. How much added significance as someone said recently: "Ask any boy in a big city whether or not the best way to stay out of a fight is by being the smallest kid on the block."

Inasmuch as the B–1 will assure the continued effectiveness of the bomber force, it will strengthen our deterrent posture in the years ahead. Related to the nature of our future deterrent posture, it is evident that the B–1 will be an important contributor to stability. The B–1 probably would not be perceived as a very good "first strike" weapon—despite its accuracy and megatonnage—because of the relatively long warning time available compared with that of SLBM's and ICBM's. This factor—combined with the B–1's high degree of survivability, and its ability to be launched under positive control and recalled without expending its weapons—means that the B–1 possibly would make the greatest contribution of all our forces to stability. And of course, the B–1's effectiveness—and its cost-effectiveness—are extended by virtue of the fact that it can be used in both a strategic role and a conventional role.

So there can be no question about the need for the B–1. It will be a highly capable system which will strengthen our deterrent posture in the coming decades by maintaining the effectiveness of our bomber force. And within this context, it will also be an important contributor to strategic stability. I urge that you give the B–1 program your fullest support.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman that likewise no part of the B–1 is made in my district, and perhaps the gentleman who spoke previously has never heard of improvement being carried on with equines but maybe the name "Secretariat" might refresh his memory.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, does the

gentleman know of any airplane which has ever been built by any company or by any country which did not have its defects that had to be worked out as the plane was developed?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I never have, and I do not think anyone else has.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will reject this amendment.

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

It seems the thrust of the arguments in opposition to the B–1 is that we have enough delivery capability with our strategic missiles so that a bomber in the future will not be necessary to our national security.

First I believe that we must, though we do it reluctantly, presume that even though a spirit of detente does exist today and we have made some remarkable progress in agreements with potential enemies this is still a dangerous world.

I, for one, must continue to believe it is a dangerous world so long as the very potent military forces of the Soviet Union are amassed ready to strike at central Europe on a moment's notice.

I, for one, must continue to believe that this is a dangerous world in which we live so long as the Soviet Union continues to spend more of its gross national product on armament than we are spending, so long as it continues to develop offensive weapons.

There is no question but what the balance of military power is shifting drastically and dramatically in favor of the Soviet Union. Considering the realities of leadtime in the development of highly complex weapons systems, one cannot help but conclude that we cannot afford to be latter-day Neville Chamberlains and hope that a few breakthroughs signal peace in our time.

The present Soviet advantage in strategic missiles, coupled with the Soviet intensive military research and development program, has increased the need for manned bombers, and certainly has made the manned bomber more important in the strategic equation.

The bomber gives us flexibility which we need. The bomber complicates the problems of a potential enemy, and requires him to find a means of meeting that threat. In addition to a role of nuclear deterrence, the bombers possess the inherent capability of delivering massive fire power in a conventional conflict.

Stop for a moment and try to imagine a military force which possessed only strategic missiles. Try to imagine where we would be if we had only our Minuteman missiles, our Polaris, and our Poseidon fleet, and the Trident fleet coming along.

That sort of posture would be fine if we intended to be the aggressor and if we intended to launch a first strike. But I do not believe anybody in this room truly believes the United States of America intends to launch a first strike and bring about a nuclear conflict. We will not be the aggressor. So, we will not have the option of what kinds of weapons we use. We will have to respond to an attack. That is where a mixture of weapons, a variety of weapons and the capability to respond to different threats, is absolutely essential.

I believe it would be most foolhardy, the most foolhardy thing this country could ever do, if we put all our eggs in the strategic missile basket. That we simply cannot afford to do.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I believe he is making an extremely important contribution to this debate.

The statement was made earlier, during another amendment, and it is germane to what we are talking about right now, that there are those of us on both sides of the aisle, because of our support for these kinds of programs, who only look upon Soviet Russia as a menace. I believe that is an unfortunate choice of words.

I would suggest that one of the reasons why this administration, and our President, has been able to bring into reality an era of negotiation rather than confrontation is primarily because this Nation has maintained its credibility of deterrence and its strength in strategic weapons. Weakness doesn't help negotiations it is a hinder. Under President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger we have stopped trying to buy the world's love and have started earning its respect. We are holding out the hand of friendship to the world but not out of weakness or trepidation.

I will tell the Members there are some people who would still consider Soviet Russia a menace, and those are the Hungarians, the Czechs, and the Poles plus millions of other captive peoples. But if we are to truly enter an era of successful negotiation, we should negotiate from strength and not from weakness. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) has expired.

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

There is one other point about the need to have a bomber that is very seldom mentioned, but which I think is terribly important. Let us assume that we were engaged in an intense negotiation with some foreign country and that we were being blackmailed at the conference table. Assume further that the only thing we had to prevent them from gaining what they wished by blackmail negotiation methods was our deterrent threat.

Now, if we rely strictly upon missiles, we have only one level of deterrence. The missile is either in the silo or we press the button and it is on the way to the target with no way of calling it back.

We have no means of upgrading our deterrent posture.

But if we have a bomber, it has one level of deterrent capability when it is in its bay on the ground, it has a higher level of deterrent capability when it is in the air, and when it is halfway to its potential enemy's boundaries, it has a higher level of deterrent capability.

Mr. Chairman, is it not obvious that a man sitting at a negotiating table, knowing that those bombers were halfway to his country, would begin to think a little bit more seriously about whether they wanted to have a nuclear war on their hands and whether they wished to pursue their tactics of nuclear blackmail.

I believe that the strategic bomber provides us a means of upgrading our deterrent posture in order to assist our negotiators who might be sitting at the conference table during a crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to take note of the fact that only 10 percent of the Defense budget, already diminished in real terms, is allotted today to the strategic forces. Within that 10 percent of the diminished budget less than half is allotted to the most flexible and proven strategic system, the bomber. This is expected to remain true as the B–1 is introduced into the inventory.

I repeat the fact that bombers make a unique, irreplaceable, and effective contribution to our deterrent capability and make critically important contributions to strategic stability. These bombers are expected to be of considerable value in the future, much longer than the current B–52 can remain effective and serviceable.

Accordingly, the development of the B–1 is essential to insure the continued contributions of the bomber force in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that we reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been listening to the gentleman's discussion. I must agree with the gentleman thoroughly.

One of the things that was not touched upon while we discussed the B–1 is the fact that the bombers we do have in the armament now are old. The new weaponry and the new systems of weaponry we have in the arsenal are most important so that the B–1 will be equipped to carry either conventional or nuclear warheads, as the case might require, and as a deterrent factor. I do not know of any nation who would attack this country if they knew we had in the air two or three B–1's with long-range missiles attached to the fuselage that could be used at any moment.

So the main objective in obtaining the B–1 is to get into the inventory of U.S. military forces a weapon that will be effectual in case we are attacked or in case an attack is imminent, or as a deterrent to attack.

You know, there are such things as sabotage and power failures that might affect the nuclear equipment supply we have, but with several B–1's in the air,

as you pointed out, this is a most valuable tool to us to stay out of war rather than getting into one, and I compliment the gentleman on his presentation.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman. I consider the "Cross of Gold" speech was the greatest speech of all time. However, it has been supplanted by the "Bomber of Gold" speech, and I wish to yield now to the author of that speech.

Mr. PIKE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I frankly agree with my friend in much of what he has said, but I think when you paint this as a black or white or all or nothing situation with manned or unmanned bombers you are underestimating the role of carriers with their nuclear attack planes and the planes that we have stationed in Europe, also.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been very interested in the debate on this issue. While I have not spoken on other items that have been in the bill, I intend to do so on some items that will come up, and I do wish to make a couple of points in relation to the B–1.

I listened to what the author of the proposed amendment said, and what he said is true in the main. I am very much concerned, also, with the cost of the B–1. I would like it if we did not need it, but I think the main point I would like to make here, which we should not lose sight of, is that this is research and development money.

Whether or not we buy the B–1 is another question. At this point in time I am opposed to the procurement of B–1's because there are still many problems yet to be solved and bugs to be worked out with the B–1. However, I certainly think we would be extremely foolish if at this time, after the money we have already spent, we were to abandon all research and development in this area.

As the House well knows, we have already done away with the research and development for the SST. What we need is a capability and the ability to advance the state of the art of aerodynamics and SST's and supersonic bombers, both at the high and low level. This bomber would have almost supersonic capacity at low level and certainly have supersonic capacity at high level.

The point is that this is research and development money and if we do not go forward and develop our technology, we will find ourselves falling behind Russia in another area. It takes a very long lead-time to work out the research and development. It is not something you can simply start and stop at will. So, in knocking out this money, as the amendment does, it will knock out all research and development in this area of critical expertise, and I believe the House would be extremely foolish to do away with it at this time.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the B–1 R. & D. program enters its fourth year, I am personally most pleased with the reports I get concerning cost, schedule, and performance—the three key flashing lights on every major defense program. I am fully aware of the recent Air Force announcement concerning the rescheduling of several future milestones in order to assure a continuing balance between schedule and cost. Those aroused by that message would appear to have very short memories concerning the extent of schedule and cost adjustments encountered by earlier weapons systems.

The news that the total B–1 R. & D. current cost estimate remains within 3 percent of the 1970 projection is a most refreshing departure from the precedent of the past two decades. Throughout the 1930's and the 1960's, the common experience has been R. & D. cost increases of 50 percent to 200 percent. The remarkable resistance to cost increase demonstrated in the management of the B–1 R. & D. program seems particularly commendable during a period when, in food costs alone, we have experienced a 305 rise.

As far as schedules are concerned, every major contractural milestone to date has been met on or ahead of schedule. I am advised that rollout will still take place the third quarter of fiscal year 1974 and I am confident that first flight will take place on schedule during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1974.

Completion of over 18,000 hours of wind tunnel testing combined with detailed tests of the structure and critical systems serve to verify the airplane's comparability and integrity. Everything points to an airplane that will fully meet performance specifications and mission requirements.

In overall perspective, by any reasonable measure, we have every reason to be pleased both with the management and the achievements of the B–1 research and development program.

B–1 CREW ESCAPE MODULE

The B–1 crew escape concept has three basic design objectives:

First. Safe escape from the aircraft in almost all flight regimes and on the ground.

Second. Post landing survival.

Third. Minimum degradation to crew station efficiency such as minimum personal equipment, maximum console and instrument space and full seat adjustment.

Conventional ejection seats afford very poor compliance with all of these objectives.

At the time of the B–1 engineering development contract award, the crew escape module, although proven on the F–111 series, was recognized to be a complex technical challenge requiring extensive testing to qualify the system prior to first flight. The awareness, coupled with potential R. & D. and production program cost schedule and performance impacts, resulted in over 2 years of the most meticulous design and risk assessment analysis. Alternative escape methods were again exhaustively reviewed during the summer and fall of 1972. On November 22, 1972, the Air Force concluded that the original design concept of a 600-knot system was not achievable with acceptable risk in time to support first flight. However, an interim module, man-rated to 450 knots, is realistic with acceptable risk for first flight. This module will provide flight test crew safety at least equivalent to ejection seats. Work is proceeding to provide the original 600-knot capability by production decision time.

A tight schedule of subsystem testing remains to be accomplished prior to first flight due to required design improvements in the capsule stabilization system.

Subsystem and full system testing since the November 1972 decision has been highly successful and within performance requirements. The B–1 crew module, proposed for a 21st century military aircraft, is now considered to be a low technical risk.

EFFECT OF WEIGHT ON PERFORMANCE

In the course of detailed design and structural testing, it has been deemed prudent to budget additional weight for B–1 structure to assure integrity and long structural life. The effect of increased weight on the B–1 mission performance has been offset by increasing takeoff gross weight, which extracts a small penalty of approximately 1,000 feet in takeoff distance.

At current design operating weight, the B–1 range performance is within 4 percent of the initial basic design mission requirements when carrying full design payloads and employing undiminished penetration speeds. Such a small discrepancy at this stage of development contrasts favorably with the performance status of recently highly successful jet airframes such as the DC–8 and 747.

Current B–1 performance permits penetration following refueling all the way at low level to 100 percent of the target system—a capability not possessed by strategic aircraft now in the inventory.

B–1 WEIGHT

When assessing the weight status of the B–1 program it is useful to consider the lessons of several military aircraft systems developed in the 1960's which have experienced severe structural problems. Limited fatigue life was at the root of those problems which were identified soon after the B–1 program began in mid-1970.

To preclude similar problems on the B–1 the Air Force and the contractor elected to change the emphasis from fixed weight requirements, as had been used in the 1960's programs, to weight goals that could be adjusted to assure structural integrity. This concept of "weight goals" instead of "fixed weight requirements" had been well proven in the successful development of commercial jetliners. Airliner design objectives are similar to those of the B–1: Not only is static strength essential but, more importantly, the integrity of a protracted—flight hour—fatigue life is mandatory to assure that the B–1 will serve as the strategic deterrent backbone into the 21st century. Moreover, it is intended that the B–1 will achieve that long service life without the need for the sort of postproduction structural modifications or retrofits which have proven so costly to several previous military aircraft.

It was fully realized that a price would

be paid for the benefits of structural integrity which accrue from a change in emphasis from fixed weight numbers to adjustable weight goals. On the basis of detailed engineering drawings completed earlier this year, that price turns out to be an increment in airframe structural weight and an attendant increase of $2 million in the projected unit production cost.

Most significantly it should be noted, first, that this special program has been accomplished without impairing the critical mission performance of the B–1, and second, that the controlled increase in the unit cost is far less expensive than the alternate of continual structural modifications and retrofits during the long operational life of the B–1.

TECHNICAL CONCERNS

At this time there are no significant technical problems on the B–1 development program.

A thorough structural analysis and testing program involving 680 different parts has revealed no known or anticipated structural deficencies.

The same note of confidence pertains to performance and flight characteristics, where nearly 19,000 hours of wind tunnel testing verify that the airplane will meet all Strategic Air Command requirements.

In the systems area, the customary refinements and adjustments will be necessary, but none approach the category of insurmountable problems.

EMUX, the multiplexing system on the airplane, has caused us some trouble. The problems have been of a development nature and now that solutions have been identified, we have set up daily milestones which are monitored very closely. As a result, we are starting to get qualifiable hardware.

Development problems have also resulted in some delay in CITS, the central integrated test system. This delay has no impact on initial flight testing, however, and all areas of concern are being remedied.

The current brake system is acceptable for flight testing, but will require further development to meet longevity goals appropriate for production aircraft.

Stringent windshield requirements have caused problems, too, but again those being delivered are acceptable for flight testing. The problem has not been in the bird-proofing, deicing, or defogging characteristics, but rather with the challenge of incorporating all those features into a windshield with excellent optical qualities.

Another area that was of concern early in the program was the wing pivot joint. Following a highly successful static test, a fatigue test program was started. At the end of 1½ aircraft lives, small cracks were developing inside the bolt holes which connect the titanium lugs to the lower aluminum wing planks. This section has been redesigned by using an auxiliary spar to take the loads through that joint. Currently, we have completed 4½ lives on the pivot, and 2¾ lives on the revised joint with no evidence whatsoever of any cracking.

Based on previous aircraft history, ripple problems had been anticipated in the area of hydraulic pumps. These problems were precluded on the B–1 by a parallel initial development program with vendor selection based on test performance. The hydraulic pumps selected have now undergone a complete integration test with the engine, auxiliary power unit, the secondary power system, and the drive generator—and performed perfectly.

The way the B–1 research and development program is structured has allowed the Air Force contractor team to follow a logical and careful step-by-step approach in developing a major weapon system. This has resulted in a development program where technical risk has been minimized and made it possible through good management visibility to accurately and promptly detect problems and make rational decisions for their solutions. The visibility gained over the past 6 months, when the engineering drawing releases went from 65 to 90 percent and fabrication of major structure for the first air vehicle accelerated, has yielded the hard-data material and man-hour costs that could only be obtained by cutting metal and acquiring real time experience in assembling the first flight test aircraft. Analysis of these data provided a more accurate assessment of cost and schedule requirements and indicated that if we were to maintain the schedule of first flight in April 1974, we would require funds in excess of those programed for fiscal year 1974. The decision was obvious to hold the cost line and adjust first flight 60 days, still holding to a first flight in the last quarter of fiscal year 1974, as originally planned. The 60-day readjustment in first flight data will allow the Air Force contractor team to use more economical schedules for subsystems installations in the first air vehicle. While production decision is being rescheduled the revised decision date still falls in fiscal year 1976, as previously planned; in fact, the new fiscal year 1976 date is such that the engine endurance and other key tests will have been completed before any production commitment is made. As we are all aware, moving ahead into production before engine endurance and other vital tests were completed has caused problems in other major programs. It is felt by all involved that this decision to put schedule and costs into a more balanced context will certainly result in lower ultimate costs and a better weapons system.

The Air Force contractor teams have been able to meet every major milestone to date since the inception of the program in June 1970. These included preliminary design review, July 1971; mockup completion and review, October 1971; and critical design review, May 1973. At the same time, they have tested more than 680 individual parts of the B–1 airframe to verify structural integrity and producibility. Systems testing results, which have been outstanding, have included eight successful capsule parachute drops and three escape capsule rocket sled ejection tests. These preassembly tests have given great confidence in the design estimates. As in any R. & D. program, one expects design changes, and they do affect schedules. An example would be the decision in early 1972 to change from a mixed compression engine air inlet to an external compression inlet. It was found, as they moved into detail design, that while the mixed inlet offered certain advantages over the external at supersonic speeds, those advantages were not great enough to offset the additional cost and complexity of the design. Detailed studies showed that for a very slight decrease in supersonic performance they save weight, maintainability costs, and even gain in subsonic performance with the external compression inlet. This decision, of course, resulted in a redesign, which caused a revision in the schedule for that portion of the airframe.

There has been concern on the timing of the program readjustment announcement, and certainly with good reason. But the philosophy adhered to by the Air Force and the contractor during the B–1 program is best described by one word, "candid." It has always been the policy on the B–1 to announce as soon as possible any significant events or decisions that take place. As soon as the course of action was established for the R. & D. program readjustment, it was announced.

Since the inception of the program in 1970 they knew we were going to be faced with extremely tight funding, particularly during the early years of the R. & D. phase. They have adhered rigidly to the yearly funding limits since inception and this will also be the case in fiscal year 1974. The whole aim has been to stay within cost and remain on schedule, and now with validated test results and actual manufacturing experience becoming available as the assembly of the first air vehicle accelerates the current readjustment of the program will still permit first flight in the last quarter of fiscal year 1974 as planned and has resulted in less than a 3-percent cost variance in the total R. & D. program.

Mr. Chairman, as a former jet fighter pilot in the Korean war, I am keenly interested in U.S. strategic air capabilities. I make it a point to keep abreast of achievements in air technology and equipment as they occur.

It is because of my keen interest that I have been following the development of the new manned bomber, the B–1. And it is because of my understanding of its development process and my insight into the technical aspects of the plane and its equipment that I am so disturbed by recently published reports that the B–1 is having cost and management problems. These reports are misleading and inaccurate and I want to set the record straight.

According to one article:

> Government auditors (GAO) have uncovered a $1.3 billion cost overrun in the Air Force B–1 strategic bomber program. . . .

In fact, a $1.3 net cost estimate increase did occur between the time that the Air Force developed a preliminary estimate of total program costs and the time that the request for proposal was received from the aircraft industry. This increase constituted a necessary and appropriate update of the preliminary program estimate and was documented in recurring reports to the Congress.

The increase was not uncovered by the GAO or any other agency. Likewise, the

increase is not, as alleged, a cost overrun, it represented conscious Air Force effort in an evolutionary process to identify and price out all elements of cost applicable to the program.

These particular adjustments of the preliminary estimate included: First, an amount for economic escalation over the life of the development program and to update the production program to fiscal year 1970 dollar value; second, an amount attributed to the AMSA program, the forerunner of the B–1; and third, amounts for testing and support and SRAM interface not previously charged to the B–1 program.

So it can be seen that the $1.3 figure I mentioned earlier is not an "overrun" as popularly understood. Rather, as was accurately pointed out by GAO, it represents the change in the Government estimate for the total B–1 programs as developed over the period from June 1969 to June 1970, and reported to Congress in the selected acquisition reports—SAR. In this connection I would stress that the program estimate shown in the June 1969 report was a preliminary Government estimate developed prior to the issuance of the Air Force's request for proposal for the private sector development contract. Thus as the source selection was completed and the contract figures became available, the estimates were revised and the new figures were incorporated in the June 1970 report.

The reported increase was largely caused by economic escalation, but there were some technical bookkeeping reasons for it as well. Between June 1969 and June 1970, the cost estimate increased $982 million solely as a result of translating costs of the development program and the procurement program to current dollar values. This represented sheer inflation. But just as important from a cost reporting view, the June 1969 SAR value was in constant fiscal year 1968 dollars in accordance with the then existing ground rules for SAR preparation. In contrast, the June 1970 value was a mixture of escalated dollars for development and constant fiscal year 1970 dollars for procurement. Inclusion of inflation factors was not routine and ground rules were not established to apply escalation factors uniformly in program reporting until the September SAR. The remainder of the $1.3 billion increase included $139 million of AMSA study funds not previously charged against the B–1 program, as well as another $187 million for other Government costs such as test support, SRAM interface, and so forth, and some program adjustments and corrections.

Finally the value of $10.1 billion reflected in the June 1970 SAR was the estimate for the total B–1 program to include the development contracts with North American Rockwell and General Electric, costs to develop the avionics, and a current best estimate for the costs of an eventual procurement program for which no contracts are anticipated until a year after the aircraft first flies in 1974.

Mr. Chairman, regarding a new program estimate, the Air Force has submitted revised estimates to Congress each quarter. By September 1970, these estimates reflected further anticipated increases in the program to $11.4 billion. These anticipated program costs prompted the Air Force to undertake an intensive study of the entire program, including its management philosophy. As a result the entire development program has been revised and significant cost reductions and scheduled improvements have been realized.

In accordance with the outlines of the revised development the B–1 is being designed for considerable growth in avionics during the later years of its lifetime. This is being done in recognition of the fact that the defensive threat which the B–1 must cope with will increase in severity during the late 1980's. However, the avionics system that will be installed in the production B–1 aircraft is expected to be considerably less costly and will be specifically tailored to meet the threat anticipated for its early flying years. This initial production avionics system will take maximum advantage of existing technology and its development will be paced to insure that the first production B–1 to join the strategic air command force will have a fully operational avionics system sized and configured to perform its total offensive-defense avionics tasks.

Speaking of offensive-defensive tasks, contrary to the impression gained from newspaper accounts, the SRAM test program has been quite successful. Recent flight tests launched from both the B–52 and FB–111 have reinforced Air Force and OSD confidence that the SRAM will be a very effective missile. The operational flexibility of the B–1 is increased by the availability of the SRAM. But this is by no means the only weapon planned for use by the B–1. Other weapons offer an extremely effective means of delivering large megatonnage against very large or very hard targets against which the lighter weight, low yield missile warheads are not nearly as useful.

Mr. Chairman, it has also been alleged that the B–1 program is being managed outside of existing directives prescribing DOD procedures for development programs. To the contrary, the B–1 program is the first program to come under the Laird-Packard approach to management, and focuses on getting full benefits for tax dollar expenditures.

The Air Force has implemented the Laird-Packard management practices on the B–1 program. The revised program of reducing the number of test aircraft and the elimination and reduction of many unsuccessful management practices that have hampered past programs is an example of the direct application of these practices.

I think the Air Force should be proud of its record on keeping the B–1 on schedule and within the authorized congressional fiscal levels. The fiscal baseline for the current program was established in the June 30, 1970, SAR to Congress and since that time the total cost of the development program has been reduced by over $55 million from that fiscal baseline. In addition, the Air Force has kept the program on schedule.

It is important to note that a primary objective of this revision process was to reduce the national resource commitment for the B–1 program to the lowest possible level prior to reaching the planned production decision point of April 1975. Under this program revision process the total dollars committed at the time of first flight were reduced and the production decision authority will be given 1 full year of actual flight performance upon which to base a production decision. This is in accordance with the DOD "fly before buy," concept.

All in all, from its very inception the B–1 program has been extremely cost conscious. The Air Force and the Department of Defense have determined that the program must be run with a continuing high level emphasis on controlling costs. It has, however, been equally emphasized that the B–1 must be a useful and cost effective weapon system, a system that will continue to provide a credible strategic deterrent for the United States in the years ahead. In my judgment, the current B–1 program meets both these objectives.

Mr. Chairman, there is a greater awareness of domestic needs in this country today than ever before. This has led to heavy pressure on Federal efforts to meet these needs. At the same time there is a budget problem, for our resources are obviously not limitless.

It goes without saying that doing the things we are talking about in this country and achieving our national goals, are not "either/or" propositions. We must strive to accomplish as many as possible. But if we are not secure in our national defense, and other nations bring us to feel, all our programs and our hopes, however well intentioned, will go out the window. Conversely, if we have the best military posture in the world, and other needed, high-priority programs suffer at the expense of this, then we have lost in another way. Consequently, we must study as best we can the capabilities of potential enemies—not as a scare tactic, not to produce a panic reaction—but because the capabilities of potential enemies are, after all, the true measure of the forces we really need.

One has to say the Soviet ballistic missile force is increasing in numbers. Their submarine capability, with sea-launched missiles, is also increasing. In fact, in total land and sea-based missile payload, the Soviets have more than a 2 to 1 advantage over U.S. resources.

In aircraft, the Soviets have a new swing-wing bomber prototype, and they are turning out about one new fighter design each year. In the process they are not phasing out their current bomber force. As a consequence, while we retain a lead in heavy bombers, we do not in total heavy and medium bombers. In fact, our strategic bomber force has been cut drastically in recent years. We have phased out the entire B–58 force sooner than previously planned, and our purchases of the FB–111 have been sharply reduced.

In my judgment, and I know my thinking is shared by Air Force balance-of-forces experts, the national defense system of this Nation should be buttressed

by an appropriate mixture of three strategic force elements; bombers, land-based missiles, and sea-based missiles.

As a result of simulated war gaming and other forms of systems analysis it has been demonstrated that to maintain an assured destruction capability, a combination of bombers and missiles has definite advantages over either an all-bomber or an all-missile force. This way, the enemy must program his resources to counter both missiles and aircraft. By dividing his efforts, he cannot concentrate on any one system. He is thus less likely to neutralize even one of our strategic force elements, let alone all three. Further, this complicates his defense problems considerably and requires commitment of far more resources.

On the basis of this strategic concept the question of what would be the effect of stripping manned bombers from our deterrent forces is answered. Obviously, we would have to put much greater reliance on missiles. In my view, we would have less flexibility and fewer options to consider in response to an enemy threat.

A few years ago, when intercontinental ballistic missiles were first becoming operational, it was then thought to be impossible to defend against them. But with systems like ABM, this has changed, actually enhancing rather than reducing the strategic role of manned aircraft.

There are other advantages of maintaining advanced aircraft in the defensive inventory. For instance, you can have a show of strength with bombers without threatening a cataclysmic confrontation, for manned aircraft can be controlled. They can be pulled back at the right time. You cannot say the same for missiles.

From another perspective, there are no crystal balls in the national defense business; it is impossible to foretell all the various uses to which our strategic forces will be put. For example, no one foresaw the extensive use of the B–52 and the flying tanker in Southeast Asia. Tactical and strategic uses are openended. The options often depend on the imagination directed toward a plane's use rather than on the particular limitations of the plane itself.

It is with the needs of the future in mind that the need for developing the B–1 becomes so compelling. Modernization of our forces is essential if we are to continue to possess a credible deterrent to the enemy. Planes do wear out. Their capabilities do become exhausted by new performance demands. The B–52 has been the backbone of our bomber system for more than a decade. But, the prototype B–52 was based on technology of the late 1940's, and first flew in 1952. The latest models were built in 1962.

Since the early days of World War II, American forces have never had to fight in the face of enemy air superiority. The Air Force is proud of that record. It has been a vital factor in dissuading would-be aggressors, and defeating those whose ambitions ran away with their judgment. I believe our pilots are the best in the world, but skill and determination can go only so far to compensate for inadequate equipment.

Eventually, technology changes so much that either potential new developments cannot be incorporated into old aircraft, or is it simply not economical to do so. Thus it makes sense to produce a modern aircraft that can handle the threat and will have growth potential for future developments.

The Air Force believes, and I agree, there are several specific factors that dictate against continuous modification of the present force of bombers. The latest model B–52—the "H" model—represents about the maximum growth attainable within the constraints of the basic design. Development of any new bomber aircraft requires about 8 years. By the time the Air Force could have a significant operational number of B–1's in the inventory, the B–52 will be 17 to 20 years old.

Also, if a major structure fatigue in the B–52 were detected, it could be too late to produce a timely replacement aircraft. The problem is compounded by large uncertainties in the magnitude of costs required to keep the old system viable. We have already invested $2.5 billion in the B–52 update costs through fiscal 1969.

Finally, while the effectiveness of the B–52 can be upgraded by equipping the current force with the latest weapons and systems, it would be unduly expensive to make the plane faster, carry more payload, fly lower, or have a smaller radar cross-section.

Mr. Chairman, some people have asked me why cannot the FB–111 be used as a replacement for the B–52? The answer is that the FB–111 was developed from the F–111 design only as an interim aircraft to replace the B–52C through F models as they neared the end of their operational life expectancy. As a strategic bomber, the FB–111 design has definite limitations—it has limited payload capacity, limited avionics capabilities, limited range, and it requires greater tanker support than does the B–52 or the B–1.

I have also been asked what is to keep the B–1 from becoming obsolete even before it can be ready for active duty. The answer to this is that the B–1 is being designed to take advantage of the many technical advances growing out of the past decade. Compared to the B–52, the B–1 will have a higher penetration speed, a reduced radar cross-section, a larger payload capacity, a better capability to penetrate at lower altitudes, a quicker reaction launch, and the characteristics necessary to operate from austere dispersal bases. The B–1 also possesses better electronic countermeasures, target-finding systems, and weapon delivery systems. Taken together this equipment will further improve the ability of the B–1 to deal with enemy targets in both nuclear and non-nuclear wars and confrontations.

Finally, the B–1 will not become obsolete before full operational readiness because there is a built-in growth factor, whereby allowances are made for incorporating further advances as they are developed.

Over the past 5 years, technical risks have been reduced through an extensive advanced development program. This provides additional assurance that the full-scale development program, though methodical, will not be excessively drawn out. The attainment of the date for the initial operational capability—IOC—with the B–1 is not the primary driving factor in this program. However, based on present and anticipated funding and an orderly progression of development, defense planners now expect the B–1 to be operational in 1978.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn for a moment to another factor which improves the bomber component of our strategic forces; namely, increasing the effectiveness of manned bombers as an instrument of control in limited conflict. On the basis of my experence, I believe that much of the misunderstanding on this point is caused by one prevalent but erroneous view of aerospace power, particularly military aerospace power, and this view is reinforced by movies and novels on the subject.

It is commonly held that the usefulness of military aerospace power is confined almost solely to preventing or deterring nuclear war. Yet those who hold this view have not apparently digested yet one of the more important points that President Nixon emphasized in his foreign policy report to the Congress:

> The overriding purpose of our strategic posture is political and defensive: to deny other countries the ability to impose their will on the United States and its allies under the weight of strategic military superiority. We must insure that all potential aggressors are unacceptable risks in contemplating a nuclear attack, or nuclear blackmail, or acts which could escalate to strategic nuclear war, such as a Soviet conventional attack on Europe.

To fulfill this broader purpose of our strategic forces, Mr. Chairman; that is, to control limited conflict, we need a capability for selective retaliation against such an attack. Bombers are not the only weapons that could perform this task, but they are clearly the best suited for it. Missiles once launched are committed, and they impose on the opponent a heavy demand for quick reaction. This, in turn, invites uncontrolled escalation. By contrast, bombers can be prepositioned in close proximity to the target or placed on airborne alert, thus providing more time for the opponent to consider his reponse and react in a deliberate, carefully controlled manner.

The factors I have just detailed will assume a much greater importance after Communist China has acquired an ICBM force of significant size. Our strategic forces will then have to be prepared for retaliation against both China and the Soviet. Or then again they might be called upon to retaliate only against China. In this latter case, bombers could be used repeatedly against China and still be a part of the deterrent to the Soviet.

I would also point out that our need for bombers is much more urgent today than it was 5 years ago when we had a wide margin of strategic superiority—with or without bombers—over the Soviet Union and when China did not have a nuclear capability. Today, with a policy of strategic sufficiency, we need forces that incorporate the versatility of

manned bombers. Only with forces such as these can we operate from a position of near parity to achieve the two major objectives that I mentioned earlier; to deter full-scale nuclear conflict, and to deter or control limited conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this short review of the need for the B–1 bomber coupled with my review of its programmatic soundness from a fiscal and a functional point of view will demonstrate to our colleagues that the B–1 is a needed plane and a good buy for the money.

I cannot overstate the importance of continuing the development and testing of this aircraft. From its very inception, it has been the most important corner this Nation has turned since the decision was made to develop the ICBM on a priority basis. And inasmuch as we are still facing the threat of nuclear holocaust and since we still face an implacable enemy in communism, the B–1 program must continue at full speed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 313, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—96

Abzug	Findley	O'Hara
Addabbo	Foley	Owens
Aspin	Ford, William D.	Pike
Badillo	Forsythe	Podell
Barrett	Fraser	Pritchard
Bergland	Frenzel	Rangel
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Rees
Blatnik	Harrington	Reuss
Bolling	Hechler, W. Va.	Riegle
Brademas	Helstoski	Robison, N.Y.
Brasco	Holtzman	Rodino
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Hungate	Ryan
Burlison, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	St Germain
Burton	Jordan	Sarbanes
Carey, N.Y.	Karth	Schroeder
Carney, Ohio	Kastenmeier	Seiberling
Chisholm	Koch	Stark
Clay	Kyros	Stokes
Cohen	Lehman	Studds
Collins, Ill.	Long, Md.	Thompson, N.J.
Conyers	Macdonald	Tiernan
Corman	Mazzoli	Udall
Culver	Metcalfe	Ullman
Dellums	Mezvinsky	Van Deerlin
Diggs	Mink	Vanik
Drinan	Mitchell, Md.	Waldie
Dulski	Moakley	Whalen
Eckhardt	Moorhead, Pa.	Wolff
Edwards, Calif.	Moss	Yates
Eilberg	Nedzi	Young, Ga.
Evans, Colo.	Obey	
Fascell		

NOES—313

Abdnor	Beard	Brown, Mich.
Adams	Bell	Brown, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett	Broyhill, N.C.
Anderson, Ill.	Bevill	Broyhill, Va.
Andrews, N.C.	Biaggi	Buchanan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Biester	Burgener
Annunzio	Boggs	Burke, Calif.
Archer	Boland	Burke, Fla.
Arends	Bowen	Burleson, Tex.
Armstrong	Bray	Butler
Ashbrook	Breaux	Byron
Ashley	Breckinridge	Carter
Bafalis	Brinkley	Casey, Tex.
Baker	Brooks	Cederberg
	Broomfield	Chamberlain
	Brotzman	Chappell
Clancy	Holt	Rinaldo
Clark	Horton	Roberts
Clausen, Don H.	Hosmer	Robinson, Va.
Clawson, Del	Huber	Rogers
Cleveland	Hudnut	Roncalio, Wyo.
Cochran	Hunt	Roncallo, N.Y.
Collier	Hutchinson	Rooney, Pa.
Collins, Tex.	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Conable	Jarman	Roush
Conlan	Johnson, Calif.	Rousselot
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Roy
Cotter	Jones, Ala.	Runnels
Coughlin	Jones, Okla.	Ruppe
Crane	Jones, Tenn.	Ruth
Cronin	Kazen	Sandman
Daniel, Dan	Keating	Sarasin
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Kemp	Satterfield
Daniels, Dominick V.	Ketchum	Saylor
Danielson	King	Scherle
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Schneebeli
Davis, S.C.	Kuykendall	Sebelius
Davis, Wis.	Landrum	Shipley
de la Garza	Latta	Shoup
Delaney	Leggett	Shriver
Dellenback	Lent	Shuster
Denholm	Litton	Sikes
Dennis	Long, La.	Sisk
Dent	Lott	Skubitz
Derwinski	Lujan	Slack
Devine	McCory	Smith, N.Y.
Dickinson	McCloskey	Snyder
Dingell	McCollister	Spence
Donohue	McCormack	Staggers
Dorn	McDade	Stanton, J. William
Downing	McEwen	Stanton, James V.
Duncan	McFall	Steed
du Pont	McKay	Steele
Edwards, Ala.	McKinney	Steelman
Erlenborn	McSpadden	Steiger, Ariz.
Esch	Madden	Steiger, Wis.
Eshleman	Madigan	Stratton
Fish	Mahon	Stubblefield
Flood	Mailliard	Stuckey
Flowers	Mallary	Sullivan
Flynt	Maraziti	Symington
Ford, Gerald R.	Martin, Nebr.	Symms
Fountain	Martin, N.C.	Talcott
Frelinghuysen	Mathias, Calif.	Taylor, Mo.
Frey	Mathis, Ga.	Taylor, N.C.
Froehlich	Matsunaga	Teague, Calif.
Fulton	Mayne	Teague, Tex.
Fuqua	Meeds	Thomson, Wis.
Gaydos	Melcher	Thone
Gettys	Michel	Thornton
Giaimo	Miller	Towell, Nev.
Gibbons	Minish	Treen
Gilman	Minshall, Ohio	Vander Jagt
Ginn	Mitchell, N.Y.	Veysey
Goldwater	Mizell	Vigorito
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Waggonner
Goodling	Montgomery	Walsh
Grasso	Moorhead, Calif.	Wampler
Green, Oreg.	Morgan	Ware
Griffiths	Mosher	White
Gross	Murphy, Ill.	Whitehurst
Grover	Myers	Whitten
Gubser	Natcher	Widnall
Gude	Nelsen	Wiggins
Guyer	Nichols	Williams
Haley	Nix	Wilson, Bob
Hamilton	O'Brien	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Hammer-schmidt	O'Neill	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Hanley	Parris	Wright
Hanrahan	Passman	Wyatt
Hansen, Idaho	Patman	Wydler
Hansen, Wash.	Patten	Wylie
Harsha	Perkins	Wyman
Harvey	Pettis	Yatron
Hastings	Peyser	Young, Alaska
Hays	Poage	Young, Fla.
Hébert	Powell, Ohio	Young, Ill.
Heckler, Mass.	Preyer	Young, S.C.
Heinz	Price, Ill.	Young, Tex.
Henderson	Price, Tex.	Zablocki
Hicks	Quie	Zion
Hillis	Quillen	Zwach
Hinshaw	Railsback	
Hogan	Randall	
Holifield	Rarick	
	Regula	
	Rhodes	

NOT VOTING—24

Alexander	Hawkins	Reid
Blackburn	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Camp	Landgrebe	Rooney, N.Y.
Evins, Tenn.	Milford	Rose
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	Roybal
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Smith, Iowa
Gunter	Pepper	Stephens
Hanna	Pickle	Winn

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to be proposed to title II? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 301. For the fiscal year beginning June 1, 1973, and ending June 30, 1974, each component of the Armed Forces is authorized an end strength for active duty personnel as follows:

(1) The Army, 791,627;

(2) The Navy, 565,912.

(3) The Marine Corps, 196,363;

(4) The Air Force, 665,963;

except that the ceiling for any armed force shall not include members of the Ready Reserve of such armed forces ordered to active duty under the provisions of section 673 of title 10, United States Code, members of the Army National Guard or members of the Air National Guard called into Federal service under section 3500 or 8500, as the case may be, of title 10, United States Code, or members of the militia of any State called into Federal service under chapter 15 of title 10, United States Code, or on active duty for training. Whenever one or more units of the Ready Reserve are ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of this section, the President shall, on the first day of the second fiscal year quarter immediately following the quarter in which the first unit or units are ordered to active duty and on the first day of each succeeding six-month period thereafter, so long as any such unit is retained on active duty, submit a report to the Congress regarding the necessity for such unit or units being ordered to active duty. The President shall include in each such report a statement of the mission of each such unit ordered to active duty, an evaluation of such unit's performance of that mission, where each such unit is deemed deployed at the time of the report, and such other information regarding each such unit as the President deems appropriate.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PIKE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIKE: page 4, line 14, after "training" insert "By the end of fiscal year 1974 none of the above-mentioned active duty forces shall be stationed or based in any nation to aid in the defense of that nation where the nation in question is expending a smaller proportion of its gross national product on its own defense than does the United States or has failed to officially notify the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that henceforth its commitment to its own defense in terms of its own gross national product shall be at least equal to that of the United States for fiscal year 1974 and subsequent years."

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

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address briefly that portion in H.R. 9286 which deals with the F–15A Eagle program.

First, what has been done here? The House Armed Services Committee has reduced the authorization from the requested $918.5 million to $587.6 million—a reduction in the amount of aircraft from 77 to 39. The committee indicated in its report that this decision was based on the fact that there have been some slight problems with the engine and that it has not completed the military qualification test. I do not intend to offer an amendment to restore this cut; however, I would like to offer some observations to my colleagues in the hope that the House will reconsider this decision at some future date.

Since the F–15 program began in January of 1970, program milestones have been consistently achieved on or ahead of schedule with one exception: That of the Pratt & Whitney F–100/F–401 engines which were to pass their qualification tests by February 28 of this year.

The qualification test program for the Pratt & Whitney F–100 engine which will be used in the F–15 is only the second time that any jet engine has been required to demonstrate its performance at altitude—performed in a large wind tunnel—at extreme speeds. In the early tests some slight problems were detected, and subsequently the nonfunctioning components have been redesigned. Since then, the engine has successfully completed a modified 150 hour endurance test and the full specification qualification test is scheduled to be completed in September.

The F–100 engine has performed extremely well in the F–15 flight test program. The F–15 has made 636 flights on 8 aircraft; over 1,300 engine flight-hours have been accumulated with no major failures.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of whether or not to go forward with a weapon. That decision has been made by the Government and supported by the Congress. There is no question that the F–15 will be built or that it should be. The Soviets have developed 13 new fighters in the past 18 years, while we have not developed one since the F–4. Reliability of the F–15 and its systems have been outstanding. Avionic reliability has been particularly noteworthy, and initial program results indicate that it will achieve an avionic reliability level which is almost four times that of the outstanding F–4.

A great deal of the debate on the overall bill concerns economy, and properly so. So we should view any decision affecting the production schedule of the F–15 in the light of its impact on total run-out costs. It is manifest that a slowdown at this time will increase the total cost. Variation in the buildup rate from 12 down to 6 per month will have the short-term effect of reduced spending; however, according to the Defense Department to whose judgment we are inclined to defer when much larger sums are under consideration, the attendant increase in the cost of the 77 aircraft at a later date will be approximately $145 million over the programed buy of 77 aircraft in fiscal year 1974.

We can also consider this issue from another aspect of our economy, that of our balance of payments. While we neither expect nor desire to sell certain super weapons to our friends and allies abroad, there will always be a legitimate market for an air-superior fighter, as witness the export record of the F–4.

The Air Force strongly supports going ahead with the full F–15 program. McDonnell Douglas has lived up to every aspect of its contract. It has stayed within cost, on schedule, and has met the performance goals established by the Air Force. In view of the foregoing factors, the committee's decision would appear to be penny wise. I hope it will be reversed before it becomes pound foolish as will inevitably be the case if the cut stays in the bill.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, we are going to be told, will destroy NATO, or will destroy the defense of Europe, or will destroy the Atlantic Alliance, or something like that, so let me tell the Members what it will do.

This amendment does not require that one single person be pulled out of Europe, but it does require that the European nations are going to pay their fair share of the cost of keeping them there. That is all it says. It says that we Americans are not going to have troops stationed in any nation, not just Europe but in any nation, to aid in the defense of that nation when the taxpayers of that nation are paying a smaller percentage of their gross national product to defend themselves than we pay.

Mr. Chairman, in the past year the value of the dollar as opposed to the German mark has decreased by approximately 33 percent, and Germany is where most of our troops are.

Our gold flow problem is tremendous.

Our balance of payments problem is tremendous.

The dollar is under assault all over the world.

Uncle Sam is holding up the nuclear umbrella, and while he is holding up the nuclear umbrella his economy is deteriorating.

This amendment says that by the end of fiscal year 1974, almost a year from now, these other nations either will have passed a budget saying they are going to spend as much of their gross national product to defend themselves as we do or will have told the Secretary General of the NATO Alliance that they intend to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it does not require that a single troop be pulled out of Europe, but it does require that they pay their fair share.

Now, I do not know what the end result is going to be. I am willing to help them defend themselves if they will bear a fair share of the burden, but I am not willing to help them defend themselves when they think that we should spend 7½ percent of our gross national product for national defense and they can get away with spending 2, 3, or 4 percent because they know that the taxpayers of America will take care of them.

The taxpayers of America have been taking care of them for long enough. Let us allow them to pay their own fair share.

Now, we can look at all the charts about NATO. Sure, that is all true about NATO. But how much help do we get from NATO in Japan or in the Pacific or in Southeast Asia or anywhere else? Not one bloody bit. They are contributing very little for their own defense. They are counting on us to contribute to them for their defense.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple proposition. The Department of Defense always tells us what the gross national product of all these other countries is. I would like the Department of Defense to tell us again whether they are being fair in their contributions in relation to what we are doing. We have not had an American President since Harry Truman who has not asked for the European nations to do more.

We talk about getting a common fund to pay for NATO. It is all very well to talk about it, but NATO will not go for it. As long as we are willing to continue to pick up the tab, they are willing to continue to let us pick up the tab.

All this amendment says is that they shall pay their fair share from now on. If they are not interested in defending themselves, then the American taxpayers should not pay the cost of maintaining these troops in Europe, should not lose all the bases in the United States of America in order to keep bases abroad, and should not contribute to the gold flow the way we are with our troops in Europe.

This does nothing to any alliance whatsoever except to say: "You pay your full share."

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment we are considering is not, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) says, a rather simple amendment. He says that it does not call for withdrawing any troops from NATO.

He has made it sound as though all we have to do is say to our allies, "Here, you are going to have to spend the same amount of your gross national product as we do."

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Members that on the face of it, it is sort of a demogagic amendment because he has made it sound simple, although it is actually not simple. Make no mistake about it this is intended to kill NATO.

I do not know what percentage of our GNP is spent on defense from year to year, whether it is 5 or 6 percent—I think it is probably nearer 7 percent—but the amendment of the gentleman from New York is not only unrealistic, but it will be virtually impossible to work out this kind of a mandate and have to say to a little country like Norway or Denmark, "You are going to have to spend the same percentage as the United States or we say goodby to you."

Now let us talk for just a few minutes about NATO. We are going to have several NATO amendments here this afternoon. There is going to be a lot of discussion about NATO before the night is over. Now we should discuss for awhile the reasons why we should not do anything to dismantle NATO at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I was privileged to chair the NATO Subcommittee for 2 or 3 years back in 1970, 1971, and 1972. As a member of the committee, my good right arm, was the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON). I would like to quote a remark he made—"mature statecraft requires you do not abandon a policy that is working well in order to achieve some other policy you do not know is going to work so well."

With all the frustrations we have—and there is a frustration over NATO, no doubt about it—and for that reason the gentleman from New York has hit upon a point that is very appealing.

In NATO we have had 25 years of success. General Eisenhower before his passing said this should be called "The successful alliance"—think of it 28 years without a war. Look anywhere else around the world and try to find where there has been no aggression or wars except in western Europe.

Let me say to you at this time that Members should consider, when you get ready to vote on this amendment, a few points, to keep in mind.

In the first place, those who would recommend withdrawing of part or all our forces from Europe may do so because they have one aim, which is a reducation of some kind in our unfavorable balance of payments. That kind of worry or frustration is understandable.

Yes, we have a most successful alliance in NATO. The gentleman from New York has served us with an appeal. Now, if we can ever turn the corner and get over the big hurdle of deficit in the balance of payments problem, which unfortunately has been about $1 billion a year, then we would be home free and to use another figure of speech out of the woods.

The truth of the matter is, whether it has been explained to you or not, our allies have provided us with EDIP, or the European Defense Improvement Fund. They have put in $1 billion 2 or 3 years ago and then another $1 billion in 1971. They have put in $5 billion over a period of 5 years. You do not hear about that much.

The second point is if we propose this reduction in forces, how can we avoid this kind of a reduction being a hurt or a detriment to ourselves? Let us think a little about our own welfare. We have had an effective alliance and an international agreement that has worked. Let us not rush into a unilateral reduction of forces, because that is what this amendment would provide for.

It has been said that we can reduce tensions by bringing the troops home, and then we redeploy them quickly. That has been an alluring appeal for a long time; it is a temptation. It is said we can bring them home with our new C–5A's and then have rapid redeployment. I am sure you have heard that appeal before.

But in straight budget terms, talking about dollars only let me tell you there is not only no saving in cost, but on the other hand there is an increase in cost. The reasons for that are quite simple. One is you must have prepositioned equipment in Europe and you must also have the training equipment in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. The gentleman raised the question as to the amount of money we were spending in our NATO operation. We contribute 1.2 percent of our GNP to NATO. The total is $17 billion which is 1.2 percent of $1,365 billion.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman. Let it be known the gentleman from Virginia has been chairing the Manpower Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services. He is a well-informed gentleman and an authority in this field. I am sure he will have quite a lot to add to this debate in a little while.

Not only is rapid redeployment a matter of 3,000 miles, but it is a question of the actual cost of the airlift and sealift. It can be a proven fact, and we have figures available to prove this. I could go back to the committee table and get them. But we have had enough figures this afternoon and some incorrect figures. One thing is certain, the cost would actually be greater for the rapid redeployment than inplace troops.

We have another matter to keep in mind in connection with all of these NATO amendments, and that is to remember what happened up in Helsinki. There was an East-West security conference there. When Donn Mintoff from Malta got through trying to get all of the Africans in it, it was adjourned with nothing accomplished. But in early October this year there will be a sincere effort made to reach a mutual balanced force reduction.

All of us have heard of and should know about what is called the mutual balanced force reduction. That effort will commence in Vienna, in October.

Here is a thought all of us should keep clearly in mind as we hear the vote on the amendment of the gentleman from New York. If we at this time on this floor pass any kind of amendment that amounts to a unilateral reduction, then how can we expect to have any possible success as we confer on MBFR in October in Vienna?

In other words, the Soviets will have what they want before they sit down at the conference table. They may not even show up for the conference.

Today we all hear a lot about détente, and the euphoria that seems to come about because of it, but let me suggest that détente is at present a matter of intention, a matter of announced intention if you please. The capability of the Warsaw Pact is real. It is greater than it has ever been. It has been 5 or 6 years since the death of Mr. Khrushchev, but there has not been even 1 year since his death that the capability of the Soviet Union has not increased. So we should keep in proper perspective such a thing as intention vis-a-vis capability.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) who was a faithful, hard-working member of the Subcommittee on NATO Commitments, which it was my honor to chair.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does not the gentleman from Missouri agree that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would place the forward defenses of the United States in the hands of other countries. By manipulating the percentage of their gross national product which went toward their defense, they could, if they chose, actually eliminate the forward line of defense of the United States and make the decisions for us.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman is correct, and the gentleman has just provided a valuable contribution.

Before we vote on the Pike amendment, let us underscore and reemphasize that we are not talking about chasing some little brown man around in the bush in Southeast Asia; we are talking about our own frontline of defense—our own security, the security of this United States.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the committee.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this observation, and see whether or not the gentleman from Missouri would agree with me.

Under the amendment that is now pending, which has been offered by the gentleman from New York, a member of our committee, is it not possible if we were to adopt this amendment that we could station all of our 300,000 troops in Europe in the country of Portugal where they are using 8.3 percent of their gross national product for defense?

Mr. RANDALL. That is correct. May I tell the gentleman from New Jersey, we could also keep our troops in Greece and in Turkey.

Mr. HUNT. The gentleman is correct. That is why this amendment is ridiculous, and why I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I must frankly say that I have a great deal of sympathy for the amendment.

When the gentleman from New York offered his amendment in committee, I

had considerable difficulty in making up my mind and coming to the conclusion that the amendment should be rejected.

The gentleman from New York is correct in what he says about the arguments against reducing our commitment to NATO. For years those who have been concerned about the deteriorating U.S. financial position and the declining value of the U.S. dollar have urged the reduction of U.S. Forces in Europe and the assumption by other NATO nations of a greater sharing of the burden. The experts have said, "Yes, they are right. There should be a more equitable sharing of the burden, but now is not the time to do it." Thus, we have continued to bear a disproportionate share of the burden and in many respects I think we have weakened our allies, to paraphrase Lincoln, by doing something for them which they should be doing for themselves.

During the past years the President has proposed spending in excess of 100 billion dollars more than what we have collected. The Congress cut about $30 billion in some places but added back about $30 billion in other places. So the Congress authorized the spending of substantially the same amount proposed by the President and such fiscal irresponsibility has been the primary cause of inflation and our very serious dollar problems. The most pressing challenge of this Congress is to find some way to bring expenditures in line with revenues. To date, we have found no permanent solution. True, we did set a spending limit of $267.1 billions in the impoundment bill but such a figure still contemplates a sizable gap between expenditures and revenues.

In view of our very serious budgetary problems, I find it exceedingly difficult to justify spending $16 or $17 billion a year for maintaining our troops and dependents in Europe, when the countries being protected are making only half the effort of the United States in terms of defense spending as a percentage of their gross national product.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that at this time there is only one nation, one NATO nation, that would meet the terms of the amendment of the gentleman from New York, and that is the country of Portugal. I would observe that this amendment is to become effective on June 30, 1974, 11 months from today. It would definitely have the effect of wrecking NATO. It would probably rule out any chances of getting any meaningful balanced force reductions from the Warsaw Pact forces. Those nations that would be willing to increase their defense spending as a percentage of their gross national product could not possibly conform to this amendment in only 11 months. I doubt if they would have the time for their parliamentary bodies to take action. If they did spend the necessary money to conform with the amendment, would it be spent properly?

I would support the amendment of the gentleman from New York, if he provided for an effective date of 1975, because I think our NATO allies should be bearing a greater proportion of the cost of defending those countries. But the amendment as drawn with an effective date only 11 months hence would wreck, completely dismantle, NATO, and I must rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope the members of the committee will reject the amendment overwhelmingly.

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

Mr. Chairman, as one who has been privileged over a number of years to attend NATO conferences, and having heard all of the debate every day, the thing uppermost in the minds of all of those parliamentarians from the United States in attendance was always requesting a plea on our part for the NATO members to do more. Historically, this is exactly what has been happening. They have been accepting and picking up a little bit more of the burden of NATO as the years have progressed. Apparently they have not done as well as some of us would like to see, and perhaps not even what some might determine to be a fair share. But yet the fact remains that progress has been made, and the fact remains that we still today have avoided a war in that part of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to you today about NATO and America's role in the Alliance; why we joined NATO, what it has accomplished, and where we are today.

You will recall the tide of Soviet expansion during the 1940's, when the Soviet Army was kept on a wartime footing numbering more than 4,000,000 men, while the Western Allies demobilized their forces in Europe from 5,000,000 to less than 1,000,000 a year after the end of the war. After the Czech coup of 1948 and on the eve of the Berlin blockade, the U.S. Senate passed by overwhelming vote the Vandenberg resolution.

With that act the Senate outlined a formula for American security that acknowledged the primary lesson of two world wars. Our destiny is as permanently linked to Europe's as our origins and our ideals. This lesson is even more valid now as weaponry has become more destructive, we and Europe have become more economically interdependent, and the globe has shrunk, as it were, in time, distance and natural resources.

The Vandenberg-Connally formula: "Association of the United States, by constitutional process, with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid," has worked in Europe. But, we in America are in peril of being victimized by our success. Some of us are growing impatient with bearing the burden of helping to defend Europe. We are confounded by the paradox of deterrence; that because it has worked in Europe it seems unnecessary. I am reminded of Santayana's observation that "he who ignores history is condemned to repeat it."

Five U.S. Presidents have supported our commitment to NATO because there are only two superpowers in the world. Only the United States can provide the margin of military power that assures stability in Europe.

Since its inception in 1949, NATO has weathered many crises. Berlin, three times; Cuba, to name a few. But the last NATO crisis was the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia. NATO's prime accomplishment is 28 years of peace in Europe.

With the 1970's, we began an era of negotiations. This emerging détente in Europe would not have been possible without the collective will and strength and perseverance of NATO that turned the Soviets away from confrontation toward negotiation. For the first time since the close of World War II, we have the opportunity mutually to reduce the level of confrontation in central Europe, as well as its associated burden on national budgets. But the Soviets would find little advantage to reducing their forces if, in the course of these talks or before they begin, we unilaterally began withdrawing troops from Europe.

Our forces deployed to Europe have not been immutable, nor should they be. They have changed according to changing needs. There was a buildup from one to five U.S. divisions during the Korean war when many felt that a war in Europe was imminent. There was a decline in the late 1950's followed by buildups during the Berlin crises. Since the last Berlin crisis in 1962, we have withdrawn from Europe over 100,000 troops. In Europe today we have 4⅓ Army divisions, 29 Air Force squadrons, and the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. I might add that besides bolstering NATO's southern flank, the 6th Fleet has an important role with regard to the eastern Mediterranean.

In the 1950's we furnished a large share of NATO's troops and weapons until our allies could rearm themselves. Now our allies provide some 90 percent of the ground troops, 80 percent of the ships, and 75 percent of the aircraft committed to NATO in Europe today. The Soviets perceive no inconsistency between détente and military strength. They provide twice the proportion of land and air forces to the vital central region of Europe than we do.

Whether our allies are carrying a fair share of the burden is a complex question which depends as much on one's perception of the stakes involved in European security as on any measure of economic or social costs or military capability. The cost of our forces in Europe and their U.S.-based support is $7.7 billion. In fact, the cost of all our general-purpose forces that are formally committed to NATO, including those stationed in the United States, is some $17 billion. This is less than half the $37 billion our allies are spending on their defense—and ours for that matter—this year. They are spending this amount with a smaller combined GNP than ours.

We do spend a larger proportion, 6 percent, of a much greater gross national product on worldwide defense than our allies. But that sum spent on our commitment to NATO, $17 billion, represents a smaller portion of our wealth, 2 percent, than our allies' 4 percent of their combined GNP's.

The allies have increased their defense budgets by 30 percent in the last

3 years, a substantial raise after inflation.

The European allies plan to put into service more than 600 tanks, 500 combat aircraft, a substantial number of submarines and destroyers, and other sophisticated equipment from this year through 1976. The Defense Department will press them to do even more.

NATO's strategy and forces have been tailored to our perceptions of the changing military balance between the alliances. These NATO adjustments have not always been so rapid as we in the United States would like, but the alliance has been responsive nonetheless. As a state of strategic parity developed between the United States and the Soviet Union in the 1960's it became clear that tripwire ground forces and massive retaliation, as a viable strategy for NATO, was obsolete. After some years of American persuasion, NATO formally adopted the strategy of a flexible range of responses across the entire spectrum of potential violence. With the adoption of the strategy of flexible response, the alliance shifted its emphasis somewhat from nuclear preparedness to conventional defense, raising the ante of any attempt at coercion, incursion or a fait accompli.

In the 1970's we have encouraged our allies further to improve their forces because it is prudent to do so. The arms negotiations underway are quite complex and hence limited in scope. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is continuing to improve both its strategic and general purpose forces.

In Central Europe, the Soviet Union has a slight margin of superiority in numbers of troops, aircraft and tanks. But success in countering the Warsaw Pact across the entire range of risk is within our grasp. The North Atlantic Alliance has a greater population by half and three times the gross produce of the Warsaw Pact countries. What are needed are the wisdom and the willingness to tailor these superior resources so as to field an equivalent conventional capability.

In sum, ladies and gentlemen, the United States took the unprecedented step of joining an alliance in peacetime because it was in America's interest to do so.

NATO has worked and is still working. It has been instrumental in preserving peace in Europe for 28 years. Our troops are in Europe today because a forward defense in concert with our allies is the best posture for the United States.

The size and capability of our forces in Europe are crucial because Soviet strength remains undiminished. The Soviet's behavior has changed, their ambitions may have become more modest, but their military capability has increased over the years and exceeds that required for defense and hegemony in Eastern Europe.

Finally, our forces make a vital material and psychological contribution to the rough conventional balance between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. We must face up to the fact that the alternative to an adequate NATO conventional capability in Europe is an earlier recourse of nuclear weapons, with all the risks that such a policy entails in this era of nuclear parity.

Well, there is another alternative. To forsake our commitment to Europe. But, if we do so, America might well become isolated and life and liberty in this country as we know it—and have sacrificed for it since 1776—would cease to exist.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE). Some 18 months ago, I was in a conference, a trade conference, abroad. I was told by a very, very prominent German diplomat, "You put your house in order; you Americans must put your house in order."

I said, "Yes, and in response we ought to put on to your shoulders a greater part of the cost of defense, a greater part of the NATO defense."

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand today how we can justify keeping 219,000 young men in Germany who are working at military wages that are close to starvation with their depreciated dollars in order to release young Germans to work in factories making automobiles and other things for the American market. It is absolutely, incredibly stupid. Young Germans are working at higher wages in their own factories, while our troops stand-in for them at the NATO line of defense.

Their productive strength is going into foreign commerce, while our resources are going into troops who live at depression wages in a foreign country, in which life has become too expensive to those who use American dollars.

I will tell the Members why we need this force in Europe. I believe it was a part of the deal that was made by Mr. Connally in connection with the Smithsonian accord; in exchange for money agreements it was agreed we would maintain troop levels in Europe.

I will tell the Members why we are involved so extensively. It is because of the multinational investment by American corporations in Western Europe.

Let us put the cards on the table for what they really are. What do we get from the American multinationals by way of tax payments? In the studies before the Ways and Means Committee, it is almost impossible to find a decent tax contribution by the American multinationals which find it so profitable to operate in this theater of the world.

Let us not kid ourselves. Our troops are there because it was a part of a money deal, a part of the continuing money arrangement. They are also there to provide that visible protection for the dollar investment throughout Western Europe. I think it is time we tried to find out what kind of tax remuneration the U.S. Treasury is getting for this kind of investment in troop strength. I say to the Members that it is very, very little.

Tomorrow, I am going to make public a corporate tax report of the 146 largest corporations of America. I want the Members to study it. I want them to read it, because it points out the very, very small contribution by these very large multinational corporations. It also points out the diminishing contribution to the cost of running this country by American corporations.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I want to take this time to thank the Armed Services Committee for its comments which appear on page 68 in the report on this defense procurement bill. In this section of the report, the committee defends the need for our present force levels and support efforts on behalf of NATO. The committee states—in a manner more frankly expressed than I have ever seen before—the fact that much of this military shield and "tripwire" has been placed in Europe for the protection of American multinational corporations and their massive investments.

To quote from the report:

> There are some 4,000 multinational companies operating throughout the world and the great majority of these are Western European and North American. In 1972, the U.S. directed almost a third of all its exports to Western Europe. U.S. corporations and private citizens have over $25 billion in capital investments in Europe on which there is an annual return of nearly 10 percent. The U.S. derives certain other economic benefits from its position in the NATO alliance *including a favorable climate for U.S.-owned corporations in Europe* and favorable attitudes on international monetary issues resulting in European support for the dollar. (Emphasis added)
>
> *Thus, U.S. forces are not stationed in Europe as an act of charity to weak allies.* (Emphasis provided by Committee)

Total U.S. direct investments worldwide have a book value of $90 to $120 billion. Profits thereon are close to $20 billion, or some 20 percent of total profits of U.S. corporations. As the committee states, approximately a quarter of this investment and the profit from it comes from Western Europe.

Who benefits from our force commitment to NATO? What corporations gain from our yearly commitment to NATO of some $17 billion in taxpayer funds?

According to testimony given to the Ways and Means Committee during the recent tax reform hearings this spring, in 1966, 80 percent of taxable income which U.S. corporations received from foreign sources went to 430 corporations with assets of over $250 million, and 90 percent went to U.S. corporations with $100 million or more in assets.

The question then arises: How much of a contribution do these few corporations make in Federal corporate income taxes to help pay for the military protection and "favorable climate" provided by our NATO commitment?

Again, from testimony before the Ways and Means Committee this spring, it was reported that taxes paid to the Federal Treasury on some $20 billion in foreign-derived profits was only about $1 billion—or an effective tax rate of 5 percent. Tomorrow, I am addressing the House on the subject of the effective tax rates paid by our Nation's largest 100 industrial corporations. The listing of these

corporations and their effective Federal corporate tax rates will show that many of these multinationals pay extremely low rates of tax—and in some cases no tax on earnings reported to shareholders.

The way in which these corporations avoid paying the statutory corporate tax rate is through a complex series of provisions in the tax code which provide for deferrals, special deductions, and credits against foreign taxes. These tax subsidies have been defended on the basis that they are needed to keep American companies abroad competitive with foreign companies. Only now are we beginning to see some of the true dimensions of the subsidy costs for these foreign business operations—not only subsidies in the tax code, but military subsidies as well.

Mr. Chairman, it is unconscionable that the taxpayers of America should be maintaining a military garrison abroad for the sake of a limited number of giant corporations. The committee's report is an admission of gunboat-dollar diplomacy of the worse sort.

I support the amendments to reduce the level of our military manpower commitments overseas. I thank the committee for providing this statement which should help all of us in reassessing the role of multinationals and the tax treatment of these giant corporations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was offered in the committee. It is a very enticing amendment; it sounds good, sounds simple. It is also a subtle amendment, and it is a very mischievous amendment, a very damaging one, because what it does is simply to destroy the entire NATO alliance in one blow.

Of all the NATO countries, as has already been indicated, there is only one that has a larger share of its gross national product presently going for overall defense than we do, and that is Portugal. Therefore, if what we want is to destroy NATO this afternoon, this is certainly the way to do it.

This is not to say that everything is good in NATO. There are people who have said, for example, that they think we ought to reduce our forces in NATO, and a case perhaps could be made for some reductions under proper circumstances. There are others who say we ought to restructure our defense pattern in NATO; some of our troops are not in the right place, they say. The Brookings Institution, for example, has suggested that we ought to rotate our troops back and forth from Germany rather than keep them over there all the time along with their families; and that, too, is a point of view that at least deserves some consideration.

There are also those who say we ought to insist that our allies make a greater contribution to the NATO defense pattern. Certainly that is true. We have in fact been insisting on just that. As a result, the Germans this year have upped their contribution.

In fact, a recommendation made by our committee a year ago for the establishment of a common NATO fund to pick up the balance-of-payments deficit we are now facing is a proposal that is being pushed hard by the United States with our NATO allies.

All these are suggestions which have been made with respect to NATO. I believe many of them are sound suggestions and ought to be considered.

But this amendment is a meat-ax amendment. This amendment would mean the end of NATO, this year, now, without any delay, without any consultation with our allies, without any regard for the commitments which have been made, and without even bothering to wait to see whether the Soviets themselves are going to make any corresponding reduction in Europe.

This idea that we are in Europe today to defend the Europeans is something that should have disappeared with the beginning of World War II. Obviously we are not in Europe to defend the Germans or the French or the Dutch or the Belgians. We are in Europe basically and essentially to defend ourselves, because we learned, after the mistakes that led to World War I and to World War II, that if a strong military power ever takes over all of Western Europe, that is a grave threat to our security. So we are in NATO to defend the United States of America, not to defend Germany.

Take a look at Iceland, for example. Under this amendment we could not even keep any military personnel in Iceland, because they devote practically none of their gross national product to defense. Yet if we were to remove the very vital U.S. antisubmarine warfare force that we presently have in Iceland in order to keep an eye on that rapidly growing Soviet submarine fleet as it comes down from the Norwegian Sea, we would be in really serious trouble.

Or, what about the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, which is protecting the Middle East and hopefully is protecting our oil supply lines from the Middle East? What precise country does that protect? Whose gross national product do we have to figure out, to see whether we can keep the 6th Fleet sailing in the Mediterranean?

These are the kinds of thing that have not been even mentioned by those who support this amendment, and show why the amendment is such a destructive one.

Yes, we do spend more of our gross national product on defense than some of the other NATO countries, but we are a much larger country after all and we have a lot more to defend. We are a super power. We have to defend in the East and we also have to defend in the West; and we have to defend in the field of strategic weaponry too.

After all we do not want the Germans to have strategic weapons. We do not want the Japanese to have nuclear weapons either. We have assumed that nuclear umbrella responsibility ourselves, so that there will not be a dangerous nuclear proliferation. Are we going to switch now and say that because these countries do not spend any money on nuclear weapons we are not going to put any of our forces there?

This idea of trying to base our military decision on what somebody's gross national product happens to be is real idiocy. Let us proceed toward peace in an orderly way.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to intrude in a colloquy on an amendment between two of my respected colleagues from the same State, but in terms of what was just said by my colleague, Mr. STRATTON, I scarcely recognize the thrust of the amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. PIKE.

I believe it is an entirely reasonable amendment, a provident amendment, one which will cause our NATO allies to exert more of their own resources in our common defense.

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. PIKE. First I should like to say that anyone who has read the amendment will be aware that it says it pertains to troops stationed in other countries to aid in the defense of those countries. The 6th Fleet thus far is not stationed in any other country.

Mr. Chairman, they are trying to get us to create a base in Greece for them.

As far as our facilities in Iceland are concerned, I will make two points:

First, at the moment the Icelanders are trying very hard to kick us out of Iceland; and second, our troops are not there for the defense of Iceland. I will concede they are there for our own defense, and the amendment would not have any effect on them.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has clarified the amendment, and I understood it was this way.

I want to speak to this particular point. The best way to have good allies in combat is to try to make sure that there are common benefits and that we are fighting on a common front.

I am a predecessor of NATO in a sense. I was in an American infantry unit under a British corps commander in the Canadian Army. It is true that they had a liquor ration and we did not have one, so there are benefits to fighting on a common front.

Let me suggest now that what is happening is that we are living by different parameters than our comrades in arms.

My colleague from New York, Mr. STRATTON, made reference to a Brookings study conducted, I believe, by Dr. Freed, who is formerly a staff counsel to the National Security Council. What he is suggesting is that—

> When you live in Germany, do as the Germans do; when you live in Belgium, do as the Belgians do; but do not have an army overseas under NATO living by American logistics and by American parameters.

Mr. Chairman, the answer is that we are not part of a completely composite

force in NATO. We are attempting to defend Europe by American standards. That is why the imbalance of payments is so aggravating, as the gentleman from Ohio has indicated. We were told by the Belgians and the Germans and we were told by the bankers—

Get your house in order, do not impose your lifestyle over here in such a way that we could not afford to bring our force levels up to your force level, because we could not live by your logistical standards.

Why in the world do we not defend Europe by using a joint base arrangement, in order to provide protection for Germany and our allies in other parts of continental Europe? What reason is there for a separate, expensive, exclusive American base system?

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York in order to discuss why we should not use joint base councils in defending Europe.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the gentleman supports the study he referred to by the Brookings Institute. Well, if he does, if he does wish to change our base set up, that change will take some time. But if the Pike amendment is adopted there will be no time to work out any changes at all. The Pike amendment will simply wash out the NATO structure now, without waiting. It would throw out the baby with the bath.

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Dr. Freed was before the Joint Economic Committee, and as part of this study he said that if we want to force the NATO partners to do more in composite areas with us on joint bases and living in the same style as far as our troops are concerned, we can save a half a billion to a billion and a half dollars over a 3-year period. Here is a half a billion dollars, and that will not weaken NATO; it will strengthen NATO and provide goals to make our participation more effective in the defense of the European nations involved.

It will also teach the non-NATO nation a lesson. That non-NATO nation is France, and French Prime Minister Pompidou has indicated that he is not going to consider our defense of Europe in terms of trade negotiation, because he says that is not related to the franc or to the needs of France, or NATO, in relation to the gross national product of the nations of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, with the adoption of this amendment, all Europe would be involved on a firm basis. I believe the amendment does not destroy NATO; it puts NATO on all fours with the President's doctrine. The President has said that we will help nations who help themselves, and all the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) is saying in his amendment is "Let us all help ourselves in common defense in the same degree as measured by our gross national product."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE).

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

RECORDED VOTE

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 282, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—130

Abzug	Evans, Colo.	O'Hara
Adams	Foley	O'Neill
Addabbo	Ford,	Owens
Anderson,	William D.	Pickle
Calif.	Gaydos	Pike
Andrews, N.C.	Giaimo	Podell
Ashbrook	Grasso	Rangel
Ashley	Green, Pa.	Rarick
Aspin	Grover	Rees
Badillo	Hanley	Riegle
Barrett	Harrington	Rodino
Bergland	Hastings	Rogers
Biaggi	Hawkins	Roncalio, Wyo.
Boland	Hechler, W. Va.	Roncallo, N.Y.
Bolling	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Brademas	Helstoski	Roush
Brasco	Hicks	Roy
Brown, Calif.	Holtzman	Roybal
Brown, Mich.	Howard	Ryan
Burke, Calif.	Hungate	St Germain
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Colo.	Sarbanes
Burlison, Mo.	Kastenmeier	Saylor
Byron	Koch	Schroeder
Carey, N.Y.	Kyros	Skubitz
Carney, Ohio	Latta	Snyder
Carter	Leggett	Stanton,
Chisholm	Lehman	James V.
Clay	Lent	Stark
Cleveland	Litton	Steele
Collier	Long, Md.	Stokes
Collins, Ill.	McCloskey	Studds
Conte	Macdonald	Sullivan
Conyers	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Corman	Mazzoli	Tiernan
Cronin	Melcher	Udall
Daniels,	Metcalfe	Van Deerlin
Dominick V.	Mezvinsky	Vanik
Danielson	Miller	Vigorito
Dellums	Minish	Waldie
Dent	Mink	Wolff
Diggs	Mitchell, Md.	Yates
Donohue	Moakley	Yatron
Drinan	Moorhead, Pa.	Young, Ga.
Edwards, Calif.	Moss	Zwach
Eilberg	Nix	

NOES—282

Abdnor	Clausen,	Flowers
Anderson, Ill.	Don H.	Flynt
Andrews,	Clawson, Del	Ford, Gerald R.
N. Dak.	Cochran	Forsythe
Annunzio	Cohen	Fountain
Archer	Collins, Tex.	Fraser
Arends	Conable	Frelinghuysen
Armstrong	Conlan	Frenzel
Bafalis	Cotter	Frey
Baker	Coughlin	Froehlich
Beard	Crane	Fulton
Bell	Culver	Fuqua
Bennett	Daniel, Dan	Gettys
Bevill	Daniel, Robert	Gibbons
Biester	W., Jr.	Gilman
Bingham	Davis, Ga.	Ginn
Blatnik	Davis, S.C.	Goldwater
Boggs	Davis, Wis.	Gonzalez
Bowen	de la Garza	Goodling
Bray	Delaney	Green, Oreg.
Breaux	Dellenback	Griffiths
Breckinridge	Denholm	Gross
Brinkley	Dennis	Gubser
Brooks	Derwinski	Gude
Broomfield	Devine	Guyer
Brotzman	Dickinson	Haley
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Hamilton
Broyhill, N.C.	Dorn	Hammer-
Broyhill, Va.	Downing	schmidt
Buchanan	Dulski	Hanrahan
Burgener	Duncan	Hansen, Idaho
Burke, Fla.	du Pont	Hansen, Wash.
Burleson, Tex.	Eckhardt	Harsha
Burton	Edwards, Ala.	Harvey
Butler	Erlenborn	Hays
Casey, Tex.	Esch	Hébert
Cederberg	Eshleman	Heinz
Chamberlain	Fascell	Henderson
Chappell	Findley	Hillis
Clancy	Fish	Hinshaw
Clark	Flood	Hogan
Holifield	Moorhead,	Smith, N.Y.
Holt	Calif.	Spence
Horton	Morgan	Staggers
Hosmer	Mosher	Stanton,
Huber	Murphy, Ill.	J. William
Hudnut	Myers	Steed
Hunt	Natcher	Steelman
Hutchinson	Nedzi	Steiger, Ariz.
Ichord	Nelsen	Steiger, Wis.
Jarman	Nichols	Stratton
Johnson, Calif.	Obey	Stubblefield
Johnson, Pa.	O'Brien	Stuckey
Jones, Ala.	Parris	Symington
Jones, Okla.	Passman	Symms
Jones, Tenn.	Patman	Talcott
Jordan	Patten	Taylor, Mo.
Karth	Perkins	Taylor, N.C.
Kazen	Pettis	Teague, Calif.
Keating	Peyser	Teague, Tex.
Kemp	Poage	Thomson, Wis.
Ketchum	Powell, Ohio	Thone
King	Preyer	Thornton
Kluczynski	Price, Ill.	Towell, Nev.
Kuykendall	Price, Tex.	Treen
Landrum	Pritchard	Ullman
Long, La.	Quie	Vander Jagt
Lott	Quillen	Veysey
Lujan	Railsback	Waggonner
McClory	Randall	Walsh
McCollister	Regula	Wampler
McCormack	Reuss	Ware
McDade	Rhodes	Whalen
McEwen	Rinaldo	White
McFall	Roberts	Whitehurst
McKay	Robinson, Va.	Whitten
McKinney	Robison, N.Y.	Widnall
McSpadden	Rooney, Pa.	Wiggins
Madigan	Rostenkowski	Williams
Mahon	Rousselot	Wilson, Bob
Mailliard	Runnels	Wilson,
Mallary	Ruppe	Charles H.,
Mann	Ruth	Calif.
Maraziti	Sandman	Wilson,
Martin, Nebr.	Sarasin	Charles, Tex.
Martin, N.C.	Satterfield	Wright
Mathias, Calif.	Scherle	Wyatt
Mathis, Ga.	Schneebeli	Wydler
Matsunaga	Sebelius	Wylie
Mayne	Seiberling	Wyman
Meeds	Shipley	Young, Alaska
Michel	Shoup	Young, Fla.
Minshall, Ohio	Shriver	Young, Ill.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Shuster	Young, S.C.
Mizell	Sikes	Young, Tex.
Mollohan	Sisk	Zablocki
Montgomery	Slack	Zion

NOT VOTING—21

Alexander	Hanna	Reid
Blackburn	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Camp	Landgrebe	Rooney, N.Y.
Evins, Tenn.	Milford	Rose
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Iowa
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Stephens
Gunter	Pepper	Winn

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS:

On page 4: Line 1, strike "791, 627" and insert in lieu thereof "681, 306"; line 2, strike "656,912" and insert in lieu thereof "493,820"; line 3, strike "196,363" and insert in lieu thereof "176,219"; line 4, strike "665,963" and insert in lieu thereof "556,357".

On page 5: After line 2, add the following proviso: ": *Provided*, That no funds appropriated by Congress may be used after June 30, 1974 for the purpose of maintaining more than 300,000 military personnel assigned or homeported at overseas bases; or afloat on a regular basis in the Western Pacific or Mediterranean."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, today I propose an amendment on one of the most important areas of choice—namely, our overseas military manpower levels.

We have over 600,000 men and women stationed abroad or afloat all over the world. After careful and detailed study of this question, it is my deep conviction that the size of this presence is bad for this country and bad for the world—and that it is up to Congress to do something about it.

My amendment is in two parts. The first part specifies end-strength manpower levels that would reduce present levels by 322,000. I have based the specific amounts for each service on study of the Pentagon responses to the detailed questions I have put to them on the rationale for the various missions we have abroad. I shall discuss these questions in a minute. The cuts for each service are:

Army	110,321
Navy	72,092
Marines	20,144
Air Force	109,606

The second part of the amendment establishes a 300,000 person limit to the amount of troops stationed overseas. This will insure that the cuts will be taken overseas. The exact location of the cuts is left to the discretion of responsible authorities in the Pentagon.

In my efforts to have the committee conduct a systematic review of this issue, I asked the Pentagon specific questions about each one of our military missions abroad.

I asked, for example, why—given the evident capacity of the South Koreans to take care of themselves—we have such a high level of troops there? What justification exist for top-heavy command structures in southern Europe? What about the small deployments we maintain in so many countries—Iran, Australia, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Morrocco, and the numerous Military Assistance Advisory Groups—MAAG's?

And so on and so on, down the list for every country—and there are more than most Members are aware of—in which we have stationed military personnel. DOD's inadequate response to my original questions can be found beginning on page 23130 of the RECORD for July 10, 1973. These answers are extremely general and vague. They refer to threat perceptions that tell us nothing; nor could the answers justify any level of troops. The answers make complicated foreign-policy assumptions as if there was the same assurance as on technical military matters. The answers rely on the Pentagon rhetoric developed under vastly different international situations 10 or 15 years ago. In a word, these answers confirm my suspicion that the real reason for most of our commitments is historical accident and bureaucratic inertia—not any on-going realities of 1973.

One purpose of my amendment is to reassert congressional control over our overseas military presence. For years, Congress has approved these manpower levels without seriously questioning basic rationale for these levels.

Yet we must be aware that manpower levels requested by DOD were not arrived at by constitutional processes of congressional control; in fact they represent an abdication of our control—not only to the Executive, but to foreign countries.

The key point here is that there are no specific treaty obligations that force Congress to approve any level of troop commitment. Exact figures for each country are the result of Executive agreements, and are not submitted to Congress for approval. Furthermore, such figures are the result of political foreign-policy calculations—and are not based on military matters to which we may legitimately defer to military experts.

This last point is crucial. There is only one question the Pentagon is professionally equipped to answer with assurance: Whether a force level in a certain country is necessary or sufficient to repel the threat that is responsible for its presence overseas. Yet in almost no case is the Pentagon able to give us this assurance.

Either our forces are unnecessary or they are not sufficient. Let me give an example of each. The South Koreans have one of the most battled-hardened armies in the world. It has well over 600,000 people under arms, and many of these have had combat experience in Vietnam, where we all know of their reputation. The North Koreans have an army of less than half a million men who have done nothing beyond border sniping since 1953. We assume the South Koreans will have the advantage of a defensive posture.

In other words, if any nation is relatively secure, it is South Korea. Yet we have top-heavy military establishment there of 38,000 troops which add a mere 7,000 fighting men in the combat division that we station there to provide ground combat support to the South Korean forces—although we must pay for all 38,000 men, when we count support and command troops. If the Nixon doctrine can be applied anywhere, it is in Korea. Given any sense of logic, there is no justification for the presence of these men, and we should bring them home.

The major part of our overseas presence is in Europe. One reason I have decided on the 300,000 level is my conviction that our European commitment is overextended and inefficient. This commitment is founded on unrealistic assumptions and built more around wishful thinking than a desire for a "lean, mean" efficient force that will do the job with less sacrifice from American taxpayers and less interference in Western Europe.

What is the situation in Central Europe? No military analyst seriously claims that U.S. troops stationed there could repel any large-scale Soviet conventional attack. In this connection, I would like to quote General Lemnitzer—Commander of SHAPE—who said before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1970:

> One of the greatest problems that would confront NATO today would be a large conventional attack. Then we would be faced with a decision to use nuclear weapons or be defeated.

This is an astonishing admission.

What about other troops in Europe, in SETAF—the southern European Task Force—and elsewhere? They are there on an assumption of a conventional war continuing past the 2 or 3 months that both the Warsaw Pact and the European NATO countries base their planning upon. Any possible conflict will be completely decided by that point, since neither side has the reserves to do any more fighting. These so-called support troops are no threat to the Soviets or anyone else, and a reduction in this area would have little or no effect on the military realities underlying the MBFR talks.

This is the military situation. of course, and reduction on our part should be done in closest consultation with our NATO allies—closer consultation than our recent action concerning Europe have displayed. But unless we face up to military realities, our discussion of political problems will be meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, the question of troop cuts is a serious and complicated one to which Congress has given too little attention in the past. I believe that when the dimensions of the situation are correctly grasped, the need for significant reductions becomes strikingly clear. We must begin the process of rationalization and adjustment; my amendment is a first step in that process.

Where interested laymen must decide issues on which experts disagree, our main weapon is the ability to ask the correct questions.

There is a growing consensus that we should have some cuts in military manpower, as we see from the actions of the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress. It is now realized that cuts are both desirable and possible. The question is now: How much? The main determinant of the size of the cut is Europe—both because of the size of our commitment there and because only there is it seriously claimed that the troops are military necessary and sufficient to meet perceived threats. I will therefore concentrate on European problems—especially since political claims of the Defense Establishment are seen here in their purest form.

I think we have to ask, first of all, what does the present NATO commitment give us militarily in the way of a "flexible response"—that is, effective so-called "conventional" defense to be used as a diplomatic breathing space before nuclear escalation? In other words, how long can we confine damage to Europe?

It is clear that 90 days is the outside limit, after which the conventional fighting will be over in Europe: Neither the Warsaw Pact armies, which are built for attack, nor the European NATO countries have plans or reserves beyond 90 days. Therefore, the great support capacity we have built up for beyond that 90-day period is useless unless we intend to liberate Europe by strictly nonstrategic means, which contradicts our nuclear guarantee. This support capacity can therefore be cut without damage.

Meanwhile, our deployment for fighting within the 90-day period is extremely inefficient—first, the troops are stationed in wrong places; second, we have much smaller percentage of combat-skill troops than we will need for a short, sharp defense; third, we have a lot of civilian dependents that will slow down troop movements and restrict our responses—

these are but a few problems. It is clear that reorganization could take place that would give us a more efficient fighting force and still allow manpower reductions.

I believe that when we understand the purpose of our conventional NATO forces—which must be effective enough to discourage and slow down an invasion but very definitely not effective enough to allow us to fight a successful, long drawn-out conventional war that would devastate Europe and make a mockery of our nuclear guarantee—when we understand this purpose, it is very difficult to maintain that cuts cannot be accommodated militarily.

That leaves us with political factors as the determinants for our troops in Europe. It depends on the spokesman and the audience whether the military argument is still maintained or whether it is conceded and then asserted that the reasons against unilateral reductions are mostly political.

The administration finds it convenient to defend its position from both sides. For example, we are told that the mutual force reduction talks mandate a long delay in unilateral troop cuts. But the reason for this is sometimes that the talks will bring about substantial cuts, and sometimes just the opposite—namely, that the natural logistic advantages of the Soviets mean that we can only give up very little without substantial concessions from their side.

I think there are a couple of things we should understand about the MBFR talks. First, our negotiators are working with what they believe is a gun at their back. They are so afraid that Congress will become impatient and take matters into their own hands that they are willing to make very real concessions to get quick results, as shown by the dropping of the principle of "balance" in what should now be called the mutual force reduction talks. This bargaining disadvantage can only be overcome if before the talks begin we remove some of the indefensible fat from the NATO structure and give our negotiators a less vulnerable position and breathing space from political pressure.

Second, the Soviets have substantial, practical, economic, and political reasons to reduce their troop levels. They would rather use these resources in their faltering economy or protecting themselves from China.

It is these concrete reasons that have caused them to enter into the talks, and these reasons will not disappear if we make unilateral cuts—especially cuts that do not give the Soviets any real military advantage. Therefore the claim so often heard that they will lose all interest in troop reduction negotiations if they see us make any sort of cut does not seem plausible. They will still want to make cuts, and they will still want to do it in the context of negotiations.

If we understand these diplomatic realities—realities presented to me during administration briefings—we need not be pressured by stories of diplomatic doom and disaster if we do not tie our hands in advance.

For these reasons, I do not find the taboo on European cuts persuasive. We can and should make cuts there. It would be an action that would prove a more sincere will to ease the burden on the taxpayer than starving a hundred domestic programs. It would rationalize our military posture in a vastly changed world. Mr. Chairman, I urge as strongly as I know how the adoption of this amendment to provide a meaningful, significant reduction in overseas power levels.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to make a few off-the-cuff remarks.

The major argument in opposition to this amendment and the amendments that have gone before this amendment and that will come after is that we must protect the integrity of this budget, because it is calculated to defend human life, primarily American human life.

The fundamental contradiction in that argument is that we have not understood clearly that the same people we attempt to defend in this budget, millions of American people, are at this moment dying. They are dying from hunger and disease and inadequate education, crippling disease, drugs, crime, pollution, broken dreams, lost confidences, and lost hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this is the reality. Many people are dying in this country because we have not come to grips with the serious human problems we must come to grips with. It is one thing for us to mobilize against fear, but I would suggest to the Members that it is insanity to mobilize against reality, and the reality is that our people desperately need help.

It seems to me that if you and I are assuming our major responsibilities, then we must strike some balance between the amount of funds we spend for defense and desperately needed funds we must spend in the domestic area to save the same lives we seek to save with more weapons systems and more men and more material throughout the world. If we do that, then this 93d Congress can do down in history as a Congress that truely attempted to defend what this country stands for, the democracy, the freedom, the humanity, and the justice.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is only one step in that direction. Let us strip some of the fat from this budget, and let us say to the American people that we are willing to take the risk and protect the freedoms this country stands for. To do less would be to lack the faith in the very Constitution and the very principles we came to Congress to protect.

Finally, if you and I must risk death, then let us risk that death trying to save human life in our country. It would be a fitting epitaph to people who believe in freedom and justice and in the democratic way of life.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the result of this amendment would be to destroy NATO.

Too often Americans concentrate on the advantages that the Atlantic Alliance has brought Europe, and skim over or ignore the benefits that Americans have derived as well.

U.S. self-interest demands that Americans regard their own security as inextricably intertwined with the security of Western Europe.

The alliance has helped to prevent general war, a war that would just as surely threaten the territory of the United States as the territory of Europe. The alliance has maintained a stable balance of power that has enabled East-West détente to go forward. The alliance has kept within the Western orbit the economic and technological resources of the nations of Western Europe, which have played a crucial role in America's economic prosperity.

In 1966, NATO formally adopted a strategy of "flexible response" in the belief that nuclear capabilities, while ultimately the overriding deterrent, should not be the first available response to military challenge.

There are many in the United States who would argue that the fact of a net foreign exchange deficit of more than a billion dollars is sufficient to dictate a U.S. force reduction. I disagree with that view.

I believe that the force structure necessary to maintain our commitments to European security must be provided first: But then we must find ways to ease the foreign exchange burden of that commitment.

Mr. Chairman, if these words sound familiar it is not surprising. They are taken from an address by Senator TED KENNEDY to the North Atlantic Assembly on May 19, 1973.

Regarding withdrawal of troops from Europe, there is certainly nothing which legally binds us to remain there. We can cut and run any time we see fit to do so.

The question is, do we really want to do this? Do we want to take the risks involved? Are we willing to gamble with the lives of the people of the United States and our European allies? For this is what we will be doing if we abandon our treaty partners.

Following World War I, our Nation felt it had no mutual interests with Europe. We would not join the League of Nations, we turned our backs on the world, withdrew to our own shores, and embarked on an era of concentration on strictly domestic issues.

For this we got an Adolf Hitler who could indulge his sick hatred of the non-Aryan, secure in the knowledge we would not intervene.

Likewise in the Orient, the Japanese embarked on military adventures on the Asian mainland, convinced we would not involve ourselves. The Germans and Japanese, vengeful and land-hungry, ultimately brought down on the globe World War II. We paid a terrible price for our isolation.

When that war was over, and Russia hungrily eyed the city of Berlin, only the determination of the Allies—and most notably, the determination of one man, President Harry S. Truman—stood between the Red Army and that island of freedom in East Germany.

Again at the beginning of the 1950's, after our Secretary of State Acheson had declared a policy of noninvolvement in that area, the Army of North Korea, aided and abetted by the fledging Com-

munist Government of Red China, swept down on its southern neighbor.

Right now, we observe the futility and frustration which accompany the attempt at bargaining without chips, as Mr. Kissinger attempts to persuade the North Vietnamese to comply with the provisions of the Paris agreement.

If the experience of the past quarter-century fails to impress, consider a present situation. Few will argue that NATO has played a major role in development of an economic community which, dependent on mutuality of interests, will go far in promoting a continuing peace.

On the continent of Africa, with no machinery for cooperation, no sense of common interest, no spirit of community—and no element of protection by any of the advanced nations of the world—nations have fallen prey to those who would promote the interests of Russia and of Red China. Internal upheavals are a constant, confusion reigns in virtually every country, plot and counterplot, coup and counter-coup, fill the pages of the world's newspapers, and development of this region which has so much to offer the rest of the world withers away, victim of the struggle to control by the Communist giants.

While I of course believe we must constantly review and reassess our treaty commitments around the world, we would be naive in extreme to believe the Warsaw Pact nations are not following our debates and our actions, and making their own interpretations of our assessments. Any further unilateral move toward isolationism would surely be interpreted as a retreat from the moral commitments we have made and which have preserved a measure of peace in Europe for more than a generation.

We no longer seek to be the world's policemen—nor do we want to be. But we cannot afford to walk away from our commitment to the peace of the world. For if we turn our backs, and walk away, wars will surely follow us home.

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

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his excellent statement.

I am very much opposed to the amendment under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has worked persistently for a reduction of our forces around the world, I agree with the principle embodied in this amendment. But I seriously disagree with its methods and timing.

Reducing our overseas forces is a fine goal. For the past several years I have sponsored bills to begin gradual troop withdrawals in Europe and have called for similar phased reductions of our forces in other parts of the world.

This should be accomplished at the negotiating table with the full participation and cooperation of our allies and not with a meat ax as this amendment proposes.

Under the Nixon doctrine, I am pleased that we have made progress in reducing our troop commitments around the world. In the past several years, we have taken a half-million men out of southeast Asia, reduced our forces in Korea by one-third and brought home troops from Japan, Okinawa and many other parts of the world.

We are just now beginning to make progress in mutual force reductions in Europe.

Thirty years ago, U.S. troops made a vital contribution to the security of Europe and the world. They served as a major deterrent to Soviet aggression in Europe throughout the years of the cold war.

Now that Western Europe has emerged as a vigorous and economically sound partner in the free world, there is no reason why it should not shoulder an increasingly greater share of its defense costs and it is doing so.

Germany, the country in which two-thirds of our troops are located, has just recently signed a $2 billion total offset agreement to help us relieve the burden of maintaining our forces there.

At the same time, we have served notice that we want to begin withdrawing some of the 307,000 troops we have stationed in Western Europe provided the Warsaw Pact nations will do likewise.

As one who has long-advocated such troop cuts, I am pleased that the administration will begin negotiations with the Soviets this October on mutual and balanced troop withdrawals in Europe.

If we succeed in these talks, we will win not only a reduction in U.S. forces in Europe, but Soviet troops as well; plus a Europe defended by Europeans and a healthier U.S. economy.

This amendment proposes to hand the Soviets on a silver platter what they have just agreed to bargain for over the negotiating table.

Its timing could not possibly be worse.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that our 30-year investment in Western Europe can be made to pay valuable dividends this fall if the Congress does not cut the legs out from under our negotiators by ordering a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. forces. I intend to oppose this amendment for all these reasons. If these talks fail to produce meaningful and mutual troop pullbacks, I assure you that I will be among the first to call for congressionally mandated cuts.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

One further comment.

The gentleman from California referred to the positioning of our troops in Europe. Of course, the gentleman knows we have an integrated force there. We have our forces along a historical invasion route in the center and the south, the British have theirs where the gentleman from California thinks ours ought to be, which faces the northern plain. That area is defended at this time by the British, who have done pretty well in tank warfare.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in opposition to this amendment, I am concerned, as many Members are, about the cost of our NATO commitment, but I am also convinced that security interests of the highest importance to the United States, demand that we reject this simplistic proposal for unilateral reductions in our force levels. Even the Baltimore Sun on Sunday surprise me very much with the lead editorial, which reads as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 29, 1973]

NO TIME FOR TROOP CUTBACKS

With no little reluctance, this newspaper has come to the conclusion that this is not the time for immediate unilateral troop withdrawals from Europe. Our judgment does not rest on the litany heard from four successive administrations over a period of two decades. We do not believe the early pullback of one or even two of our four divisions would encourage belligerent actions on the part of the Soviet Union; Kremlin leaders have bigger fish to fry with Washington. We do not believe NATO would start to unravel or Western Europe, so prosperous and confident, would become prone to "Finlandization," as government spokesmen contend.

No, we do not believe any of that. (What we do believe is that unilateral cutbacks now would harm the broad yet particular national interests of the United States at a pivotal stage of detente diplomacy.) Last month foreign ministers of 34 nations met at Helsinki for the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe—an enterprise Soviet propagandists had promoted for years. The rather blatant purpose of this conference was to give an aura of legitimacy to Soviet hegemony over the peoples of Eastern Europe. Its collateral thrust was to emphasize the "European idea" at the obvious expense of the United States and Canada. The United States agreed to go to Helsinki in the hope that loud demands for more freedom to travel and exchange ideas plus emphasis on the integrity of small nations like Romania might nullify the Soviet advantage. But more important, we showed up in Helsinki on the understanding—since confirmed—that the Russians would agree to open negotiations on mutual troop reductions in Vienna beginning October 30.

These troop-reduction talks, the first in postwar history, are normally considered in their East-West context since the ostensible end-goal is some sort of thinning down of the massive forces along the Iron Curtain. This is at it should be. But it is most important that we also consider the troop-cut discussions in terms of our over-all relations with the nations of Western Europe. Any immediate U.S. withdrawals would complicate the already difficult quest at NATO headquarters in Brussels for a common Western negotiating position at the Vienna talks. Our allies, let it be remembered, are as wary of Vienna as we were of Helsinki since the prospect of any U.S. withdrawals, in any context, troubles them. If we should go to Vienna in a weakened negotiating position, this would limit our bargaining room at later Helsinki meetings and compromise the Nixon-Kissinger efforts to put our economic and political as well as military relations with Western Europe in better harmony.

These are big-stakes issues because our real national interests are on the line in Europe as they never were in the misguided Indochina adventure. These issues far transcend any economies that would be achieved by bringing home substantial numbers of troops and dependents now in Europe. They override the need to curb the Executive fronts. We understand and indeed share the impatience of legislators who have long believed our large military presence in Europe is wasteful and anachronistic. This impatience may force some token withdrawals this year as part of the over-all reductions

sought by the Senate Armed Services Committee. (But we must urge Congress to resist pressure for a significant pullout from Europe at a moment when our relations with our NATO allies are at a sensitive juncture.) Let us reconsider a unilateral approach again next year after we have had a chance to see if Vienna negotiators can make real progress on mutual cutbacks.

Especially now at a time when the success of our NATO alliance and the very presence of these forces are in large measure responsible for the agreement by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact to talks on the mutual balanced reduction of forces. I think we have a chance to bring about this now.

We know that the budget cost of our forces deployed in the European area is not our most serious problem. If we brought them home, we would still have this sizable problem. To maintain airlift and sealift capability from this country would be more expensive.

But it is our military balance of payments in NATO Europe that is a serious concern.

William J. Casey, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, said on July 12 that in fiscal year 1972 this deficit for NATO Europe comprised about one-sixth of the overall worldwide basic balance-of-payments deficit. The balance deteriorated from a surplus of $1 billion in 1970 to a deficit of about $2.7 billion in 1972. But he said, due to the changing monetary picture that trend has turned around. Of course, we have got to hold down inflation in this country.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) last year chaired the subcommittee in evaluating our commitment to NATO. That subcommittee pinpointed where the burden sharing is unequal and how it can be adjusted without weakening NATO militarily. The executive branch has now proposed the solution recommended by this subcommittee to the NATO Ministerial Council. On June 7, at the meeting of the Defense Planning Committee, Defense Secretary Schlesinger asked the ministers to work on the development of a multilateral program to compensate the United States for the additional burden it assumes by stationing its troops in Europe. They agreed, and we expect that a formal report on that will be made in December.

Mr. RANDALL'S subcommittee recommended the establishment of a NATO common fund, and General Goodpaster said he felt this common fund would solve our deficit. Contributions into the fund would come from countries which experience a balance-of-payments windfall from troops stationed in their country and also from those who receive protection from those troops.

In our simplistic approach, we often overlook the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany has since the early 1960's faithfully negotiated and renegotiated bilateral offset agreements with the United States to eliminate our military deficit in our balance of payments.

We and our NATO allies have been able to build a dynamic and prosperous world economy from the shambles of war because we worked together, not only to rebuild the world economy, but also because we worked together to provide our own common security.

Deputy Secretary Rush testified early in July that the approach to eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit should not be to forego programs which are essential to our security.

To this end, as a matter of legislative history, I would say that this body should make it known that we support the recommendations for a NATO common fund and for further offset agreements with our allies, and indicate our belief that such action is absolutely necessary if we continue the level of U.S. deployment of troops in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the four points that I have tried to make here are:

First. Because the deficit in our balance of payments caused by military costs in Europe is a small part of the total;

Second. Because we have turned that around;

Third. Because we are working diligently with our NATO allies to improve the balance of payments and the budgetary help they are already providing; and

Fourth. Because there will be an inevitable and disadvantageous spillover into our economic relations with our major trading partners if we ignore their deep security concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this body to reject proposals for unilateral reductions of our European troop deployment.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the question is frequently asked: "Why does the United States have over 300,000 troops in Europe 28 years after World War II ended there?"

Well, they certainly are not there to refight the battles of World War II. They are there, because our military commitments stipulate the amount of U.S. support to the NATO structure, and today this requires about 300,000 troops.

Will we always need 300,000 Americans stationed on European soil? Now that is a reasonable question that honorable men with differences of opinion can argue in good faith—and not emotionally.

The Western alliance has provided over 20 years of successful deterrence. The alliance, the Marshall plan, military assistance—and the U.S. nuclear umbrella—have permitted our allies essentially unbridled recovery and economic growth. As an undesirable—perhaps unanticipated—consequence of this phenomenal growth, the United States has become a debtor nation to Europe in the 1970's instead of enjoying the favorable creditor position that prevailed in the 1950's and 1960's. It now requires the addition of about $1.5 billion annually to our unfavorable balance of payments to keep our troops in Europe. This should be reduced. Secretary of Defense Schlesinger said recently that America's allies must face up to the need to help the United States address the balance-of-payments problem.

But supposing they do not face up to the balance-of-payments problem right now—should we jeopardize all of the resources we have invested in the cause of peace by a precipitous and probably ill-conceived action? I think not.

As a result of rapid growth over the past 10 or 12 years, the Soviet strategic nuclear forces have reached essential parity with those of the United States. The May 1972 SALT agreements recognized this fact of life. But does such recognition somehow indicate that the United States should completely unbalance the badly balanced situation involving NATO and Warsaw Pact tactical forces?

Our distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. STRATTON) did us a great service when he published an updated version of the famous Randall report on America's military commitment to NATO, in the July 19, 1973, issue of the RECORD. The tables on force comparisons, page 25000, are very revealing. NATO conventional forces are significantly below Warsaw Pact strength in every category—tanks, mechanized infantry, artillery, aircraft. It does not make sense, to me, for the United States to unilaterally increase this imbalance by withdrawing forces without comparable reductions being made by the pact forces.

I am aware of the "reduction in force" arguments based upon détente, good trade relations, good will, the proposed balanced force reduction studies now under consideration and so forth. However, I strongly favor waiting for the outcome of SALT II, the force reduction studies, the European security conference, and others, before recommending any troop withdrawals from Europe.

Unilateral U.S. force reductions which appear based on bilateral United States-U.S.S.R. understanding will quickly and seriously erode for our allies the credibility of the U.S. commitment to NATO, particularly as Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces continue to increase in numbers of weapons.

I do not believe in token force reductions. A token force reduction is like a breach in a dike. One small crack can destroy the entire edifice—a small political concession can destroy the treaty.

I repeat—let us await the outcome of some of these important conferences on SALT, MBFR, the European Security Conference, even the disarmament meetings and U.N. deliberations before we take any action which will have significant long-range consequences.

I would hope that this House is not panicked into a situation where its reaction is comparable to throwing the baby out with the bath water. We have been through too much and invested too much national resources to jeopardize it all now with a move which most certainly would be false economy.

This is certainly not the time to institute changes just for the sake of doing something different.

We and our allies must continue to meet our commitments to the Western alliance until it is absolutely certain that reduced efforts provide no windfall to the Warsaw Pact.

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr.

Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California's amendment to the procurement bill would reduce U.S. military presence abroad by 50%. It is imperative to note that the rationale set forth to support the amendment—as exemplified by the statement that this would be a "step which would not decrease, but increase national security"—is clearly unsound. Reductions as called for in the proposed amendment obviously would jeopardize our national security in a number of critical ways. In this regard, it is important to understand exactly what contributions our overseas forces make to our security posture.

The President has stated on numerous occasions that the three basic principles of U.S. foreign policy for building a lasting peace are "partnership, strength, and willingness to negotiate." The role of our military forces in bringing this present era of negotiation to fruition in a stable peace is crucial. Yet the question is continually asked: "Why do we need so many troops abroad, 25 years after World War II?"—when the seldom asked, but correct and pertinent question is: "How large must our overseas presence be in order to make our proper contribution to the deterrence of World War III?" This latter question is the important question—the question which accurately highlights that the purpose of our overseas forces is to deter future conflict.

Our forward deployed forces serve four significant functions in this respect. First, they are an important aspect of U.S. foreign policy. Forward deployed forces underwrite overall stability in Europe and the Pacific. This makes detente feasible, and visibly demonstrates our resolve to honor commitments and defend U.S. interests. Second, in concert with political and economic initiatives, these forces also provide the basis for collective security, and assist in self defense efforts of selected countries. Third, they support our national security objectives which require forces to deter, in conjunction with free world forces, attacks against friends and allies whose security is essential to the United States. Fourth, they are essential elements in our overall defense posture. Not only do they support agreed defense strategy, but they also unmistakably provide a wide range of response options, including a capability to respond rapidly to contingencies.

In support of his proposed amendment, the gentleman from California has stated that—

> Korea is a case where our troops are not necessary; Central Europe is a case where they are not sufficient.

On this point, he has overlooked a basic truth. Where the threat and U.S. national interests are most significant, we underwrite our commitments by garrisoning our military forces on the sovereign territory to be defended. This strategy thus emphasizes the special deterrence afforded by these forces when combined with indigenous forces. It also exploits the deterrence capabilities of the U.S. strategic nuclear forces, of proximity forces located nearby, and of other forces in the United States which might be deployed quickly in a crisis. This strategy—where the emphasis is on garrisoning forces on the sovereign territory of our allies—has proven quite successful. The foremost example is the deterrence of aggression against NATO. Significantly, this strategy has also worked in deterring aggression in Korea since the truce in 1953.

In short, he seems to imply that our current strategy does not work—when in fact just the opposite is true. It has worked well to deter aggression, and that is what our overseas deployments are all about.

Specifically, with regard to NATO, our friend from California has stated that—

> The military uselessness of our troops in Europe is an open secret.

However, it is obvious that the Soviets do not share that view. Since General Eisenhower activated NATO Headquarters in 1951, not one square foot of allied territory has fallen under Soviet domination.

The NATO countries have devised a common strategy which has evolved over the years to meet changing conditions and realities. Current NATO strategy in an era of relative strategic nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union calls for a wide range of capabilities—strategic nuclear, theater nuclear, and conventional—to pose a credible deterrent to aggression at any level. To support agreed NATO strategy—and our national security objectives—NATO requirements receive high priority. Additionally, our European forces are essential to U.S. security objectives and commitments in the Middle East and African areas.

It is imperative that we take our NATO commitment very seriously—a commitment supported for more than two decades by each President, by every Congress, and by most Americans. Unilateral reductions at this time could not only destroy the current tenuous military balance in Europe, but also destroy the prospect of orderly, balanced, mutual force reductions.

In the Pacific, the United States has individual treaties with the nations involved, as opposed to the collective security of the NATO treaty. Nevertheless, the military requirement for forward basing forces in the Pacific area is essentially the same as for Europe. Our bases and forces in the Pacific provide the presence needed to demonstrate convincingly our resolve to honor U.S. treaty commitments. Also of major importance, our forces there provide an essential U.S. element in the evolving balance of power situation in Asia among Japan, China, the U.S.S.R., and ourselves.

Of course, it is important to recognize that substantial and precipitous reductions in our overseas forces would be seen by our allies, and our potential adversaries as a lessening of our interest and commitment. If we were to make unwarranted reductions, we should not be surprised if the political results were to our profound disadvantage.

As has been correctly noted by the Department of Defense, the military balance at this critical juncture in world affairs is very delicately poised. There is no doubt that we have a considerable stake in maintaining the balance, including forward deployments, while efforts are made to increase its stability. Unwarranted cuts in our military presence overseas would erode our strength, would seriously weaken the U.S. positions in international negotiations, and would undercut efforts to develop a more stable balance at reduced cost to all involved. And clearly it is these efforts which are fundamental to the development of a lasting peace.

I strongly urge that you cast your vote against the proposed amendment.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to ask that the debate be limited, as I promised, but however I do think it is fair for the Members, so they may make some plans, to ask how many individual Members want to talk on this amendment. This is merely for the sake of guidance so we can go to dinner or plan to stay until midnight or tomorrow morning or whatever, but it is to find out how we stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes six Members standing.

Mr. HÉBERT. That is a minimum of a half hour if they do not ask for more time.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. It is the amendment's intent, as I understand it, to reduce our forces stationed overseas, primarily those in Europe. While I know who offers the amendment, what I do not know is, Who wants it?

The President does not want it. He knows the NATO countries have been overlooked during our involvement in Vietnam. He has declared this to be the "Year of Europe." He knows that an atmosphere of growing detente does not mean that Utopia has arrived.

The Secretary of Defense does not want it. He recognizes that a viable strategy for the deterrence of aggression requires both a nuclear and conventional warfare capability. He recognizes that the first line of defense for the United States is in Europe.

The Secretary of State does not want it. He recognizes that our Nation's credibility, and the very existence of a Free World, relies in large part upon our demonstrated willingness to live up to our treaty obligations.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff does not want it. They recognize the increasing military strength of the Warsaw Pact and the vital necessity for a range of military options designed to react to contingencies. Without a strong U.S. military presence abroad, our options are reduced. Of necessity, we might be forced to reinstate the policy of massive nuclear retaliation, also known as "brinksman-

ship" which has been proven unsatisfactory in the past.

The Nation's economic experts do not want it. They realize that major troop reductions in Europe might well lead to an erosion of our best commercial market and dry up an important source for certain raw and manufactured resources. They recognize that our withdrawal would place them in a more precarious position with regard to the Warsaw Pact and, therefore, might lead to favorable trade agreements with the East at the expense of the West.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, other than for a few self-designated military experts and the Warsaw Pact countries, I am unable to determine who it is who wants these troop reductions.

I add my name to the long list of those who do not want to reduce U.S. Forces overseas at this time. I trust the House will also join and defeat the amendment.

Therefore, it might lead to favorable trade agreements with the East at the expense of the West.

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

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from New Jersey to yield so that I might ask the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS), the offerer of the amendment, a couple of questions.

I wonder how the gentleman from California arrived at this figure. I think this represents a reduction of 312,168 troops, if I have added correctly.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for the purpose of answering him; as I stated in my opening statement, we asked the Pentagon a series of questions regarding the 38 nations in which we deploy military personnel.

Based on their responses, we calculated reductions of troops by nation and by branch of service.

However, if the gentleman read the amendment of what we are suggesting here, we advocate a general policy position. We provide that the military shall determine where those cuts come. However, we recommend those cuts by branch of service and by country.

I put all that material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There was three reams of material in the record clearly pointing out country by country, place by place, so everyone in this body ought to know how we arrived at it.

Mr. WYLIE. The gentleman said his amendment is offered to reduce our Armed Forces in Europe. I see nothing in the amendment which would assure that troops would be removed from Europe. They could be removed from any place in the world as far as that is concerned.

Mr. DELLUMS. The thrust of our amendment is that we reduce troops everywhere in the world, but it is obvious, when we have 600,000 troops, and I call for a reduction of 300,000, there is no question but that some of them are going to have to come out of Europe. We suggested about half.

Mr. WYLIE. There is nothing in the amendment which mandates the reduction of troops in Europe.

Mr. DELLUMS. That is right. The military shall make that decision under my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope I shall not take all of my 5 minutes. I hope that you would agree that this amendment is not quite as mysterious as the amendment of the gentleman from New York. It is perhaps not quite as mischievous. It is not quite as subtle. But it is every bit as dangerous.

Let us take a look at what the Dellums amendment really does. About 600,000 troops are involved. We have about 500,000 troops stationed overseas. There are about 100,000 afloat. That will total over 600,000.

No matter how you slice it or no matter how you add it up—and I see the gentleman from California reaching for some books to quote some figures—his amendment still involves cutting about 300,000 personnel. This is what the amendment provides.

What I want to do is take a minute and examine what the amendment might involve. In the first place, it would gut the 6th Fleet. It would put us out of any defense in the Mediterranean—

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had 15 minutes or rather 17 minutes of his own time so I must decline.

Mr. DELLUMS. The gentleman may take all the time he wants. I wanted to ask a question.

Mr. RANDALL. I thought when we defeated the amendment to kill the Trident we had reached a good goal. But now if this amendment passes we will have to close up Holy Loch in Scotland. and to close up our submarine base at Rota in Spain. We will have no place overseas to port our new Tridents.

Then are we going to put our B–52's off Guam and forget about all the western Pacific? If this amendment passes we may have to remove all our forces from Guam.

Now turning to NATO, this amendment will cut NATO in half. That consequence alone should be good reason enough to oppose this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and ask him: is it not true that because of the existence and strategy of NATO, since NATO has been in existence we or none of our NATO allies have been required to be involved in any war in Europe during the last 28 years?

Mr. RANDALL. That is correct.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for making a very important point. A lot of attention in this debate has been devoted to NATO, but this amendment would reduce not only forces in NATO, but our forces stationed elsewhere as well. This, for example, would pull our forces out of Korea.

But today, in the very day when Prime Minister Tanaka, of Japan, is here in Washington, D.C., trying to establish better relations between Japan and the United States, this surely is no time for this House to order our forces pulled out of Korea or out of Japan, for that matter, since the Japanese people regard both forces as a part of our defense commitment in that vital part of the world.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman has made a good point.

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

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

Mr. KEMP. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I am in opposition to the amendment, and I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and with those of my colleague from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

I have just come back from a trip into Southeast Asia and all around Southeast Asia today it is pretty obvious there is a great deal of doubt about Ameircan credibility, about our determination to live up to our obligations with our mutual security pacts.

We all know it is essential in negotiations that one not make unilateral cuts. Anyone who has ever negotiated anywhere in the world knows that one does not give away something for nothing, without getting something in return.

I believe that is what our President and those of us who support his position want to do, that is to negotiate from a position not of bellicosity and saber rattling, but of strength. We are willing to negotiate, but there should be a quid pro quo not unilateral concessions.

To turn away from the world and simply to say that we are unilaterally going to reduce, to cut here and to cut there, will mean to the world that we have seriously called into question the credibility of the United States in the world, not only in NATO but also in the Middle East and Asia.

I oppose the amendment and ask for its defeat.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Would not the effect of the amendment be that our only response to a major threat or attack would be nuclear. A conventional military force adequate to deter aggression is preferable to reliance on nuclear weapons.

Mr. RANDALL. That is an excellent appraisal of what would happen if this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in a recent editorial of July 29, 1973, the New York Times, in en-

dorsing the proposal to reduce troops in Europe, said:

> The growing weakness in the Administration's argument before the Congress is the inability so far to present any coherent if necessarily long-range program for winding down what is portrayed as an almost open-ended commitment in perpetuity.

I should like, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to address the issue involving Europe and our NATO commitments. I have spent a good deal of time in this area both on the ground in Europe and holding hearings here.

I do acknowledge many of the arguments against a unilateral troop reduction insofar as NATO is concerned. I believe that the first line of defense of the United States is in Central Europe. I believe we have to take into consideration ongoing negotiations, such as CSPCE and MBFR. I believe we, cannot on the other hand, wait for the MBFR negotiations, because once we do that we are going to be tied in perpetuity to the relationship we have with our allies.

Let me offer just another word as to what that relationship is in actuality. These figures should be observed, I believe, by every member of the committee.

As to the defense expenditure as a percentage of Gross National Product, as between the United States and the NATO countries, in 1972 the European NATO countries had a perecntage of 3.64 percent, and the U.S. percentage of defense expenditure as a percentage of Gross National Product was 6.7 percent.

In another burden-sharing related table we have the defense expenditures as a percentage of total tax revenues, which includes not only national tax revenues, but also State and local tax revenues.

The European NATO defense expenditures as a percentage of total tax revenues was 11.8 percent. The U.S. defense expenditures as a percentage of total tax revenues was 26.1 percent, or more than twice as much.

As to men in the Armed Forces, per 1,000 of population, in 1972 the European NATO was 9.15 percent and the United States was 11.4 percent.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we have for 25 years been committed to the NATO structure. I am not naive enough to think that simply because we had a conversation with Mr. Brezhnev, a détente has been worked out across the board, and we can just melt away and take our troops out. But, I do believe a significant reduction in U.S. NATO forces is a realistic proposal.

The loss of $1.7 billion in balance of payments that the United States has suffered must be corrected if this country is going to get on an even keel. What I see as a scenario is the fact that if we were to reduce forces by 50,000 to 100,000 troops unilaterally in Europe, our European allies would then make an adjustment and increase their share or they would make a decision that it was not necessary to have that number of land forces there.

Mr. Chairman, this would in no way reduce our credibility. This would in no way reduce our need for nuclear, technological response if it were necessary; this would in no way mitigate our unswerving commitment to the success of NATO. But what we must achieve is a reasonable balance of input between our allies and ourselves.

There is not any question that the countries in Europe that are on the ground and that are, in fact, in the front line of defense themselves can best judge what the threat is, as compared to what we can.

If they make a decision that they do not have to escalate their military commitment, then I would abide by their decision.

I do not think we should always be on the short end of the stick in terms of the relationship between our allies and ourselves. What we have been doing for the last 5 or 10 years is going with hat in hand asking them to increase their commitment. When they tell us that the political situation is such that they cannot do it, we say that we are sorry.

Every one of the people who testified before our committee, Secretary Schlesinger, General Goodpaster, Ambassador Rumsfeld, and Secretary Casey, and everyone else has acknowledged that our allies ought to increase their share.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROSENTHAL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the only way to enforce that request is for this committee to take affirmative action here today and to say that we are going to reduce our forces, whether it is by this amendment or another amendment, and in that way we are going to get some equity.

So I would suggest that we not be bound to the tradition of the past, and that we take reasonable risks. It is a risk for peace, and I believe it is one we can well take at this time.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I have listened very carefully to the arguments all day today. I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I am concerned, as everyone else, both on the committee and in the Congress, about what we do for the country and what we do with our resources.

I believe we have lost sight of some very important things in this discussion. We are discussing a military procurement bill for $21 billion, but we must consider the total picture—we must consider our priorities.

As an example of the priorities that we are asked to ratify that we should take note of the word of some others, not only those on the committee, but other experts. Senator SYMINGTON of the other body said during debate that no economy, not even that of the United States, this great country, with the largest amount of money in the world, can continue indefinitely to police and babysit the world. A sound economy is just as important to the security of the United States as is the latest weapons system.

So we come to the issue of troop reduction. Everyone is very concerned here today in the discussions concerning the entire weapons system about the threat—the threat from Russia. We have not talked much about the threat from China—only a little. We have revived this whole business of the threat from Russia from another era, at a time when we are seeking detente.

What is this threat that requires us to keep so many forces in this world? The gentleman who offered this amendment made it very clear that he is not just talking about a cut of the troops from Europe, but since it seems to be a problem that is plaguing a lot of people around here, I will discuss it.

What is the "threat" that requires so many U.S. forces in Europe? If there is a threat of conventional war in the East, would not our European allies who are much closer to that threat be making an accelerated commitment of their own resources? But that is not happening. Quite to the contrary, they are spending their money for making the lives of the people in their countries much better than we have here.

It is interesting. Why should we, so many thousands of miles away, assume such arrogance—and that is what it is—to perceive a much greater threat to Europe than the Europeans do?

There will never be a rational answer to this question, but I raise it for your consideration.

I also raise the question, concerning unilateral action which a previous Member of the House, a colleague of mine from New York, addressed himself to very well. It seems to be an untenable concept around here.

Now, I am not a military or diplomatic negotiator, but over the course of the years I have followed the history of this country and its negotiations in the course of my concern for American peace and world peace, with which I have been associated for many, many years in and out of Congress. I have yet to understand why there is anything inconsistent about any country, especially the great United States, taking a position as to what she determines—and you notice I said "she"—what this country determines to be unilaterally in her own interest.

The fact is that we have an obligation as a nation to make our own decisions as to what is in our own interest. When we go to the negotiating table and conduct a bilateral or multilateral negotiation it is premised on what we think is unilaterally in our own interest. Therefore we have an obligation—and we need not fear it—to be able to make a unilateral decision.

It is in our own interest to unilaterally determine that we do not need as many forces in this country or that country as we have now. The truth of the matter is we do not. The truth is that these commitments were commitments which were made in the past and which stem from past threats and are not commitments

which we should have in a period such as we are in now. This is a period in which there is a détente not only in Europe but a détente in Asia. We are supposed to be getting out of the war in Laos and in Vietnam and, of course, we have acted to be out of the war in Cambodia in August. What is our position? We are negotiating with the Soviet Union on many levels in this country and in this world. We are negotiating with that other large threat that we have heard about in this Congress, namely, China. We are making détentes all over the world, in Europe and in Asia.

Therefore, is it not the time to say it is in the best interests of our country and of the needs of our people to cut the amount of military forces?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. ABZUG was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. ABZUG. Is this not indeed the time, therefore, for us to assert a rational policy and determine that we must find a way to cut the costs that the people of the United States are paying for?

It has been estimated that we are spending about $30 billion a year to maintain bases and troops and facilities abroad. No single act the President or the Congress can take at this time would do more to check inflation at home or the enfeeblement of the dollar abroad than to move without delay to reduce the far-flung and outdated overseas military deployment in an orderly fashion.

I see no reason to be fearful. Unilateral action and independent actions were taken by the United States and the Soviet Union, for example, to bring about moratoriums with regard to tests in the atmosphere. That led to the test ban treaty. Those were unilateral actions which resulted in good multilateral actions.

I see no reason whatsoever to be fearful of asserting an independent policy. Congress has the right and the obligation to make a decision, together with the executive branch of the Government. The executive branch is capable of making a decision at this time.

But whether the executive acts or not the Congress especially has a responsibility at this particular time to act in behalf of the needs of the American people, to try to adjust our economy and try to make it clear that we must begin spending our money for what we need. We have the responsibility to build a strong Nation from within, and not to be talking about strengths and weaknesses from without. We are raising false enemies. There is no evidence that we are threatened to that extent. We ought to begin strengthening ourselves from within; that is where our true security lies.

I support the amendment and all such amendments on the same subject.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS to establish a ceiling of 300,000 on troops stationed overseas after June 30, 1974.

Yesterday, and now again today, we have heard a lot of talk about whether our Armed Forces are No. 1 in the world. I happen to believe that the United States still retains the strongest military force on Earth, but I am not confident that it will continue to remain in this premiere position as long as we continue to waste billions and billions of our military budget on items that do not add one iota to our national defense. Our top-heavy overseas military force is one such item.

Yesterday, everyone was bemoaning the fact that we are not spending more on research and development. Well, one of the reasons that we are not spending more on research and development is that such a vast portion of our defense budget goes to manpower costs. Fifty-six cents of every American dollar spent on defense goes to support the more than 2 million men in uniform. In comparison, only 24 percent of the Soviet Union's military budget goes for manpower costs.

This is a great and powerful nation, but unless we wake up and end our never ending balance-of-payment deficit, we might find that we are less great and less powerful than a few of our neighbors. This Nation spends over 7 percent of its gross national product on national defense. Interestingly enough, the countries that we are supposedly defending with these 600,000 overseas troops are committing less than 4 percent of their own GNP to their defense. Something is wrong here.

It is simply impossible for the United States to continue as the No. 1 economic power in the world when we are competing with nations like Japan, who spends less than 1 percent of its GNP on national defense, and Germany, who spends only 4 percent of its GNP on defense.

It will be argued here today, of course, that we cannot reduce troops in Europe because those troops are a deterrent to nuclear war. This is a fallacy and everybody knows it. No military analyst seriously claims that U.S. troops stationed in Europe could repel any large-scale Soviet conventional attack. Despite the fact that we have 300,000 troops in Europe, this level is simply not sufficient to repel a Soviet attack. What we should do, then, is either increase this level dramatically, or decrease it substantially. We gain nothing by being in this middle ground.

It is argued that while our European force is not sufficient to deter an attack, it does demonstrate commitment. Well, frankly, gentleman, with the American exchange worth 40 percent less in German marks than it was 2 years ago, with gold escalating from $35 per ounce when President Nixon took office to $122 per ounce on the foreign markets last week, and with a national debt of $465 billion, I can think of a few less costly ways of demonstrating commitment to our allies.

Some people say that while we should reduce our overseas force level, we should do it through the mutual balanced force reduction talks. I have nothing against the MBFR negotiations, and, in fact, I hope that they are successful. But I am not going to hold my breath. This Nation is in the throes of an economic crisis that cannot wait years for the successful completion of the MBFR negotiations. The crisis is now, and the time to reduce our overseas committment is now.

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

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has said on the subject of this amendment. I wish that the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) had limited his amendment to the proposed manpower cuts in the various services, so that the President could have made the cuts either from our forces stationed overseas or from our forces stationed in the United States. Such an amendment I would gladly have supported.

The difficulty with the Dellums amendment in its present form is that it requires the cuts in effect to be made almost entirely from forces stationed overseas. Since all these reductions could not be made in the Pacific and the Far East, a substantial proportion of them would have to be made in Europe. At this time when we are engaged in an effort to achieve mutual reductions in Europe, it would seem bad policy to press ahead with unilateral reductions.

I am also concerned, as I was in the case of the amendment previously offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIKE) that a drastic move by the United States to reduce the level of its commitment in Europe may have the unintended result of encouraging and fostering the recreation of a large West German military establishment. This is a prospect which must concern us since we have no assurance that the type of regime in West Germany in power today will continue indefinitely.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I support Congressman DELLUMS' amendment to reduce the overall level of American troops by 322,000 including a reduction of manpower overseas to 300,000. From a number of points of view—strategically, economically, and legislatively—I feel that this amendment represents a reasonable, well-founded and desirable goal.

The major opposition to unilateral troop cuts overseas is that it would mean a substantial reduction in the level of our forces in Europe and therefore a lessening of our commitment to the NATO Alliance. While James R. Schlesinger, Secretary of Defense, admitted to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on July 11 that NATO is stronger than the

Warsaw Pact countries in a number of respects, that the level of our troops in Western Europe is not immutable, and that we need to improve our present combat-support ratio, he argued that the present level of forces must be maintained. He stated that unilateral cuts would jeopardize the talks scheduled for October 30 on mutual and balanced force reductions; however, these talks, which are being held in conjunction with the SALT negotiations, are bound to proceed slowly and it is just as likely that unilateral cuts, initiated by the Congress, will serve as added, rather than detractive, incentives to Warsaw Pact nations to negotiate.

The DOD also argues that the present level of conventional forces in Europe serves as a deterrent to another war. However, defense experts generally agree that the major deterrent there is not ground forces, no matter what their number, but the presence of more than 7,000 tactical nuclear weapons. The existence of these nuclear forces, together with the increasing military capability of our Allies and the general level of detente now achieved in Europe, substantiates the lack of danger posed by a decrease in American troops. This position is further bolstered by the evidence that the withdrawal of more than 100,000 troops from Europe since 1964 has had no adverse effects on the political, economic, or military situation in Western Europe.

While the Dellums' amendment calls for a reduction of 50 percent in overseas forces, it does not specify that these cuts be in Europe, thereby allowing the DOD flexibility in determining where such decreases should be made. Reductions in Europe make sense, to aline out military policy with our economic and cultural attitudes. However, cuts in the level of our forces in other areas abroad are also desirable to encourage our Allies throughout the world to take on the responsibility for their own defense.

In economic terms, the troop reductions proposed by this amendment would amount to savings of billions of dollars for the United States. DOD has stated that there probably is some overstaffing abroad, but that such cuts are not now warranted and are unwise. However, the cuts proposed by the amendment are substantial enough to force the services, all of which are presently topheavy, to increase their efficiency without jeopardizing their basic strategic strength.

In addition, the cuts in overseas manpower would mean complementary reductions in the number of overseas dependents, now numbering a quarter of a million in Europe alone. In view of the recent devaluations of the dollar, the increasingly large deficit in our balance of payments—one-third of which is directly attributable to forces stationed abroad—and the closing of military bases here at home, reductions of both servicemen and their dependents is both warranted and desirable.

Furthermore, DOD has repeatedly cited manpower costs as the single most important factor in recent military budget growth, comprising 56 percent of military spending. Troop cuts of 14 percent would therefore substantially contribute to lowering the overall level of military spending regardless of other international economic considerations.

Finally, this amendment offers Congress the opportunity to reassert its responsibility for oversight of military operations and its control of military policy. In general, the arguments used by the DOD tend to show that past policy has been dictated by troop levels, rather than troop levels following the considerations of military policy. Substantial troop reductions will indicate that the United States is genuinely interested in scaling down its defensive posture and emphasizing détente, and that Congress is not going to allow excessive military waste and spending for obsolete policies and surplus manpower.

Less directly, but no less importantly, insistence on reductions in military spending and manpower can serve to show that Congress will not tolerate cuts and impoundments of the domestic budget while the DOD budget increases even as the Vietnam war comes to an end, thus also reasserting the responsibility of the legislative branch for fiscal control and decisionmaking.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I think that some of the discussion this afternoon has missed the degree of commitment which the United States has undertaken around the world. If we look just at the European part of our military establishment our expenditures are running between 4 and 4½ percent of our gross national product, which is not very far off from the expenditures being made by the European countries.

I do believe that when an amendment is of such a magnitude that it would force a major reduction in our European forces, that we need to look very carefully at the circumstances in Europe before we accede to that proposal.

I have been very much impressed with the progress we have made in Europe. I am impressed with the almost unanimous desire of the political leadership in Western Europe to have our troops stay there. I think it does serve our interests. I would hope that we might approach the problem of reducing our forces in a fairly careful way.

My own impression is that our commitments in Europe are essential sound. We may have more forces there than we need, but it would be a major tragedy in my judgment if we were to cut our forces in half, as I think might be required under the amendment.

In my judgment an amendment that was more moderate, that called for a smaller reduction, and where the reduction could be taken essentially out of Asia, would make more sense, and could be more easily defended as in our national interest.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to congratulate the gentleman for making his statement.

The gentleman and I have sometimes been on opposite sides of questions affecting the military defense of our country, but I want to commend the gentleman for his statement on this amendment. The gentleman understands the nature of the NATO situation. I might add that these recommendations were incorporated in a resolution presented to the Democratic caucus, which was very substantially favored, although it never did come to a recorded vote.

I think the gentleman has made a very important contribution to this debate.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota on the very statesmanlike remarks the gentleman has made. The gentleman is emphasizing something that we have overlooked, and that is that we have actual treaty obligations and commitments. So if people wish retrenchment of the U.S. presence around the world, then the first place they should direct their energies is toward a revocation of those treaties and commitments.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I should say in response that I do believe the NATO commitment is very important, but I do believe we could reduce our forces in Asia, but not by the amount offered in this amendment.

I believe we ought to take our 40,000 troops out of Thailand who are there running the air bases. The Japanese would welcome a reduction of our military forces stationed in Japan including Okinawa. So we could make substantial reductions in Asia which would not impair our security.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid this amendment goes too far, and would make a major cutback in Europe. I do not believe that this is the time when that can be justified.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, (Mr. HÉBERT).

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to associate myself with what the gentleman from Minnesota has said. As the gentleman well knows, I support his position on this matter.

Speaking from some of the thinking that has gone on before, I would say that this is essentially the same thing that was adopted by the steering committee of the Democratic Party on this side of the aisle. I am just sorry that that particular resolution did not reach a vote on the floor.

Again I do congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota, and wish to associate myself with the gentleman. I believe that it is a proper and sound approach to the whole problem, and I hope we can con-

tinue to develop that type of approach this afternoon.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the chairman. I would only say in closing when a later amendment appears which is more moderate in scope, I hope that it will get support. I think there will be an amendment offered which will not force a reduction in Europe, and that amendment, I think, would be in our national interest and would save the taxpayers substantial sums.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has made an able argument but I must oppose his amendment. In fact I consider it very dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has approved a force level 13,000 below the level requested, and 94,000 below last year's authorization. That means in the coming year the U.S. force level will be the lowest since the Korean War of 1950. It will be 464,000 fewer than in 1964 prior to the Southeast Asia build-up, and 1,325,000 less than at the height of the Southeast Asia conflict. What more do you want in the way of troop cuts? You can't man weapons without people. We are down to 13 combat divisions. This amendment would cut us to 11. It cuts all forces proportionately.

Even if we could be assured of cutbacks of comparable numbers of United States and Russian forces, they would be withdrawn from their respective bases in Europe to their home countries, the U.S. and Russia, respectively. If this were accomplished, the U.S. forces would be withdrawn 3,000 miles across the sea, and the Soviet forces 500 miles overland. In case of a necessity to reinforce in Europe, the problem would be obvious.

The number of troops which can be moved by air is limited. The supplies which are moved by air are far from adequate for large forces. It is much slower to move them by ship. To move forces and supplies overseas by sea means that you must run counter to nearly 400 operative Soviet submarines. Hitler had 51 submarines when World War II began. We have not forgotten the toll they wrought. If that picture is not gloomy enough, the U.S. Navy decommissioned 300 ships last year and more will be decommissioned this year. It would take a long time to reinforce our troops overseas. It is no time to cut the ground out from under America's fighting forces.

The proposal to cut U.S. military forces abroad is, I assume, an economy measure, and undoubtedly it would save money. Nearly 60 cents out of every dollar of defense money goes to pay the high salaries which we provide for military and civilian forces. It would also accomplish something else. It would strictly limit American combat effectiveness.

We have a reasonable number of modern sophisticated weapons. In most categories the Communist forces have more. What the North Vietnamese did with Russian surface-to-air missiles to our aircraft shows that we are not the only people who possess and can use modern weapons. The Russians have just flown a plane 120,000 feet high which we cannot do. It takes manpower to supply, maintain and use weapons whether or not they are modern. They have that manpower.

We have fewer combat personnel in the division slice than any other military forces in the world. It takes many, many U.S. personnel to supply the great variety of services and supplies which we deem essential for our forces. That means fewer men to do the fighting.

When we are spread thin, we offer an inviting target to aggression. You recall how long it took the Russians to overrun Czechoslovakia. It was accomplished in a matter of hours. When Communist aggression comes, it will be a steel tipped juggernaut. A handful of forces cannot stop it. The Communist objective will be to overrun the capitals of Europe in a matter of hours. They do not want to destroy them with nuclear weapons. They want their productive capability intact. Take away our ability to stop such an attack by cutting U.S. forces too much and you will have condemned the remaining forces overseas to decimation and defeat, or you will require that we back down before every Communist demand.

If the Communist forces were going to be reduced to a comparative degree this amendment would make more sense. But the facts show that they are building up their military forces. The purring noises that you hear during state visits or when we sign another agreement which gives the Communists an advantage, and all of them do, are listened to with gratification and hope in this country. But in Russia it is only window dressing. While their diplomats smile benignly, their military forces prepare for whatever requirement may be expected of them by the Russian overlords. The Communists have not changed their spots. They still seek world domination. We are trying to steer away from military confrontation. Trying to direct competition into peaceful channels of trade and diplomacy. We will have a far better chance to do this if we maintain sufficient strength to deter the Russians from easy military conquest.

Negotiations for troop reductions and the second round of SALT talks will have little opportunity for success if we make cuts unilaterally in advance and leave ourselves without bargaining power.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to vigorously oppose the amendment which seeks to cut our troop strength in Europe.

Since the end of World War II, America has had a commitment to rebuild Europe, and for this reason, we instituted the Marshall plan which was directly responsible for the economic upsurge that countries like Italy, Germany, France, and other Western European nations have experienced.

In order to rebuild Europe, it was necessary to preserve peace, and peace has been preserved in Western Europe for the last 28 years largely due to the presence of U.S. troops as part of our NATO commitment. Our forces are proof of our commitment to the concept of collective security through an alliance of democratic nations.

I want to remind my colleagues that when the Western Nations joined together in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, their purpose, as stated in the NATO charter, was to "safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their people founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law"

In order to safeguard this freedom, we made a commitment to NATO to maintain a force equal to the Warsaw Pact countries. Right now, some 3½ million NATO troops face over 4 million soldiers of the Warsaw Pact. The Communists have twice as many planes as NATO does, and they have three times as many tanks. They have more airfields, more shelters, more command and control facilities, and more anti-aircraft defenses. Not only that, the Warsaw Pact divisions are steadily increasing in combat power as they receive new tanks, new personnel carriers, and more artillery, in addition to newer types of high-performance aircraft.

Certainly, now is not the time for us to reduce our troops. Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster, commander of allied forces in Europe, said recently, in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that despite the atmosphere of détente, the Soviet Union continues to build up forces "far larger than would be necessary for defense." He emphasized the need to maintain a credible conventional defense in Europe in order to deter Communist attempts at local aggression, and urged continuation of our present NATO policy for four reasons: deterrence, solidarity, defense, and détente.

Our commitment to NATO, as far as I am concerned, has prevented world war III. Any unilateral withdrawal of American forces would diminish NATO's capability to respond to conventional attack. The only alternative would be earlier recourse to nuclear weapons with all the risks that such a policy would entail in this age of nuclear parity.

Have we forgotten that over five million Poles were killed in World War II? Have we forgotten that over 5 million Jews perished during the last World War? Have we forgotten the millions of Latvians, Lithuanians, Czechoslovakians, Slovenians, Estonians, Bulgarians, Hungarians and others died in that war? Have we forgotten that millions of people today are still enslaved behind the Iron Curtain?

Yet, I hear voices in America saying that because we are negotiating with

China and because we are negotiating with Russia, we must prove our "good faith" by cutting our troop strength in Europe. I would like to ask those who take this view what "good faith" the Communist dictators are showing to us when they continue to keep millions of people enslaved. Why should we be called upon to prove our "good faith" by cutting our troop strength, when Russia has already demonstrated the true extent of her "good faith" by denying millions of human beings their inherent right to freedom and self-determination?

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the Communist dictators are actually increasing their suppression of individual freedoms, thought and expression. We must never forget that millions of people who love liberty and who want to live in a free society are looking to the United States to hold the line and to protect them from further erosion of their rights as human beings.

Mr. Chairman, if we want to stabilize the overall military balance in Europe, if we want to deter the Soviet Union from nuclear attack, if we want to insure the unity of Europeans in their common defense, if we want to preserve the peace that has been maintained in Europe for the past 28 years largely through the presence of NATO forces, then we must continue to uphold our commitment to NATO.

Mr. Chairman, because of these compelling reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment which seeks to cut our troops for NATO.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I believe all of us can agree that there should be troop reductions, especially in our overseas bases. The question is just how many. It appears to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is a reasonable one.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services recently estimated that each individual soldier in fiscal year 1974 would cost $12,500. On that basis a reduction of 322,000, as proposed by the gentleman from California, would mean a savings of about $4 billion annually. Here is an area where we can reduce without hurting anyone.

I was somewhat impressed by the argument made by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) but given the international position of weakness in which the dollar now finds itself, our projected balance of payments deficit, and the current imbalance in the Federal budget, the pending amendment should command a broad range of support. The Senate committee, as we all know, is not composed of flaming liberals, and yet the Senate committee reported a similar measure out by unanimous vote. Certainly they all cannot be wrong. 322,000 troops removed from overseas, meaning a savings of $4 billion annually, will certainly be in the best interest of this Nation.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I just want to ask the gentleman a question. I have been out in Hawaii a time or two, and it always seemed to me that it was fairly overcrowded with troops. I thought maybe we could bring about 50,000 home from there and close Hickam Field. How would the gentleman feel about that?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. We do not have 50,000 at Hickam Field.

Mr. HAYS. What is the gentleman proposing here?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. And I might remind the gentleman from Ohio that Hawaii is not overseas; it is part of the United States.

Mr. HAYS. I am aware of that, but it still costs $12,500 per man and it has probably got more troops in it per square mile than any State in the Union.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I should be happy to have troop reductions even in Hawaii if it would mean a step toward peace.

Mr. HAYS. I am not sure that that means anything.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. What we are proposing here is to bring home troops from overseas in order to better our financial situation here at home for one thing and to better our image abroad.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Hawaii, for yielding.

I would point out the amendment in one part says:

> For the purpose of maintaining more than 300,000 military personnel assigned or homeported at overseas bases; or afloat on a regular basis in the Western Pacific or Mediterranean.

Would my friend, the gentleman from Hawaii, agree that if we do remove—and God forbid we do at this time—the fleet from the western Pacific, it would have an impact on the economic structure of Hawaii?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The amendment as I understand it calls for, I repeat again, withdrawal of overseas troops—and I certainly do not consider Hawaii as being classified within the term "overseas."

Mr. HUNT. I am reading to the gentleman directly from the amendment. It says:

> . . . military personnel assigned or homeported at overseas bases; or afloat on a regular basis in the Western Pacific or Mediterranean.

I believe Hawaii is in the western Pacific, unless the gentleman has moved it.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Hawaii.

He is perfectly correct. There is no language in this amendment that relates to Hawaii. We all know what we mean by "overseas."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) will not take this as a personal affront that I oppose it. I have nothing personal and I would oppose it if it were offered by the Speaker who is one of my dear friends.

I know a little bit about the situation in NATO and I know a little bit about the fact that Western Europe is our first line of defense, and I know that no one can deny that the NATO organization being there has—well, maybe somebody would argue it has not kept the peace but at least there has not been any war in Europe, and I think NATO is largely responsible for that fact.

I would not say we could not take 10,000 or 20,000 or even 30,000 troops out of NATO, but I think this is the wrong time to do it, because we are engaged at this moment or about to be in talks with the other side about mutual and balanced reduction. To come on this floor and mandate a reduction in the face of trying to negotiate a reduction would simply give them all the chips and deprive us of all the ones we have. It is a matter of intelligent negotiation. I do not think that anybody at this time wants to deprive the State Department or the Defense Department of the opportunity to negotiate and see what can be done and not just do it and say to the Russians: "Here it is. We have done it. Forget about taking your troops out. We have taken ours out."

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

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Does the gentleman have any feeling about whether or not there is an imbalance in performance between the United States and our allies?

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman there has always been an imbalance in performance because we have always up until recently been much better able to do what had to be done than they were able to do it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAYS. I do not yield any more. I do not know why I yielded in the first place, if I am to be truthful about it. I did not think the gentleman was going to be much help.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAYS. Do not overdo it because I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If both sides agree to a reduction then we are going to be cemented in with our allies with this imbalance.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think that is true at all. I think if both sides agree that there will be a reduction, I think we can negotiate with our allies that the major part of the reduction will be ours.

I want to say another thing. Everybody talks about how much it would cost to keep our troops overseas. I am perfectly aware that Hawaii is a part of the

United States, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Hawaii. I voted to make it a State before the gentleman was here. So, in fact, I had a little to do with getting him here. He could not have been here if we had not made Hawaii a State. But let me say this: It costs less to keep a man in Europe than in Hawaii because the Germans are offsetting a big cost of keeping the troops in Europe, to the tune of more than a billion dollars a year, and nobody is offsetting the cost of keeping a man in Hawaii, which is the highest place in the United States, I am told, as far as the cost of living is concerned.

I simply refer to Hawaii because the gentleman is making a point about bringing troops home. If we are talking about bringing them back to the continental United States, that is one thing, but I say we could probably keep them with the offset the Germans are putting in and other countries may put in if we negotiate properly—we can probably keep troops in Western Europe, which is our first line of defense—do not forget that—cheaper than in North Carolina, Ohio, Hawaii, or any place anyone would care to mention. Therefore, the economy argument really goes out the window.

It boils down to a question of, Do we want to deprive ourselves of that bargaining chip in bargaining about mutual reduction?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 67, noes 339, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—67

Abzug	Green, Pa.	Owens
Adams	Harrington	Rangel
Addabbo	Hawkins	Rees
Anderson, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.	Riegle
	Holtzman	Roncalio, Wyo.
Aspin	Howard	Rosenthal
Badillo	Hungate	Roybal
Brademas	Jordan	Ryan
Brown, Calif.	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Burke, Calif.	Koch	Sarbanes
Burke, Mass.	Kyros	Schroeder
Burlison, Mo.	Leggett	Seiberling
Burton	Lehman	Stanton, James V.
Chisholm	Litton	
Clay	Long, Md.	Stark
Conte	McCloskey	Stokes
Conyers	Matsunaga	Stuckey
Dellums	Metcalfe	Studds
Diggs	Mezvinsky	Thompson, N.J.
Drinan	Mink	Tiernan
Eckhardt	Mitchell, Md.	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Moakley	Vigorito
Giaimo	Nix	Young, Ga.

NOES—339

Abdnor	Bafalis	Blatnik
Anderson, Ill.	Baker	Boggs
Andrews, N.C.	Barrett	Boland
Andrews, N. Dak.	Beard	Bolling
	Bell	Bowen
Annunzio	Bennett	Brasco
Archer	Bergland	Bray
Arends	Bevill	Breaux
Armstrong	Biaggi	Breckinridge
Ashbrook	Biester	Brinkley
Ashley	Bingham	Brooks
Broomfield	Guyer	Perkins
Brotzman	Haley	Pettis
Brown, Mich.	Hamilton	Peyser
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-schmidt	Pickle
Broyhill, N.C.		Pike
Broyhill, Va.	Hanley	Poage
Buchanan	Hanrahan	Powell, Ohio
Burgener	Hansen, Idaho	Preyer
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Burleson, Tex.	Harsha	Price, Tex.
Butler	Hastings	Pritchard
Byron	Hays	Quie
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Quillen
Carney, Ohio	Heckler, Mass.	Railsback
Carter	Heinz	Randall
Casey, Tex.	Helstoski	Rarick
Cederberg	Henderson	Regula
Chamberlain	Hicks	Reuss
Chappell	Hillis	Rhodes
Clancy	Hinshaw	Rinaldo
Clark	Hogan	Roberts
Clausen, Don H.	Holifield	Robinson, Va.
	Holt	Robison, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Horton	Rodino
Cleveland	Hosmer	Rogers
Cochran	Huber	Roncallo, N.Y.
Cohen	Hudnut	Rooney, Pa.
Collier	Hunt	Rose
Collins, Tex.	Hutchinson	Rostenkowski
Conable	Ichord	Roush
Conlan	Jarman	Rousselot
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Roy
Cotter	Johnson, Colo.	Runnels
Coughlin	Johnson, Pa.	Ruppe
Crane	Jones, Ala.	Ruth
Cronin	Jones, Okla.	Sandman
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Sarasin
Daniel, Dan	Kazen	Satterfield
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Keating	Saylor
	Kemp	Scherle
Daniels, Dominick V.	Ketchum	Schneebeli
	King	Sebelius
Danielson	Kluczynski	Shipley
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Shoup
Davis, S.C.	Landrum	Shriver
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Shuster
de la Garza	Lent	Sikes
Delaney	Long, La.	Sisk
Dellenback	Lott	Skubitz
Denholm	Lujan	Slack
Dennis	McClory	Smith, N.Y.
Dent	McCollister	Snyder
Derwinski	McCormack	Spence
Devine	McDade	Staggers
Dickinson	McEwen	Stanton, J. William
Dingell	McFall	
Donohue	McKay	Steed
Dorn	McKinney	Steele
Downing	McSpadden	Steelman
Dulski	Macdonald	Steiger, Ariz.
Duncan	Madden	Steiger, Wis.
du Pont	Madigan	Stratton
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	Stubblefield
Eilberg	Mailliard	Sullivan
Erlenborn	Mallary	Symington
Esch	Mann	Symms
Eshleman	Maraziti	Talcott
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Nebr.	Taylor, Mo.
Fascell	Martin, N.C.	Taylor, N.C.
Findley	Mathias, Calif.	Teague, Calif.
Fish	Mathis, Ga.	Teague, Tex.
Flood	Mayne	Thomson, Wis.
Flowers	Mazzoli	Thone
Flynt	Meeds	Thornton
Foley	Melcher	Towell, Nev.
Ford, Gerald R.	Michel	Treen
Ford, William D.	Miller	Udall
	Minish	Ullman
Forsythe	Minshall, Ohio	Van Deerlin
Fountain	Mitchell, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Fraser	Mizell	Veysey
Frelinghuysen	Mollohan	Waggonner
Frenzel	Montgomery	Waldie
Frey	Moorhead, Calif.	Walsh
Froehlich		Wampler
Fulton	Moorhead, Pa.	Ware
Fuqua	Morgan	Whalen
Gaydos	Mosher	White
Gettys	Moss	Whitehurst
Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.	Whitten
Gilman	Myers	Wiggins
Ginn	Natcher	Williams
Goldwater	Nedzi	Wilson, Bob
Gonzalez	Nelsen	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Goodling	Nichols	
Grasso	Obey	
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Griffiths	O'Hara	
Gross	O'Neill	Wolff
Grover	Parris	Wright
Gubser	Passman	Wyatt
Gude	Patten	Wydler
Wylie	Young, Alaska	Young, Tex.
Wyman	Young, Fla.	Zablocki
Yates	Young, Ill.	Zion
Yatron	Young, S.C.	

NOT VOTING—27

Alexander	Harvey	Podell
Blackburn	Jones, N.C.	Reid
Camp	Karth	Roe
Collins, Ill.	Landgrebe	Rooney, N.Y.
Evins, Tenn.	Milford	Smith, Iowa
Fisher	Mills, Ark.	Stephens
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Widnall
Gunter	Patman	Winn
Hanna	Pepper	Zwach

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'NEILL

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL: on page 4: line 1, strike "791,627" and insert in lieu thereof "741,627"; line 2, strike "565,912" and insert in lieu thereof "493,820"; line 3, strike "196,363" and insert in lieu thereof "176,219"; line 4, strike "665,963" and insert in lieu thereof "615,963".

On page 5: After line 2, add the following proviso: ": *Provided,* That no funds appropriated by Congress may be used after June 30, 1974 for the purpose of maintaining more than 400,000 military personnel assigned at overseas bases."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARENDS. Is this the same amendment that was just defeated on the floor of the House?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). No, it is not. It is a different amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. As I heard it read, it is only a matter of a change in figures. Is it not?

Mr. O'NEILL. It is a change in figures and a deletion in wording. It is not the same amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I preface my remarks by saying that I rise in strong support of substantially reducing our commitment of troops overseas.

I voted against the Dellums amendment because it reduced troops by 300,000 in a period of 1 year, and I think that is too much. Consequently, I could not support it.

Now, for a play on figures, let me say this: After the removal of all our troops from Vietnam, the United States still has 500,000 troops stationed on land overseas in addition to about 108,000 afloat on stations overseas.

My amendment on line 1 strikes 50,000 out of the Army that are overseas.

On line 4, it takes 50,000 out of the Air Force that are overseas. It does not touch the Marines, and it does not touch the Navy.

The Members will note, if they have watched my votes during the course of the afternoon—and I am talking as an individual who is interested in my country—I voted against every amendment that cut procurement.

I appreciate the fact that we have been fighting a war in Vietnam for many

years, and the fact that our Navy is practically now in a desperate state. I realize the fact that much of our conventional war equipment needs to be increased.

Why have they not been? Because of the amounts of money that we have been spending in this useless and needless war. So I agree with the Navy. I want to see us have the greatest Navy in the world. I think that money should be spent on building up our Navy, and I think that money should be spent on new equipment like the Trident and nuclear carrier.

But, let me say this: I want you to know before we leave the Congress this year there will be a troop reduction because the Senate is going to demand a troop reduction and because, in my belief, the President of the United States is going to ask for a troop reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I take this well, this afternoon to explain two reasons which, in my personal opinion, necessitate a troop reduction overseas. The first reason is the economic argument, and the second reason is the reassertion of congressional prerogatives.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the question of U.S. military forces around the world. The United States currently has stationed on foreign soil 500,000 military personnel. In addition, they have 108,000 military personnel afloat or on foreign shores, and that group would not be touched at all by my amendment.

About 30 percent of our military are overseas. Let us look at the economic factors. There are those who would say that it is estimated that it costs the U.S. taxpayers $30 billion annually to maintain bases, troops, and facilities abroad. According to the administration's own figures, the price tag for the U.S. participation in NATO is $17 billion annually. The net balance-of-payments drain because of our forces in Europe is in the neighborhood of $1.5 billion annually.

While Europe receives the greater portion of the defense dollar outflow, the United States maintains a total of 600,000 uniformed service people around the globe at an expense of $10,000 per man in pay and allowances alone.

This places an immense drain on our financial resources. It has contributed to the devaluation of the dollar by more than 25 percent in the last 2 years, our balance-of-payments deficit, and inflation.

The Nixon administration has impounded $12 billion for domestic needs; the Nixon administration has closed several U.S. military bases as an economy measure, thus putting many Americans out of work. And this administration has consistently told the American taxpayer that the Nation's resources are not big enough to provide adequately for domestic services like health, education, welfare, and rural needs.

It just does not make any sense to me that if we are in such a tight economic squeeze, we can continue to waste billions of dollars a year to maintain troops abroad which do not contribute commensurately price-wise to the security of the country where the troops are stationed or to our own national security.

Now is the time to make reductions in our forces abroad. Why, if we withdrew only 40,000 men per year, the result would be a saving of almost $400 million. And the significant deficit in our balance of payments would clearly be improved. Whatever possibilities may exist for mutual troop reduction, they should not inhibit our efforts to cut unilaterally the Nation's excessive military involvement world-wide—in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, Latin America, or the islands.

In my judgment, no single act which the Congress can take at this time would do more to check the inflation at home or erosion of the dollar abroad than to move to reduce the farflung and outdated military deployment in an orderly fashion.

No economy, not even that of the United States, can continue indefinitely to police and babysit the world. A sound economy, to use Senator SYMINGTON'S own words "is just as important to the security of the United States as is the latest weapons system."

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about reduction, not complete withdrawal. And we are talking about reasserting congressional control over our overseas military presence. For years, Congress has approved these overseas manpower levels without seriously questioning the basic rationale. Manpower levels requested by DOD were not arrived at through the constitutional process of congressional control. In fact, they really have represented an abdication of our control not only to the Executive, but also to foreign countries—because there are no specific treaty obligations that forces Congress to approve any troop level or troop commitment.

Exact figures of troop commitment for each country are the result of executive agreement and are not submitted to Congress for approval. For more than two decades, the commitment and level of troops abroad has determined our policy rather than our policy determining the level of U.S. forces overseas.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thought I understood the distinguished majority leader to say that he was only cutting 50,000 in the Army and 50,000 in the Air Force, but the text of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as it is circulated here, would involve a 72,000 cut in the Navy and a 20,000 cut in the Marine Corps for a total of 192,000.

Mr. O'NEILL. May I say that the gentleman from New York is incorrect in that statement. The amendment says:

Provided, That no funds appropriated by Congress may be used after June 30, 1974, for the purpose of maintaining more than 400,000 military personnel assigned at overseas bases.

So we will understand, I am trying to write a legislative record on this, and in my introductory remarks I said there were 500,000 troops overseas and 108,000 in the Navy.

I am properly stating that my intent is, and I am writing intent in this, that there shall be no naval force reduction whatsoever. So with 500,000 overseas troops of Army and Air Force, a cut of 100,000 would leave 400,000. I think I am correct.

(On request of Mr. STRATTON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. O'NEILL was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. The document that is being circulated in the majority leader's behalf says on line 2, "Strike 565,912 and insert in lieu thereof 493,820."

That adds up to 72,000 reduction in the Navy. Maybe the majority leader has circulated the wrong document.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct. I will have to modify my amendment. I am in error. I intended to strike from my amendment line 2 and line 3 and amend it as to line 1 and line 4.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out line 2 and line 3 from my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct. There was an error in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I was not able to hear what the gentleman said in his request, and I should like to know what his unanimous-consent request was.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has asked unanimous consent that lines 2 and 3 be stricken from his amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL: On page 4: Line 1, strike "791,627" and insert in lieu thereof "741,627"; line 4, strike "665,963" and insert in lieu thereof "615,963".

On page 5: After line 2, add the following proviso: ": *Provided*, That no funds appropriated by Congress may be used after June 30, 1974 for the purpose of maintaining more than 400,000 military personnel assigned at overseas bases."

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that I still have time on the 3 minutes. I want to say to the gentleman from New York, (Mr. STRATTON) a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am very grateful for his correction. It was an error on my part.

Let me go on. I do not say we are going to gut our forces, I merely say that 50,000 shall come home of the Army, and 50,000 shall come home from the Air Force. I leave it up to the Army and I leave it up to the Air Force as to what sections of the world they should make these cuts.

I think we have no other alternative but to move in the direction of a reduction of total forces stationed abroad. And I think the reduction must come on a worldwide basis, because I believe that the United States is overextended and overcommitted precisely on that basis.

The time for action is long overdue, and I do hope this amendment is adopted.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PEYSER FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'NEILL

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute Amendment offered by Mr. PEYSER for the amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL: On page 5, after line 2, insert the following new sentence: "That the Committee on Armed Services of the House shall report to the House by April 1, 1974 a detailed and independent study on the advisability of maintaining our present military commitment to Europe in view of the current economic and military situation in Europe."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a point of order against this amendment on the ground that it is not in the nature of a substitute. This amendment has no relationship and should not be in order as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PEYSER. I do, Mr. Chairman. I think that this is in direct relationship to the amendment. We are dealing with troop reduction and the whole question of troop reduction, and it seems to me it relates and is a substitute for the amendment that has been offered by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, could I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if an amendment is appropriate to cut personnel, it is equally appropriate for an amendment to order the Committee on Armed Services to study and make a report to the House. I see no basis whatsoever for the point of order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further, as I understand it is not appropriate to offer in the nature of a substitute a proposal that does something quite different and unrelated. In other words if the pending amendment were defeated, the gentleman's amendment would be in order, but this deals with a different part of the bill really and addresses itself to a different subject matter. The original amendment does not deal with the troops in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state it does not deal with a different section of the bill. It deals with the same section, with section 301, and it deals generally with the same topic. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, one of the points that has come out continually this afternoon has been the statement that says "we do not take too great a risk if we start cutting our troops in NATO." I do not care whether the numbers are 100,000 or 300,000 or whatever the numbers may be, I frankly do not think the United States should be taking any risks at this time unless we thoroughly know what we are doing. It is for this reason that in this amendment I am asking the Armed Services Committee of the House to do an independent study and to report back to the Congress by April 1, 1974, on the exact situation they find in Europe with the NATO forces, taking into consideration the economic picture we are facing in the world today and also the military picture.

It is my hope that by April we will know something about the mutual reduction pact that is now under way. I think it would be quite ridiculous for us as a nation to, in effect, fly by the seat of our pants and at this point after years of NATO during which we have not had a war in Europe now to start pulling out the troops without knowing what we are doing. My amendment calls for the study and a report back to the House giving us information.

I would like to mention something else. Just last week we had the opportunity of talking and listening to the former Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the present Secretary of State William Rogers. Among several things that they were in agreement on they stated there is a great temptation today to pull back troops, to go into our shell. It might sound very appealing to the American people because we are in an economic bind and we would like to save a billion dollars.

They did not want us to fall into the trap. They urged us to stand up on this issue and not give way to those who would say: Let us save some money today.

I think I heard the figure before. If we were in war today we would be spending $600 million a day. So we are talking in some of these amendments about saving 8 days of war. There is a great deal more to be saved, and that is human lives and American lives. I think we ought to hold fast in NATO until we hear from our Armed Services Committee and know exactly what the situation is. I am convinced we will know more and will be able to act intelligently at that time. Let us not give in to the easy answer until we know better, let us stay with the position that a strong America is our best bet for peace.

I hope you will support my substitute to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. I intend to support it. Consideration of troop reductions is a very serious matter. I do not think it ought to be done in the hasty manner in which it would be accomplished if we pass the pending amendment. It should be done after careful study.

The House Armed Services Committee did have a committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) which went into our troop commitments in NATO in great depth. We concluded there should be no reductions. I will admit to the gentleman that study is more than a year old and perhaps in the light of recent developments it should be redone and we should go into it again.

One other advantage I see in the gentleman's substitute amendment is this: This study would tend to act as an incentive to our European allies to step up their own commitments, and after all that is the purpose we are all trying to accomplish.

Mr. PEYSER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I too congratulate the gentleman in his support of this substitute amendment. As one member of the Armed Services Committee I heartily endorse his position. I feel one thing this House ought to bear in mind is that our Committee on Armed Services is capable and we will be able to do the job assigned to us by this substitute amendment and complete that assignment and study as soon as possible.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as the members may have noticed, or hopefully they have noticed, I have been very quiet during this entire debate and discussion today because I have such valiant troops backing me up so that there is no need of my taking the time of the members, and I have succeeded in not doing that. However, now we come right to the crux of the whole situation. This is the decision, and the moment of decision, and we have to make it, we have to face up to it.

I rise here in support of the substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader (Mr. O'NEILL) whom I think perhaps is one of the finest Americans I have ever known; one of the most patriotic men I have ever known; and who has in his heart to do something that he thinks is the right thing to do, and to do it for his country.

Here is an example which has been demonstrated again, and the Members will recall that I warned yesterday that we should be cautious, logical, and reasonable in approaching these decisions we are about to make. Here today we had one member offer an amendment when he did not realize how many men he was asking to be cut.

Here, we have the distinguished majority leader, who, except for the alertness of the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) was making an inadvertent error of almost 100,000 people, is typically an example of a mistake which could have gone unnoticed and ridden on the popularity of the majority leader, and yet this mistake would have been made.

The argument is made about what the Senate is going to do—I do not care what the Senate is going to do. I care about what we are going to do, and we cannot follow the lead of the Senate. If the Senate wants to cut all the troops out, that is its business. I do not want to.

The substitute amendment expresses the philosophy that has been expressed in the Armed Services Committee. The Armed Services Committee studied this matter in depth. It debated the various alternatives and considered the priorities and came up with the proposition that the 13,000 man cut which we made was the proper cut at this time, recognizing that already 94,000 less troops were offered in this year's bill.

To say, "Let us cut here and there," I do not know whether 50,000 troops can be cut in Europe, in the Air Force or in the Army. I do not know. I would like to find out. How are we going to find out? Through making a study of it. That is all we want to do. That is all we ask.

It is our philosophy to do this, and that is what the substitute amendment does. Here is a letter addressed to me as of yesterday, July 30, 1973, from the Secretary of State:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1973.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The House has before it several measures calling for non-reciprocated reductions in U.S. forces overseas. I would like to explain why the State Department considers these proposals unwise.

The Department fully recognizes that very important changes are taking place in political relations among the principal world power centers. In this period of transition, a principal goal of our foreign policy is to achieve, through a process of negotiation, a stable and enduring system of relationships that will insure our security and that of our Allies at lower levels of cost and risk. SALT I, the Berlin Agreements and the Vietnam accords are concrete examples of progress we have made. We have also been able in the last four years to reduce our total armed forces by about 1.2 million men, and our overseas deployments by about one half.

But much remains to be done. Force reduction talks with the Warsaw Pact start in October. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe continues its work in Geneva next month. We are deeply involved in the second phase of SALT. Although different in subject matter, each of these negotiations has a central purpose: to identify areas of agreement with our adversaries which can safely and in due time permit corresponding reductions in the size of our forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HÉBERT was allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I read further from the letter:

This will not be a rapid or easy process.

Mind that line:

This will not be a rapid or easy process.

Certainly he does not mean this is going to be a simple process of, at the last minute, one of the most able and efficient and popular Members of the House, rushing in here with an amendment in a few seconds and, after a few minutes' discussion, we find it is faulty by 100,000 men. I continue to read—

A reduction in U.S. forces without reciprocity from our adversaries would make it very difficult—even impossible—to pursue this objective at all.

In my view, Western Europe is at present the area where an undiminished U.S. presence has the greatest importance, because of our NATO commitments, the evolving European political situation, force reduction talks and our changing relations with the Soviet Union. Other areas, however, are also important. Reductions in South Korea before the North and South find mutually acceptable ways to reduce tensions would have an adverse impact on those negotiations.

I emphasize this, and the emphasis is my own.

just as a U.S. reduction in Europe would under-cut MBFR. Our forces in Taiwan are tied to the U.S. commitment in the Shanghai Communique to reduce, and ultimately remove, those forces as tensions in the area are reduced. Reductions in Thailand clearly depend on the situation in Southeast Asia. Our forces in Japan and Okinawa are at the very heart of our security position in East Asia. Finally, it would be shortsighted to make further cuts in the United States Navy while Soviet naval power is growing and after the drastic reductions in our naval forces that have already taken place since 1969.

Of course, that area is now removed because the gentleman from New York detected an error in the motion made by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I read further from the letter:

We do not intend or desire to maintain an unchanged world-wide force posture indefinitely. However, the extent to which we reduce our force levels depends squarely upon the extent to which our adversaries are prepared to reduce theirs. No responsible President could risk a reduction without reciprocity any more than he could fail to seek such a reduction with reciprocity. We are committed to that effort and we have moved closer to its success.

I urge the Congress to continue to support this process by rejecting measures aimed at reducing our forces overseas without reciprocity from our adversaries.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the O'Neill amendment and to support the Peyser substitute.

Let me at the outset compliment the Committee on the strong action and the fine votes that have been taken in not gutting our Defense Establishment. I believe these votes indicate quite clearly that we are not going to weaken our Defense Establishment at a time when we have an opportunity, by being strong and wise militarily, to achieve a negotiated reduction in overseas forces not only in Europe but elsewhere.

History is supposed to teach us something. Past experience is supposed to keep us from repeating mistakes. From past experience we hope to learn what we ought to or ought not to do in the future.

We have had peace in Europe for 28 years, from 1945 to 1973. We have had peace in Europe because of the wisdom, under President Truman, of putting together a NATO alliance.

Mr. Chairman, we have had peace in Europe for 28 years, because every President following President Truman had the foresight and the support of the Congress in maintaining a sufficient military strength in Western Europe, a deterrence against any military aggression by any other adversary.

What happened after World War I, a war that was supposed to end all wars? At that time there was the great hope and expectation, in 1919, that peace had come for all time. Peace failed in that era, in the twenties and in the thirties, because the efforts that were made to put together a unified Europe and a League of Nations failed. That unified effort that failed can be laid at the doorstep of the U.S. Congress. The United States failed in that period to join an organization that might have been a means of preventing World War II.

We had a short span of two decades of peace, 20 years of peace, and then World War II broke out in 1939. Some 16 million Americans in World War II served in the Army, in the Air Force, in the Marines, and in the Coast Guard. The records show approximately 291,000 Americans lost their lives in World War II, a substantial number of them lost their lives in Europe. This worldwide military conflict developed because this Congress in the decades of the twenties and the thirties, failed to understand that military strength is the best deterrent against any enemy aggression.

Let me say that I sincerely hope we do not fall into the same trap. In contrast why do we not continue to pursue a policy that has worked for 28 years, a policy that has kept peace in an area of the world where historically there was one war after another?

I do not think it makes sense for us here on this occasion to pull the rug out from under a military alliance that has been successful.

I fully supported the Strategic Arms Limitation No. 1. I believe that was a strong first step leading to perhaps other agreements that will permit us to reduce our strength as the other side reduces its strength. I strongly support SALT II, but this is a mutual weapons reduction. At the same time we should negotiate to reduce their forces as we reduce our forces in NATO.

It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is without any foundation in fact. It is opposed by the Defense Department, by the Chiefs of Staff, and it is opposed by the overwhelming majority of the members of the committee of the House of Representatives who know more about this critical issue than most of us do. I

refer to the House Committee on Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that these amendments that are pulled out of a hat cannot be justified, and, therefore, I strongly recommend that the committee which has the responsibility of advising us on military matters be given an opportunity to make an independent study and report to us by April 1.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us at this juncture to understand clearly where we are and understand the intent of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, in offering his amendment.

I would like to ask, if I might, this question: It is my understanding that in substance the gentleman's amendment will reduce by approximately 100,000 the forces overseas, excluding Navy personnel?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct. And excluding Marine personnel.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, it is also my understanding that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts would leave a total end-strength, a year-end strength reduction of a figure approximately either totaling 100,000 or 192,000? I was not sure.

Mr. O'NEILL. Four hundred thousand. I would leave 400,000 of our troops overseas. So we cut our overseas military, Army and Air Force, strength 50,000 each, leaving 400,000 for the Army and Air Force, to place in areas which they desire to have them. In other words, if they want to leave them all in NATO, I do not disturb it whatsoever, or if they want to leave them in Korea or if they want to leave the 1,000 they have in Bermuda. They must have a pretty good deal there, but if they want to leave 1,000 in Bermuda, they can leave them.

Mr. ESCH. I understand. But it is also my understanding the total end strength of the armed services would be reduced by 100,000?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ESCH. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I think it is important to recognize the intent of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts and against the substitute as offered by the gentleman from New York. I would like to take just a few minutes to explain my position.

Most of the members of the committee are well aware of the fact that I had a substantive amendment in which I was joined by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), which would have cut in a comparative way 100,000 troops from overseas. In addition it would also have reduced the end strength by 200,000.

Because the main amendment before us is in essence the amendment I intended to introduce, I will support that main amendment, although I think it is unfortunate we are not cutting total end strength by another 100,000.

Now let us address ourselves to the issue as to whether or not we should cut overseas and if that is a responsible amendment.

First of all, it should be pointed out that the debate is not on the question are we going to cut NATO or are we not going to cut NATO. As indicated by the maker of the amendment and by the dialog in the House, there is a general feeling that this is not the time to cut our NATO forces. However, within this year it may well be possible after the discussion commences; it may well be possible after the mutual reduction to cut in that area. However, this amendment before us today would allow us substantially to cut our forces overseas without touching the NATO forces.

There are forces in the Far East, in Japan and Thailand and the islands, which could be cut without reduction of forces in NATO. So remember, then, the issue is not "are we going to cut in NATO or not going to cut in NATO." You can support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts without touching the NATO forces.

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

Mr. ESCH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I want to say that while I opposed the Dellums amendment, because I thought it was too deep and did force a cut in NATO, which I am not in favor of doing, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) which corresponds to the amendment you are going to offer, seems to be well within our capacity and it does not require any reduction in NATO.

Further, I understand the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) may offer a perfecting amendment to Mr. O'NEILL's amendment which may clear it so that we will be cautious about any cut in NATO. If that happens, I hope Mr. BUCHANAN's, which is a perfecting amendment, will carry and that we will adopt that decision.

Mr. ESCH. I understand that, and I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Mr. ESCH. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I would like to say clearly and on the record that I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks in support of the amendment offered by our distinguished majority leader, Mr. O'NEILL, and also associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

There is little question but that the time has come when we must view our troop commitments in a new light. The dollar is under heavy pressure in foreign financial markets; urgent domestic needs, for improved housing, hospitals, schools, and pollution treatment, have been too long neglected; and a spending ceiling has recently been enacted by the Congress.

What all these facts lead to is the obvious conclusion that we can no longer afford to provide all the programs and funds that the Department of Defense may wish to have.

We have a tight budget, and we must all of us—including the military—learn to live within it.

Now, of course, our national security is an extremely vital consideration. But, in an era of improved relations with Russia and China, and after successful conclusion of the SALT talks, I do not see that our national security is in any way jeopardized by the amendment under consideration. On the contrary, reducing our overseas presence lessens the chance for new military involvements such as our recent unfortunate experience in Vietnam.

In short, we are presented by this amendment with the opportunity to—by the same stroke—reduce the likelihood of future entanglements such as Vietnam, and to increase the likelihood that our too long neglected domestic needs will be met.

There is every reason to support a proposal as sensible and timely as the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader, and I urge the Congress to adopt it.

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

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his fine statement and urge strong support for the O'Neill amendment. We have been closing bases here at home, and I think it is time we took a good look at the bases all around the world, whether in NATO or not, and consider whether we can make troop reductions without jeopardizing our national security.

It is most important to note that this amendment would reduce overseas forces by 100,000 men excluding Navy and Marine personnel. None of these have to come out of Europe if the Defense Department feels that this would not be advisable. With over 600,000 U.S. troops stationed at 1,963 installations overseas there are many other areas where our strength could be reduced.

After a long and bitter political struggle, Congress has finally ended the wasteful and devisive Indochina war effort. So this war can no longer be used as an excuse for an oversized military establishment and the taxpayer can now begin to see some savings in what has been one of the biggest drains on his tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this administration is to be commended for its efforts to shut down unnecessary military bases. These bases have long been maintained solely for political reasons and they, too, have helped soak the poor taxpayer.

Now it is time to match base closings in this Nation with base closings abroad. The United States over the last two decades has completely overextended itself in this regard. It has been estimated that the cost of overseas personnel and facility maintenance approaches $30 billion annually. At least one-third of our serious balance-of-payments deficit can be attributed to our military expenditures abroad. The O'Neill amendment, by reducing overseas personnel by 100,000, would be a first step in reducing this cost.

Mr. Chairman, all of those who worked to develop this amendment, particularly the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), are to be commended. They have focused on a problem which is central to the struggle to control the budget.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Maryland.

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

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Esch-Carter amendment and I am happy to be one of its cosponsors. This amendment is well thought out and represents an opportunity to cut out excess spending in the military while not cutting into the meat of national security.

The Esch-Carter amendment has two provisions. One will limit the size of our Armed Forces to 2,019,000 men. This is a cut of 200,000 from the committee bill. The second major provision is that it would limit our aggregate force level overseas to 500,000. The committee bill makes no mention of our forces overseas.

Manpower makes up over 50 percent of military costs. Some Department of Defense estimates, after PX's, pension pay and other manpower related expenses are figured to go as high as 56 percent. Clearly, if we are to make a real effort to cut our budget, to stick within our own budget ceiling and President Nixon's budget ceiling, we must cut the defense budget down to a figure proportionate to our limited resources, our national security needs, and our total priority values.

The cut in total manpower is 200,000 men below the committee recommendation. The Armed Services Committee in the other body has already slashed the authorized manpower 136,000 below what our distinguished committee in the House has recommended. Clearly, there is a lack of consensus as to what the minimum manpower requirement of the U.S. military is.

Our Armed Forces must be a rather small but highly trained, professional fighting force to provide a short-term, conventional arm of our flexible response defense strategy. We must make the military a life that highly qualified men and women will find desirable to enter, both as enlisted and officer personnel. We have made some progress toward this goal by cuts made in manpower as our involvement in Indochina lessened. We have also given substantial pay raises to all of our men, and increased pension and other fringe benefits. We must, in addition, limit the size of our Armed Forces to a number which, while adequate to defense, will produce more volunteers than needed. We must raise the standards for admittance and make the military more than a "few good men." It should be a "few good and envied men."

I believe that the Esch-Carter amendment would render harm to our Armed Forces. It should help to raise the level of competence and, in that way, enhance national security.

The second half of the Esch-Carter amendment limits our forces overseas to 500,000. This represents a cut of 113,000 over present levels. There are many areas of the world where we could cut the number of troops while not risking the credibility of our involvement.

Europe is the area which has received the most attention. In the last year we have reached new accommodations with the Soviet Union. The agreement on Berlin has been reached. We now have SALT I signed and SALT II is promised by the end of next year. We hear from the State Department and the Department of Defense that the Europeans are now willing to take up more of the burden of their own defense. The European Security Conference is about to start in earnest. With all of these tension relaxing actions, what has happened to U.S. force levels in Europe? It has increased from 303,000 to 313,000.

We are told that we cannot withdraw our forces, because the mutual force reduction talks are going to start next week. What is not mentioned is that our European allies are opposed to any force reduction, to any MBFR. In addition, the level of troops being discussed is in the vicinity of 50,000 to 75,000.

We have also been told that the Europeans have been paying us a small sum to offset our balance-of-payments deficit. The amount paid by our allies is only a fraction of what it costs to maintain our forces in Europe. I do not like having a "rent an army" service for others who can defend themselves and who are paying a substantially smaller portion of their GNP than we are, for their own defense. The French have been the most emphatic in demanding that our troops remain. Yet it was the French who kicked us and NATO out of France, and it is the French who are now using their defense dollars in atmospheric, nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

Under the Esch-Carter amendment, the Secretary of Defense does not have to withdraw any troops from Europe. He can pick and choose as he pleases as long as the end of the year overseas force does not exceed 500,000. I surely hope he chooses Europe as a source for most of the reduction. Europe makes up a little over half of our troops abroad.

Over 28 years after World War II, the United States still has over 58,000 troops stationed in Japan. But if you read the Department of Defense tables, the figure is only 18,000. The reason for this discrepancy is that the Department of Defense lists the 40,000 troops in the Ryukyuan Islands separately. The Ryukyu Islands have been a part of Japan since the Meiji Restoration of 1871. They were occupied by the United States following World War II and they have recently been returned to Japan. I believe that the 58,000 troops stationed in Japan may be too high.

It has been a little over a year since North and South Korea announced that they will reunify in the next few years. Yet we continue to have 42,000 men stationed in Korea despite the fact that the South Korean armed forces is among the largest and most modern in the world.

It is easy to see that there are a number of areas ripe for troop reductions and that this amendment provides the administration great flexibility in determining where to make the cuts.

The savings under this amendment is estimated at between $2.5 to $3.0 billion. I think that this is the prime consideration which should be weighed in favor of this amendment. I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder where we are going to cut these troops from? I have heard speaker after speaker say that we should go slow, we should get a report, find out what is going to happen and where we can make these cuts sensibly. Now I hear the gentleman on the floor suggesting a meat-ax cut for 100,000 troops, and the gentleman does not know where they will be taken from or what our services require. The gentleman has no knowledge as to what they require, or as to what is going on in other parts of the world. But 100,000 is the figure that is arbitrarily set.

Now, tell me where they will get them from, and what it will do to those men who have been induced to go in by virtue of recruiting promises that we now seem to be backing out of.

Mr. ESCH. I appreciate the gentleman's question. Let us examine the significance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There are now 606,000 troops stationed overseas, and of this there would be a reduction of 100,000, excluding Navy personnel.

Now the question is, from what areas do we reduce forces? Well, in Thailand we have 45,000 troops. In Japan there are 18,000. In the Ryukyu Islands, there are 42,000 troops. In South Korea there were 38,000 troops, and it is now up to 42,000. So there is an opportunity for a substantial reduction.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I will not yield further at this time. I will be happy to yield if I might be permitted to summarize my comments.

I think it is important for us to recog-

nize that the issue alone is not just how strong this country is going to be overseas militarily. If there is any movement of this current administration it is a recognition that we must take into account not only the military aspect, but the political and economic aspects as well.

Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that we have an opportunity to move toward the achievement of several goals in one amendment. I would submit that this amendment offers us just such an opportunity. With its adoption, we can move to remedy a serious balance-of-payments problem, we can take a meaningful step toward the much talked about goal of reordering national priorities, and we can contribute to a worldwide détente, a détente which has the full support of this administration.

Economically, there can be no question as to desirability of this proposal. The U.S. balance-of-payments problem continues to plague us, our current deficit reaching almost $10 billion. While this is the case, we maintain a troop level abroad whose cost is calculated to be $7.5 billion annually, and this figure represents labor costs only. Others have estimated that the total cost of maintaining bases, troops, and facilities abroad approaches $30 billion annually. Clearly, here lies one of the main sources of that continuing deficit.

There are those who would question the advisability of reducing our troops overseas on an economic basis alone, that indeed, such a reduction affects U.S. posture abroad. As I will point out later to so argue is not my intention. However, just as troop reductions should be viewed in a larger context than just economics, so should, I believe, U.S. posture abroad be viewed in a larger context than mere troop levels. This debate has been strewn with references to America's credibility abroad and the necessity of maintaining our allies' faith in the United States. Yet nowhere is that credibility more in question, nowhere is that faith more badly shaken than in relation to the American dollar. U.S. foreign policy should not be based on economic considerations alone. Yet I would submit that to discount these considerations is an equally parochial view.

Domestically, this amendment conforms with the much needed reordering of national priorities that so many have concerned themselves with. It has been estimated by the Senate Armed Services Committee that the average cost of maintaining one unit of end strength during fiscal year 1974 would be $12,488. Using these figures, the savings under this amendment would approach $1.3 billion annually.

We should, of course, not fool ourselves into thinking that we are transferring this $1.3 billion from the military budget to education, or health services, or environmental control or to any of the myriad of pressing domestic needs. Unfortunately, the Congress never has the opportunity to vote on the budget as a whole and, therefore, determines with one decision what the national priorities are to be. We can only vote one item at a time, each of us trying to be consistent with what we believe those priorities should be. This amendment offers us that opportunity.

This administration has talked a great deal about reordering national priorities. Having brought our troops home from Vietnam, it has called for a conversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy. The amendment begins to answer that call.

Politically, this amendment is fully in line with the policy this administration has embarked upon—a policy of detente and of reduction of the U.S. military presence abroad. The desire for a detente with the East has been at the core of this administration's foreign policy. It has told both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China that in an easing of tensions rests the hope of future peace. Nowhere could the sincerity of this hope be more easily demonstrated than by a reduction of U.S. military presence around the world. As Admiral Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, pointed out before the Senate Armed Services Committee:

> True detente requires a reduction in the underlying political and economic sources of conflict and an atmosphere free of force and the threat of force.

The administration itself has spoken in terms of troop reductions in putting forth the "Nixon doctrine." As Secretary Rogers summarized that doctrine:

> It provides that the United States will reduce its presence, particularly its military presence, in areas where we are overextended.

Or as Mr. Nixon himself has said:

> A more balanced and realistic American role in the world is essential if American commitments are to be sustained over the long pull . . . to insist that other nations play a role is not a retreat from responsibility, it is a sharing of responsibility. This is not a way for America to withdraw from its indispensable role in the world. It is a way, the only way, we can carry out our responsibility.

The approach in this amendment is a flexible one. It makes no attempt to dictate from where overseas troops must be taken, leaving this decision to the Pentagon. In Asia alone we see the possibility of reducing our troop levels by the 100,000 called for in this amendment. In Japan we maintain 18,000; in the Philippines, 15,000; in South Korea, 42,000; in the Ryukyu Islands, 40,000; and in Thailand, 45,000.

It may be suggested that this is an irresponsible amendment. Yet is it irresponsible to attempt to alleviate our balance-of-payments problem? To the contrary.

Is it irresponsible to take a meaningful step toward reordering this Nation's spending priorities? To the contrary.

Is it irresponsible to leave the Pentagon with the flexibility to cut troops where they feel those cuts can best be made? To the contrary.

Is it irresponsible to demonstrate our sincere belief in detente by contributing to that détente? To the contrary.

To all these questions, Mr. Chairman, the answer is "No." It is a responsible amendment, one which is flexible in approach, and one which moves toward the attainment of multiple goals. I urge you to join in this effort.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to be aware that we are dealing with a rather complicated matter here. It is a matter on which the House has now spoken twice in rejecting irresponsible and ill-conceived proposals for cutting forces overseas. Now we are confronted with another one which, in the first place, came in with defective numbers, and, in the second place, places burdens on the military that nobody really understands, and that we are not at all clear as to what the precise effect will be.

First of all, the proposal of the gentleman from Massachusetts would reduce the Air Force by 50,000 personnel. If we are going to take 50,000 personnel out of the overseas Air Force, we are going pretty much to destroy the various Air Force bases around the world which are now designed to protect us in the strategic field as well as in the tactical field. When we talk about bringing troops home from NATO, we are talking about the GI's over in Germany. We want to get those GI's home. But nobody is really suggesting, are they, that we call the Air Force home? Nobody suggests, does he, that we call the Navy home? Because those two branches of our military can project our power around the world, as the Nixon doctrine proclaims, without committing American ground troops.

Yet, although the gentleman from Massachusetts has exempted the Navy from his amendment, and thus does not interfere with the 6th Fleet and the job it is doing in the Middle East, he, nevertheless, would impose a 50,000-reduction on the Air Force, and that cut is going to involve our B–52's on Guam; it is going to involve our defensive air forces in Japan; it is going to involve our defensive air forces in England, where our F–111 bombers are poised to deter any invasion of Europe. This Air Force cut could be a very irresponsible amendmend. That is why I support the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER). I think he has done an excellent job to have this matter studied by the relevant committee.

We cannot conduct strategy here on this floor, and we ought to recognize it, when we cannot even get numbers straight on an amendment.

Now second, we in Congress have been talking about reducing our NATO forces for a long time. We have said we have to get our troops home, because nobody is willing to make any reductions on the other side. Well, finally, in this year 1973, we have reached a condition of such détente with the Soviet Union that we have finally been able to get mutual and balanced force reduction talks underway. This year, 1973, the year we have finally gotten the talks started, do we now pass legislation to gut our forces in NATO without even waiting to see what those talks with the Russians will produce?

What was the point of getting Brezh-

nev over here? What was the point of giving him another golf cart, if it were not to try to get him to sit down and talk seriously about mutual and balanced force reduction? Why do we not let those talks go on? The gentleman from New York would at least give these talks until next April to see whether we can get the Russians to agree to withdraw forces at the same time that we withdraw some. Why do we have to take steps here tonight to guarantee that the Russians will withdraw no forces because they will know we intend to make our reductions without any quid pro quo?

These are the two basic reasons why we just cannot handle these complex military problems as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts would do. I know what is in his heart. I know he wants to reduce our forces and reduce our expenditures to aid domestic causes. As a matter of fact, that is what our committee has been trying to do, too. But we ought to try to give this task to those with the expertise to handle it, in the committee itself, and not try to settle this matter on the floor of the House at 7:30 in the evening when everybody is anxious to go home.

So let us support the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York and vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'NEILL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN to the amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL: Immediately before the period at the end thereof insert the following: ": *Provided*, That any determination with respect to the number of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (hereinafter in this section referred to as "NATO" shall take into consideration the following: (1) the importance of NATO to the security of the United States and to the stability of Europe, (2) prospective negotiations between representatives of NATO and member nations of the Warsaw Pact with respect to mutual reductions in force, (3) the European Security Conference at Helsinki, Finland, (4) the level of effort by NATO allies of the United States to offset financial burdens incurred by the United States as a result of stationing personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States in Europe, (5) the need to eliminate unnecessary military manpower in Europe, and (6) any political consequences in Europe of any unilateral reduction of personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed in Europe".

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order or a parliamentary inquiry. Is this an amendment to the substitute amendment or an amendment to the O'NEILL amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is an amendment to the O'NEILL amendment.

Mr. CONLAN. Is it proper to take that up at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair it is in order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am simply here trying to play fair with the Members of this Committee by setting before the Members the alternatives they do in fact face.

I am well aware that the probability is we will adopt the substitute recommended and offered by the gentleman from New York and will not therefore be voting on the O'Neill amendment, but should the vote occur on the O'Neill amendment or any similar cutting amendment, I wanted to offer this amendment thereto to underline the fact that if we will adopt this amendment, should the situation occur that it might be possible, we will be saying we do not intend to cut NATO forces at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is of extreme importance. We are on the eve of mutual and balanced force reduction discussions. We have some reason to hope we can get the other side to make concessions through hard-nosed bargaining from a position of strength. Under these circumstances, it is economically questionable and politically and militarily wrong to unilaterally cut NATO forces. I urge the Committee not to take any action which would imply we are endorsing that idea.

I am concerned about the political and psychological repercussions of any vote by this body which would imply we want to reduce NATO forces unilaterally at this time. Of course we need to work for our NATO allies to bear a fairer share of the economic burden and the administration is publicly committed to that end. There have been repeated statements to that end, that we will work for a fairer burden sharing, but this does not necessarily involve bringing our troops home.

Indeed economically it may even cost more to bring our troops home unless we take them out of the service.

So I would offer this amendment to this Committee and this House to clearly say we do not endorse the unilateral withdrawal of NATO forces at this time.

But we are faced with a second question, Mr. Chairman, and that is whether or not there shall be any reduction anywhere in the world. I think before we vote on the substitute we need to understand that this at least will be offered, that we can say, yes, we will support some reductions in force somewhere but we do not endorse unilateral withdrawal from NATO at this time.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in this bill this year we are cutting 95,000 men below the authorized strength we have in 1973? That is 13,000 less than was requested by the Department of Defense this year. So we are in this bill already cutting 95,000.

Why do we not wait to find out what we need so as to successfully discuss the project now before us in Europe? Why can we not wait until the first of April 1974 to be sensible, until a report comes in, so that we who are in the military business can justify the work that has been done by the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I ordinarily would be simply supporting the substitute and opposing any cut. That has been my normal position in this House year after year after year. However, I am really concerned about a couple of things. The first is that the distinguished Armed Services Committee of the other body said that it felt it could safely cut 150,000 troops. I am not an expert, but they are. This is not the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but a committee which has expertise in military affairs. If they say we can safely save some of the taxpayers' money in this way, perhaps they are right.

Second, for more than a year one of my subcommittees, the European Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, has been attempting in vain to obtain information from the U. S. Navy pertinent to why they saw fit to home port in Athens, Greece, rather than somewhere else, and we have simply been unable to obtain that information. One of the reasons I think it may be possible for us to cut forces is that the chief admiral in the Navy, Admiral Zumwalt, said in testimony last week before my committee, after he had explained to us that we were laymen who could not understand maritime affairs, that according to his own expertise, Athens, Greece, is the only place he could reasonably home port in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(At the request of Mr. HUNT and by unanimous consent Mr. BUCHANAN was allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. He said further that if we do not home port in Athens, we will simply bring them home and have them based in the United States. He said if he cannot home port and I quote: "I will be forced to recommend a reduction of the Navy's commitment to the 6th Fleet to one carrier task group."

If the head man of the Navy feels he can cut the 6th Fleet in half if he does not get the specific port he wants in Athens, then it would appear to me that he has said, in effect, that there must be some basis for believing Greek homeporting to be of high enough priority that we should have a cut in forces, if it is not implemented.

I do not agree with the philosophy. I do not think we can cut the 6th Fleet, but it simply seems to me that this one who does have expertise says, "Give me the Greek home port, or I recommend we cut the 6th Fleet."

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the quotation that the gentleman from Alabama read correctly, Admiral Zumwalt was saying that he was advocating the cutting in half of our aircraft carrier fleet in the Mediterranean. The gentleman might leave us with the inference that this is what the admiral was proposing. It is just the opposite.

Mr. BUCHANAN. He did not advocate the cut. He said if he did not get the

home porting in Athens, he would recommend that they be based in the United States, and if he could not get home porting he would recommend the carrier task force be cut in half.

I am talking about priorities. I say it should not be cut at all. But if the admiral truly reflected our sense of priorities and the degree of flexibility in the Navy, perhaps a reduction in forces is not as serious a matter as I deem it to be in this high-priority area, and perhaps cuts can be made in lower priority areas. The distinguished committee in the other body does have expertise, as I said, and they have voted a substantial cut.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the gentleman with great interest, particularly on the discussion of the Navy. However, the O'Neill amendment does not reflect cutting anything from the Navy.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. I do not want the Navy cut.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman tell me how his amendment would amend the O'Neill amendment?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It simply explains that we do not recommend cuts in NATO forces outside the context of mutual and balanced force reductions, and would indicate our opposition to unilateral withdrawal without consultation, sober consideration and hopefully concessions on the other side.

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

(At the request of Mr. HÉBERT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BUCHANAN was allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

Mr. BUCHANAN. What I am trying to say is that if we cut, do not cut NATO without taking these things into consideration unless we have an agreement for a mutual cut.

Mr. HÉBERT. That does not change one word of the amendment. It says, cut 50,000 Air Force, 50,000 Army, and the gentleman's amendment does not change it a bit. It reduces the overseas strength to 400,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is precisely correct. I am trying to set the alternatives. It requires a cut, and it says, "do not take it from NATO."

Mr. HÉBERT. This is a lot of words, and says nothing.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; it says, "Do not take it from NATO". That is something.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. The amended amendment, the corrected amendment of the majority leader of this House does not cut the Navy.

So the Buchanan amendment is superfluous. The gentleman is just saying he wants to cut something but he does not want to cut the Navy.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What I am saying is not to take the forces from NATO.

Mr. HUNT. We agreed on that twice before.

Mr. BUCHANAN. All right.

Mr. HUNT. By votes today.

Now let us get back to the figures again. We are saying in the bill we are going to cut, and that this does cut 95,000 personnel. The other body is saying that they want to cut 150,000. If we take 95,000 from 150,000, that is 55,000. I realize there has been a tremendous discrepancy here in mathematics today. Everything that has come up here has been erroneous. By that I mean the figures in amendments have been grossly in error. But I do not see 100,000 coming out of that figure considering the 95,000 cut already contained in the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman has spoken eloquently against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I hope he will support mine.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

I have finally been able to get hold of a copy of the amendment of the gentleman and I note there he includes five or six recitations.

The gentleman has just finished saying this would not do any detriment to NATO. A careful study of the amendment, I believe, reveals, and as I understand the parliamentary situation, that the gentleman's amendment does nothing. It would have no effect or achieve no objective of any kind.

At this time we are in a parliamentary situation, whereby the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered an amendment, and then by unanimous consent asks it to be modified. He finally said he was going to leave the Navy out and to leave the Marines out of his amendment. Finally he said his amendment would cut 50,000 from the Army and 50,000 from the Air Force. That adds up to 100,000.

We know we have approximatley 613,000, or maybe only 608,000 military personnel overseas.

Finally as I read it the gentleman from Massachusetts winds up his amendment with a provision that not more than 400,000 be deployed overseas 1 year from now.

The last amendment on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama to the gentleman from Massachusetts is simply a series of recitations, nothing more—and it means nothing.

We do have before us a substitute that has real merit, which was offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

I know the hour is getting late, but let me take only a minute or two to stress the importance of Mr. PEYSER'S substitute.

There are two reasons, two very valid and important reasons, why we should support the substitute, and reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, and then we can get to a vote on the amendment offered by our majority leader.

The lady from Maryland very graciously mentioned a moment ago the Randall report, which contained the NATO common fund. I hope I am not speaking out of school.

I can report that we have discussed this matter informally within the past 2 weeks, the past 10 days, with our new Secretary of Defense when the Minister of Defense of Germany was in the city Our Secretary of Defense informally told some of us it would be only a matter of a few months until some kind of NATO common fund arrangement to relieve our balance-of-payments burden could be worked out with our allies in NATO.

He thought we could achieve the adoption of some sort of alternative to our proposal of a NATO common fund. If he can accomplish this then we strike at the very thing we are all concerned about, that is the balance-of-payments deficit.

I believe it has been established this afternoon that if we bring the troops back we will not save money, unless we demobilize them. In fact, it would cost more for them to stay in this country, for we would have to build facilities for them.

The second point is the merit of the proposal by the gentleman from New York. We can update the report. We can find some figures that perhaps should be amended.

The point is that we can come back here with some new information. Tonight we have been up the hill and down the hill four or five times this afternoon, on the question of withdrawal of troops from NATO. But remember, we are now on the verge of achieving a mutual reduction of forces. The amendment of Mr. PEYSER would give us some time, because it provides that the committee would make another report.

I hope we can vote to support the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman said that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) was all foam and no substance. Actually, since his amendment would in effect say not to take these personnel cuts out of NATO it would mean all 100,000 personnel would have to be taken out of the Pacific. And that would amount to about half of the Air Forces out there. So the Buchanan amendment could be very damaging to our Pacific defenses.

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

(Mr. GUBSER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) I believe his amendment is totally unworkable. We ought to pursue it a bit, and find out where it is going to lead us.

Where are we going to make this 100,000 reduction contained in the O'Neill amendment if we do not take it from the NATO countries?

Well, here are the eligibles: There are 24,000 in South Vietnam. Many of those are Navy, and they would not be affected by the O'Neill amendment, and furthermore, most of the balance will be coming out anyway under the reduction already made in the committee bill.

In Thailand, there are 43,000 American forces; almost all of them, with the exception of a few at the Navy base at Sattahip, are Air Force. They would be eligible for withdrawal.

In Japan we have 20,000 men, and I believe—and I think correctly—that at least half of those are Navy, and would not be affected, so we would have 10,000 Air Force personnel coming out.

In the Philippines we have 15,000, and at least half of those are Navy, so we would have 7,500 Air Force personnel coming out.

In the Ryukyu Islands we have 42,000, and I would say at least 10,000 of those would be Air Force coming out anyway, since we are going to have to reduce our forces there under the committee bill. Thus 32,000 are eligible for withdrawal under the O'Neill amendment.

In South Korea we would take out 38,000, primarily Army personnel.

I might say parenthetically, when we talk about South Korea, that they have a 5-year modernization plan which is aimed at allowing us to withdraw all our forces when that 5-year modernization plan is complete. This would absolutely kill it. It would necessitate a premature withdrawal, at a time when they were not ready to fill the gap we would leave.

Then there are other places and other areas that are too small to reduce, like Bermuda where we have a communications station; and in Canada, 2,000. The only other place eligible in the rest of the world outside of Europe is Guam, with 17,000, and almost all of those are Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, all of those eligible for withdrawal total up to 147,500.

My point is this: We are going to take 100,000 out under the O'Neill amendment. We are only leaving 47,500 if we do not take any of them from NATO. What we would be accomplishing would be the removal or withdrawal of the defense perimeter of the United States back to the continental limits of the United States. We would be leaving even Hawaii exposed.

We did that once before, before the Korean war, with disastrous results. If we gut the Air Force all over Asia, as we would with the adoption of the Buchanan and O'Neill amendments, we would have brought our defense perimeter back to the continental limits of the United States.

The Buchanan amendment is unworkable. If withdrawals are going to be made to satisfy the O'Neill amendment, and we are to have a balanced force around the world, they must come from NATO and they will come from NATO.

I will remind the House that in the 1960's our troops in Europe were reduced by almost 30 percent from their peak during the Berlin crisis down to the present level of 305,000. This decline ended in 1971 when the United States of America pledged, solemnly pledged that, given a similar approach by our allies, the United States would not only maintain its forces, but would improve them, and that we would not reduce our forces further without reciprocal action by our adversaries.

Now, the reciprocal action is something that is going to come about in the balanced forces reduction talks which start in Vienna in October. Why prejudice them? Obviously, we are not going to give them what they would be seeking in that negotiation.

Mr. Chairman, I summarize my views in this way: It is totally impossible to adopt the Buchanan amendment without either withdrawing our defense perimeters to the continental limits of the United States or stealing troops from NATO.

To take them from NATO would be denying or abrogating the solemn pledge that this nation made in 1971 and would be prejudicing the mutual balanced reduction force talks starting in Vienna in October.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. ARENDS, Mr. GUBSER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. I make this request for the purpose of asking the gentleman to once again repeat to this House, so we may all understand what this amendment does. It is the beginning of the tearing down of NATO, and you cannot put it in any other terms. It will be the first step in the breakdown of our forces overseas. We will again be back in the box that we were in many, many years ago when we found ourselves militarily weak. Years ago under President Truman when he promoted the NATO organization. I hope the gentleman will, I repeat emphasize his point once more.

Mr. GUBSER. I did.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here all afternoon listening to this nonsense going on here about the great Soviet threat.

Just a few months ago the Department of Defense swung a meat ax up there in the Northeast section of America and closed down almost every military installation in Rhode Island and Massachusetts and caused the layoff of 35,000 people from their jobs. They further placed the North Atlantic Fleet in jeopardy.

However, that is not the issue here. The real issue here is the economy of the United States and whether or not this country can bear up under its present fiscal policy. And nothing threatens a nation's security more than going broke.

We have had two official devaluations of the dollar in the last 18 months and one unofficial devaluation.

There is no reason for us not to have this 100,000 troop cut right now. Think of what it will save America. Bring those boys home here. Bring home some of those admirals and generals who are living along the Riviera and skiing up in the Alps and spending thousands and thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

We do not have the capacity to police the whole world. With the modern weaponry in existence these troops mean very little; they mean very little whatsoever.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If what the gentleman advocates came about, is it not true that the only recourse we would have in the event that war became necessary is a nuclear rather than an conventional war? I wonder if the gentleman wants to set the stage for that kind of a confrontation.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. For God's sake stop bringing up those old herrings, will you, please? Let us discuss issues around here. This threat of a nuclear war and all that.

Every time this defense bill comes in here suddenly they show up with all of those threats of the Soviet Government and everything that will happen.

We have these people over there and we have to educate their children and pay for the support of their wives and families. Bring those families back to America. They will be better off, anyway, here.

The dollar is bouncing around like a yo-yo. Right now I think it had gone down 30 percent in the last 18 months. Is that what you want? Do you want this country to collapse entirely? Are we going to have responsible people here or are we going to have the Armed Services Committee coming in here year after year and spending billions and billions of dollars in an unending river of money which is just going down the drain?

Have you ever visited some of these installations and seen the way some of these commanding generals live? I am telling you it is a public disgrace and it is about time we started to exercise some cuts on the Department of Defense and cut the fat out of them. Let us get this thing down to a reasonable position.

Let us bring these 100,000 men home. I wish it were 200,000 or 300,000. That is actually what it should be. But it is a step in the right direction.

It will help out our balance of payments and start this country back on the road to recovery.

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

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, arguing here today as to what we should do with regard to our defense establishment is much like arguing yesterday as

Mr. Chairman, arguing here today as to what we should do with regard to our defense establishment is much like arguing yesterday as to whether or not Members of Congress, as well as some others in the Federal Service,

ought to get a pay raise. The consensus seems to be the same. There never is quite the right time or quite the right way. Everybody has a little different idea.

I want to tell the Members that I have a little bit different idea than does my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE). He says that the issue here today is the economy. I submit that the issue here today is the security of the United States today and tomorrow and in the years which lie ahead. And I rally admit we are in deep trouble with our economy.

My good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), has just concurred in those remarks by Mr. BURKE, and in making his remarks he has stated the position that we have wasted through the military-industrial complex the wealth of this Nation. Maybe he is right, to a point. But it has been a pretty darned cheap insurance policy, as far as I am concerned. What would we have done, I ask, without that military—industrial complex in World War II?

This is like a friend I had who had a twin brother. The twin brother had fainting spells. I asked him one day how his twin brother was.

"Oh, not too good."

"What is wrong?" I asked.

He said, "Well, he had a fainting spell last night, and I wasted a whole bottle of ammonia on him."

I said, "did he die?"

He said, "No; he is still alive."

I said, "You figure you wasted a bottle of ammonia to keep him alive. If it saved his life how can you say it was wasted?"

The attitude is we are wasting away something if we provide for the security of this great country.

The truth is that we can legislate a ceiling on the military, but is it wise when we stop to consider that the level of our troops today is lower than it has been at any time since the Korean War in 1950? Is it further, wise with this feeble effort to provide for the manning of a military establishment by the volunteer process?

I will tell you this volunteer concept is simply not going to work. We are dealing with the security of this country at great risk, and certainly, yes, we can legislate the assignment of troops both here in the United States and oversea. But is it wise? We cannot legislate assignments with any degree of wisdom. The truth is that we have problems.

I resent some of the expenditures, as you do, that we have had to make with regard to NATO. But do not forget this: What we have done in Europe with NATO has been good for this country because it has provided in part for the security of this country. Do not mistake that for one moment.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) said that the President had opened new avenues of dialog with the Russians, and that is true, but would it be good for the security of this country if we reduced, for example, the troops in NATO, assigned to NATO? Would it be good for this country politically if we allowed Europe to come under the influence of Communist Russia? Would it be good for this country economically if we allowed Europe to come under the economic influence of Russia? What would happen to an already deteriorating economy and a deteriorating trade position—deteriorating not just because of what we have been spending on our military establishment oversea, but deteriorating because of a lot of other foolish expenditures that we have been engaging in, and which have been unproductive? What would our market position in Europe be then?

The truth is, my friends—and remember this—that NATO has served us and served us well. The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. We have not had a war in Europe for 28 years because of NATO.

I submit to the Members that if they do not believe in the domino theory, just wait until after August 15 and see what happens to Cambodia and to Laos and to Thailand, and then to South Vietnam. Do you want to set the same wheels in motion in Europe?

Further, my friends, remember just exactly this, because it is the truth: If we had had the wisdom to provide in Southeast Asia an organization somewhat equal, somewhat comparable, to NATO, we would never had had this mess that we refer to as Vietnam.

God save us from our friends, not our enemies, as well meaning as they are.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hour is late and I am not sure I can add a great deal to the discussion this evening, but I think it is important to return to a question that was asked earlier by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT), a member of the committee, when he asked the question of where are these cuts going to come from.

It was because I admired and hold in such high regard and respect the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) that I undertook to analyze the amendment that they sent around in advance of the debate this evening. We have substantially that amendment before us now in the form of the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader.

The fact is that if we exclude from the 606,000 troops we are talking about as being troops stationed abroad the number which is now in NATO—and if there is one broad consensus we seem to have reached this evening it is that we are not going to reduce those troops in view of the forthcoming mutual balance force reduction talks—if we take out the NATO contingent, and if we take out the 42,000 American troops stationed abroad in our possessions, in our own territories overseas, if we take away, as the gentleman from Massachusetts himself would suggest the 108,000 troops who are afloat, what do we have left?

According to my mathematics we have about 208,000 overseas, from which we are going to make this reduction of 100,000 as proposed by the distinguished majority leader (Mr. O'NEILL). Consider for a moment if my figures are correct, and I think they are, what this would mean. There are 58,000 of these remaining forces stationed in the Japan-Okinawa area and the Ryukyus. Some people have complained about the three successive shocks by the Nixon administration in the form of the visit to Peking without advance consultation with Japan, and the shock that was administered to the Japanese with the new economic policy in August of 1971, and the further shock of the export embargo placed recently on soybeans. To now suggest that a 50-percent cut would be made, in American forces now stationed in that area, because that is what we would have to have if we are going to get this reduction, a 50-percent cut in the forces we have in that area of the world is certainly not going to contribute very much to repairing our tattered relations with Japan.

And if the Tanaka government, as some have said, is already in some considerable difficulty, if there are Communist and neutralist forces in the country that are now making gains, and I believe they did in the last election, then I think a precipitous cut of 50 percent of the troops we now have in that area of the Pacific would merely confirm the Japanese suspicion that we are an unreliable ally. I think an abrupt withdrawal of this kind would only revive a latent tendency in Japan to revive and develop their own nuclear force.

I am suggesting to a Congress that wants to reclaim its rightful place in foreign affairs, because a majority of us voted for a War Powers Act just a few days ago, let us act responsibly in the area of foreign affairs when we consider the amendments that are now pending on the floor.

In the brief time I have left, again analyzing the amendment that is before us, we have another 42,000 of the forces from whom the reductions would have to be made who are stationed in Korea. I believe that we have reduced our troop levels in South Korea by about 35 percent since 1971. Given the hopeful but still very delicate state of negotiations between the two Koreas, negotiations that are now in progress, this does not seem to be a very propitious time to in a very precipitous manner remove those particular troops.

I think the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) referred to the 25,000 troops in the Philippines and Taiwan. Consider, if you will, the political instability in the Philippines right now. What would be the impact of our sudden withdrawal of 50 percent of the American troops in that particular area?

Do not misunderstand me. I am for a reduction in military spending and I hope there will be some amendments offered on the floor yet tonight that I can support, but when I look at the O'Neill amendment and the other amendment pending thereto, I do not think this is the area where we should be acting, where we can responsibly say we are discharging our duty with respect to the

conduct of the foreign affairs of our country. I would call for the defeat of the O'Neill amendment. I would call likewise for the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

In conclusion, I would also like to comment on the balance-of-payments problem.

A fairly effective argument given for troop reduction is that our current serious balance-of-payments difficulties would be partially alleviated by a reduction of U.S. military dollar outflows. The basic truth is that our overseas military commitments have very little to do with the recent adverse swing in the balance of payments. First, the net military outflow has been relatively stable for the last two decades: from 1965 to 1970 it averaged $3 billion; from 1970–72 it averaged $3.2 billion. During the same period our official reserves transactions balance dropped from a negative $1.2 billion in 1965, to —$30 billion in 1971 and to —$12 billion last year. The main reasons for this decline is our deteriorating trade balance and short-term money flows resulting from the weakness of the dollar. Since military outflows have been stable, it cannot be inferred that they have contributed in any dynamic way to our short-term balance-of-payments difficulties. Similar military deficits were accommodated in earlier periods with no trouble.

Finally, this analysis has assumed that none of the required overseas reduction would be taken from Europe. I do not think you need to be convinced of the undesirability of European withdrawals while mutual balanced force reduction talks are in progress, but I would like to emphasize one key point. A proposal to seriously cut European troop levels is tantamount to proposing that we revert to the dangerous John Foster Dulles doctrine of massive retaliation. That is, if overrun by superior Warsaw Pact conventional forces in Central Europe, we would respond with strategic nuclear weapons. There is just one catch-22: Such a posture under today's conditions of strategic parity—as opposed to massive U.S. superiority in the 1950's—has absolutely no credibility. As a result, massive retaliation becomes passive abdication to Soviet hegemony in Europe, as one by one our major allies would make their accommodations with that country.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Peyser substitute and in opposition to the O'Neill and Buchanan amendments. The Peyser substitute would give us the time needed to test the sincerity of the Soviets relative to the MBFR. It will also give us some time to right our balance of payments and trade deficits which is improving now, as the Members of the House know.

I would also like to respond, if I may, to a couple of statements which have been made. With respect to the grade creep, the gentleman from Massachusetts talked about the fat generals. Just recently, Mr. ASPIN, of Wisconsin, published the results of a study of grade creep of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which indicated that HEW puts the Department of Defense to shame in that area.

Citing Civil Service Commission figures, he revealed that the number of supergrade employees—those making over $31,203 annually—had increased almost five times in the past 10 years, from 84 to 414. Those in the next three grades, GS–13 to GS–15, increased fourfold. "The grade creep in the military," Mr. ASPIN stated, "actually is a pretty amateurish operation compared to what the real pros in HEW have been pulling off."

Mr. Chairman, now with respect to military spending which was discussed. I agree that we should reduce expenditures wherever and whenever appropriate, but by most any yardstick, the defense share of public spending in constant dollars as a precentage of the GNP or tax dollars, or as a factor in the Government workforce, is at the lowest point since the Korean war.

In the 20-year period between 1953 and 1973, the gross national product has risen an average of 6.2 percent annually. During the same period, the average increase in funds expended for the military forces of this Nation, including the Vietnam war period, was 2.2 percent annually.

We hear a lot about priorities, and they are essential and especially important in the present time, when we must cut the pattern of Federal spending to fit the cloth of tax receipts. To any person involved with a program which is tax funded, his program is a high priority item, but what must be constantly remembered, however, is that all priorities become academic in the absence of a defense sufficient to maintain our national independence.

Those who deplore the expenditure of funds for the defense of this Nation should consider the alternative, which is surrender to foreign ideologies and the imposition of a way of life repugnant to the vast majority of Americans.

While we must work diligently for peace, until there is some concrete sign not now visible of a like desire on the part of adversary nations, we must remain prepared to defend ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me our best guarantee for peace is to keep our Nation militarily impregnable, and the best approach to the goal of world security is through the security of the United States of America.

The gentleman's amendment suggests that the present levels of U.S. military presence overseas is too high in view of the recent extensive lessening of tensions between East and West. This rests upon a faulty understanding of the origins and maintenance of détente. While the relaxation of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union is real, it does not stem from any shift in the nature of our national interests. Nor does it represent any alteration of Russia's apparent goals, especially in Europe.

In some respects, nothing has changed since the cold war. The United States and the Soviet Union remain the basic choices for influence in every important area of the globe. The expressions of this competition have altered over the years—the rhetoric has softened, overt crises are fewer, and eyeball-to-eyeball confrontations are no longer the fashion. But the United States cannot afford to think it has won the contest. The Soviet Union remains a formidable challenger.

Do not mistake that conciliatory approach for any relinquishing by the Soviets of their original aims. It was Western determination, buttressed by U.S. military strength and commitment, that made détente possible. It was and is the true basis for détente.

It would also be a serious mistake to assume that the current softening of East-West tensions is permanent. This period of détente, in short, is precarious. At the first sign of weakness on the West's part, détente could revert to cold war confrontation.

The United States, therefore, must exercise as much caution as ever during this period—and perhaps even more, since the delicacies of a period of negotiation require more flexibility, tact, and caution than do periods of stark confrontation. If the United States now indulges in a series of unilateral withdrawals of its overseas presence, such behavior would be seen by both our friends and our potential enemies as a public notice to the world that we have redefined our national interests in such a way as to undermine the stance that made détente possible in the first place.

If our national interests are to be protected, we must guard against falling prey to a faulty conception of détente. Détente is anything but an outgrowth of Soviet friendliness; it is instead an outgrowth of the Soviets' typically realistic assessment of our determination to oppose their expansionist efforts. The Soviet Union will explore every possible avenue of weakness on the part of the West and where they are met with determined opposition, they will alter their approach to a more conciliatory one. But it would be a dangerous error on our part.

Only Western determination created détente; only Western determination can insure that it lasts. After many years of wavering the Warsaw Pact nations have finally acknowledged genuine interest in multilateral negotiations for force reduction in Europe. If these negotiations are pursued with firmness and circumspection on our part, they may bring about a diminished level of confrontation in Europe and a period of peace and stability.

The benefits of such actions are real and long range. The dollar savings, if any, are brief and illusory. Only by demobilizing the returning units and personnel could we effectively eliminate the expense they represent. That, in turn, would constitute but another weakening of our strength freely bestowed upon our adversary with no quid pro quo asked or exacted.

The United States, therefore, would be ill-advised and shortsighted to engage at this time in any major, unilateral contraction of our overseas military presence.

Détente is a dread not a reality.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chair-

man, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments the gentleman has made. I must confess that I too want to save military spending and want it to be responsible.

I notice that recently a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee undertook hearings on the question of the utilization of manpower in the military. Some of the findings of this subcommittee were that, although we had 323,000 less personnel in the military compared to 1946 yet we had 26,000 more captains, 21,000 more majors, 15,000 more lieutenant colonels, 4,000 more colonels as of 1971. At the same time, we had 43,000 fewer second lieutenants and 77,000 fewer first lieutenants.

The gentleman has commented on the findings of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) in terms of HEW, and I believe that is something we should criticize, too.

I should like to ask the gentleman, or the distinguished chairman of the committee, if the gentleman will yield to him, what assurance can be given to us that this very great imbalance in the officerships in our military is going to be remedied in the next fiscal year.

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

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I believe the answer to the gentleman's question is obvious. In combat one has to have as many generals who do the planning and actual command at the upper levels as one does in peacetime. One has to be ready in peacetime for combat, but during the combat periods one has to have more company-grade officers, like second lieutenants, captains, and majors, actually out leading the troops.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will say to my fellow Members that I am new in this body. I have been here only 7 months. I cannot speak with the eloquence of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), or with the factual background and the details of the military services that many Members have who have served on the Committee on Armed Services.

I am speaking today as a taxpayer, and I am also speaking as a former NATO soldier and officer.

If a Member had asked me a week ago what I would do tonight on this I would have told him I did not know. Like some of the gentlemen who have spoken here tonight, I was concerned about the dollar outflow.

I am concerned about the waste in the military bureaucracy, just as I am about the waste in the HEW bureaucracy, so ably pointed out, or waste in other bureaucracies, or perhaps even some of the waste and profligacy in this body.

But that is not the issue, where there is waste. The real issue is what our action tonight is going to do to trigger the opposition's negotiating position, to strengthen their credibility, to give more courage to them to hang in tough in the battle for supremacy in the world.

And, where will it put our negotiators? Where will it put them when we unilaterally move and give them no option, no strength with which to bargain in a reasonable sense?

I will tell the Members something which they are going to do with this 100,000-man cut, regardless of whether they put in the camouflage amendments saying it will not be out of NATO.

Let me sidestep from that point for just a moment. What we have before us is a very clever dialectical approach, started first by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) with his 300,000 cut—the far out approach. That is a parliamentary giveaway. It was easily voted down.

Now they come back with just the 100,000 cut, but the principle is the same, and they want to mousetrap the Members into a position by saying, "You have opposed the ridiculous one and now you are going to vote for a reasonable one."

If Members were serving overseas, as I was, and many of the younger fellows have been, and if you are going to take 100,000 away, when the remainder overseas find out they do not have enough buddies to reasonably win and survive, it is very disconcerting to them for us to stand here and ask those young men to do our fighting for freedom for us.

I did not relish going abroad and to spend 3 years in service. I did not want to take the time out from my family and from my career. But I did it, and many others here did. If you think back on it, you would not want to be in a weak position overseas.

I am going to quote a couple of things the Members need to bear in mind, because it is a little bit confusing, as another gentleman said, when our leaders speak of détente on one side and speak of the Soviet on the other, and when they speak of the Communist movement for world supremacy on the one hand, and on the other hand speak of giving them wheat surpluses at fantastic subsidies. I admit it is confusing to me, too. That is why I had doubts prior to hearing the debate and discussion here today.

If Members will listen, I will quote G. Arbatov, director of the Soviet Institute for American studies when he stated in March 1973:

> Relations with the capitalist nations will remain the relations of struggle, however successful normalization and detente may be. . . . The essential question is what form that struggle will take.

If we read Pravda of May this year, we find this quote:

> Only naive people can expect that recognition of the principles of coexistence by the capitalists can weaken the main contradiction of our times between capitalism and socialism, or that the ideological struggle will be weakened.

If we look around the world further, we can take a look at Haiphong and we will find this:

A steady parade of Communist-bloc ships brings military equipment sufficient to replace all losses in the 1972 offensive and to beef up forces in Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam.

If we look at Aden, we find this: With Soviet equipment and training, forces in South Yemen move toward the strategic goal of overthrowing the pro-American Government of Saudi Arabia and depriving the United States of access to its principal foreign source of petroleum.

If you look around the would you can see what the issues are that are being debated today.

If we look at Oman, we find this: Soviet-supported and equipped Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman and the Arab Gulf—PFLOAG—fights in Dhofar Province, aiming at control of Oman and the other oil-rich sheikdoms along the Persian Gulf and southern coast of Arabian Peninsula.

Then we look at Mogadishu, Somalia: Soviet technicians, supplies, and money support buildup of the harbor as a key African control point for Red Sea passage. In Iceland, the local Communists, in close liaison with the Kremlin, maneuver as part of the government coalition to use the cold war as a lever for prying Iceland away from NATO and closing down NATO's Keflavick base.

In Geneva, Soviet representatives continue to reject "on site" inspection to verify nuclear accords. While we prepare for "mutual balanced force reductions," the Kremlin orders additional heavy equipment and troops into the zones subject to the negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to undercut our negotiators. Tell them to bargain hard. Tell them to use our wheat and our technology as part of a tough quid pro quo negotiations. Tell them to put new, more effective negotiators on our team. But let us not unilaterally move toward disarmament tonight. I urge adoption of the Peyser amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CONLAN) has expired.

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the O'Neill amendment, and I do so because of the assurances that the gentleman from Massachusetts has given me as to his intentions and desire in regard to the level of U.S. troops in Europe in the years to come. I believe we all recognize that there is not any magic in the present level of U.S. forces in Europe. We have had a lot fewer troops over there since the end of World War II than now.

On one occasion former President Eisenhower said that we could have one division in Europe and that one division would be an adequate demonstration of our commitment to the defense of Western Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I believe most of us recognize also that in a showdown the defense of Western Europe would have to be nuclear. There is no real way to avoid it. Therefore, the 4⅔ Army divi-

sions we presently have in Europe are really a token, a showing of the flag, a very important showing of the flag.

So I feel that we could just as effectively and as safely show the American flag with fewer troops in Europe. But how will the Europeans read what we do today if we adopt the O'Neill amendment? Will they say this is the beginning of the end, to use the words of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), as "gutting NATO"? Will they say, "100,000 troops out this year, 100,000 out next year," and so on. So that after 5 years we will have no forces overseas in Europe or elsewhere.

That would be misreading the intent of this body, if I read the intent correctly.

With that in mind, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) this question:

Am I correct in stating that the gentleman feels the durability of our presence with military forces on the ground in Europe is of such national interest that at the end of 5 years he would like to see at least two full-strength Army divisions still remain there?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling, in opposition to some Members in this House, that NATO is not a sacred cow, and if it gets to that, the feeling that we are not going to touch NATO, I believe, is wrong.

We have 390,000 troops in NATO now, and as the gentleman said a moment ago, President Eisenhower in 1963 said we could get by with one division.

I believe the gentleman has summed it up very beautifully. As I understand it, we have troops over there now that would last for 57 days in a conventional war. They would end up 20 miles from the line of the Russians or from the lines of the Communists, and they would either be overrun or they would overrun the Communists within a period of 5 days. As long as we have missiles over there I believe we should have NATO troops over there.

I am not for the breaking down of NATO. I believe we should have forces there at all times. Yes, 5 years from now or as long as we are in the present situation and as long as NATO is in existence I believe we should have troops there.

But I do not believe we can go on policing the world and acting as a babysitter for the world with the millions of troops all over the world. I believe we should bring home some troops.

The answer to your question is I have no intention of scuttling NATO whatever. It is not the beginning of the end for it. But I do think we can send home some troops from NATO.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH). May I pose the same question to the gentleman? Does the gentleman view the amendment now pending, the O'Neill amendment, as being the beginning of the end of our presence with U.S. ground forces in Europe?

Mr. ESCH. If I may respond to the gentleman, I support the Buchanan amendment as the intention that we need to continue to have a presence in Europe. But our interest in the European continent is not only military but economic and political as well. The amendment is a responsible one. I think the amendments offered by both the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Massachusetts are responsible.

If we recognize we need to keep a presence in Europe but we cannot keep a military presence alone, we need to keep economic strength as well as a military strength in Europe. That is why I support both the amendments offered by the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will add finally that I have talked with other sponsors and supporters of the Esch amendment and I have not found one of them that cannot put his support behind the concept of a durable and substantial U.S. presence on the ground in Europe in years to come.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened this evening with a great deal of interest to the debate. I would like to remind the Committee that following World War I it was the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Henry Cabot Lodge, who took the lead in keeping America from joining the League of Nations. That action was followed, of course, by a nervous breakdown of the President of the United States, who had hoped that World War I would be the war to end war. Senator Lodge was joined by Senator Hiram Johnson of California and various others. They were sincere isolationists who believed peace could be obtained by disarmament and withdrawal.

You know, I had hoped numerous times that this country at that time and that this Congress had joined the League of Nations and had remained strong and thus prevented World War II, with its loss of 25 million lives throughout the world and 100 million injured.

This Nation alone, as the distinguished minority leader pointed out, suffered 300,000 lives lost and 1 million injured and $300 billion spent.

I have prayed and I have wished thousands of times that this Congress had kept America strong and that we had not placed the fleet in mothballs and that we had not permitted a virtual court-martial of Billy Mitchell. General Mitchell advocated airpower and military strength for peace.

I want to remind my colleagues that I have on the wall of my office in the Rayburn Building, as I have had in the Cannon Building since almost the day I came here, a picture of Billy Mitchell for one reason: to remind me constantly of World War II and who caused it. Gen. Billy Mitchell said that a bomb could sink a battleship. Very few of our leaders listened and Congress continued to cut the defense budget. We had no aircraft carriers, we had tin tanks and wooden guns.

General Mitchell proved it in 1923 when he sank the German battleship *Scharnhorst* with one well-placed bomb. And then Billy Mitchell was forced out of the military and forced out of public life because there were those who would disarm America, and who refused to develop a potential for peace. He was hounded and harassed for advocating peace through strength.

I remember the principal of my high school, and I can remember that he took the senior class, in fact, the whole of Greenwood High School out of school one day to see the U.S. Army cavalry troop by several months after Hitler had taken office, trooping from Fort McPherson, Ga., to Fort Jackson, S.C. And you know, as one high school senior then, and knowing of Hitler's plans to build Panzer divisions and Stuka dive bombers, I wondered what our gallant cavalry—and I loved our school principal for doing what he did—what they would do on the battlefield in a war against dive bombers and tanks.

Do the Members of this body know that the only reason why we sit here today is because Hitler and Tojo were not where Canada is? We were saved by the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. We built from the ground up factories to construct tanks, carriers, and B–29's but the next time we will not have 5 minutes.

The greatest peace force—and I am speaking this evening for peace—the greatest peace force in the world that we have today are our forces that are deployed in Europe and on some of those islands in the Pacific. A return to isolation would be a national disaster. We must for freedom and peace keep the sea lanes and the air lanes and yes, space, free to all nations. For peace we must maintain a superior Navy, Air Force, and a modern skilled U.S. Army.

I do not believe we can stay out of a war by isolationism. Isolation is the road to war and aggression. That was proven once, and if it is proven again it will mean the destruction of this country and all the free countries of the world.

Strength is the greatest peace force that we could possibly have in this world today—Do you know why I was named after William Jennings Bryan? Because William Jennings Bryan resigned as Secretary of State in President Wilson's Cabinet in protest of the measures that led up to American entry into World War I. William Jennings Bryan was a pacifist. He was a peacenik, and a great one. He believed in isolationism. But let us not forget that we cannot huddle behind the Atlantic and the Pacific and just do right because it is right, and make an appeal to morality. There are always Hitlers, Stalins, Tojos and Mussolinis. They have been in this world since Cain killed his brother Abel, and they exist today—Aggressors who would plunge the world into war and the only thing under the wide sun that would prevent them from moving is a strong America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not choose to reiterate the arguments that we made when we placed the amendment before the Members on troop reductions. It is clear to me that the mood of the House is that the majority of the people in this body are not willing to address themselves to the question of reducing troop levels in NATO countries. While I disagree with this position I accept the reality of this moment.

But this amendment which has been offered by the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) calls for a reduction of 100,000 troops. Let us for the moment set aside the NATO countries and let us talk about where those 100,000 troops could come from if we decide not to reduce them from the NATO countries.

I stated in my opening remarks that where lay people attempt to make decisions on issues where experts disagree, then our most important weapon is our ability to ask accurate and important questions. Without dealing with the NATO countries, let us talk about from where some of those 100,000 troops can come.

Why is it necessary for the United States to maintain 30,000 military personnel including one division of 13,000 U.S. soldiers stationed in South Korea 20 years after the war?

What U.S. national defense commitment requires the presence of 43,000 U.S. military personnel stationed in Thailand after U.S. military forces have been withdrawn from South Vietnam?

Since the Nixon doctrine rules out the future use of U.S. ground troops in combat in Asia, why is it necessary to continue to maintain 42,000 U.S. military personnel, including most of one Marine division, stationed in the Ryukyu Islands?

At a time when the United States is taking its first step in a series of steps toward establishing an embassy in Peking, why does it continue to see it necessary to station 9,000 troops in Taiwan?

What is the purpose for the forward deployment of nearly 20,000 U.S. military personnel, including nearly 10,000 ground troops, in Japan? What treaty article requires this U.S. commitment? Under what treaty article does the United States maintain 1,000 military personnel stationed in Ethiopia?

What is the treaty article that requires the forward deployment of 1,000 U.S. military personnel in Morocco?

What treaty article stipulates a U.S. commitment which requires the stationing of 7,000 military personnel in Turkey?

What treaty article requires U.S. commitment of over 68,000 military personnel afloat in the western Pacific?

What military agreement or treaty article obligates the forward deployment of nearly 1,000 U.S. military personnel in the following countries of Iran, Australia, and Cyprus?

Mr. Chairman, there is more than enough room for us to cut at least 100,000 troops around the world. If we choose not to cut them out of NATO countries, we certainly can raise questions with respect to the bloated forward deployment of troops in other nations throughout the world.

I think this amendment should be supported.

Finally, I should like to point out that one gentleman alluded to the grand strategy here on the floor. I should like to hope that I have the power and the prestige and the influence to be the architect of a guaranteed strategy to win on this floor, but I humbly submit to the Chairman and members of this Committee that I do not have that power.

All of us who have been trying to cut these troops are saying that we have a bloated deployment of forces throughout the world. We have serious economic problems in this country. We have a responsibility not only to defend from the outside but to defend the people from the problems we have within this country.

We desperately need money. Whatever decision is made by this Committee establishes the perimeters for whatever any other committee in the Congress does, because without resources, we cannot adequately deal with other issues.

As I said earlier, we can mobilize against fear, but to mobilize against the realities of the problems that we have in this country is absurd. We must cut this budget in some way. Let us support the O'Neill amendment that gives us an opportunity to cut 100,000 troops.

I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to say to the Members that if the argument of Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. O'NEILL that the only reason that we are doing this is to save money had any validity, they would offer amendments saying we would just demobilize 100,000 troops. It does not cost any more to keep them in Europe than it does here, not as much with the German offset.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. May I say to the gentleman that is my intent. I hope we are not just going to bring them here.

Mr. HAYS. But the gentleman's amendment does not say that. It says "overseas."

Mr. O'NEILL. I presumed that when the Army brought them back from overseas, they would discharge them.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman presumes too much, and if the gentleman had written it in saying we could just have 100,000 fewer troops, I might have been able to support the amendment.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) asks, "Why do we have troops in Korea?" I sort of got the impression yesterday—and if I am wrong, the gentlemen who voted that way can come around and quietly and privately correct me—a good many Members think that it is pretty important that they stay there. Let me tell the Members about a little silly vote I made in the first term I was down here. There were 83 of us—I believe 83 is the right number, or 88, something like that; Mr. BOLLING and I think it was in the eighties; I conferred with him—who came here in 1948 as new Democrats.

And I was lulled into voting for a troop reduction in Korea on the grounds that we could not afford to keep them there in 1950. It passed by two votes and I was one of the stupid two. Do the Members know what happened to those 80 Democrats? Sixty of them did not come back because the Communists invaded Korea within 3 weeks after we voted no more money for Korea. I survived by 1,200 votes and I made up my mind that the most important thing was not my staying here but that I was not going to be stupid enough to invite another disaster for the United States even if I did not stay here.

If the Members think the Communists will not roll in their tanks if they think it is in their interest to do so and if we withdraw troops enough that they think they can get away with it, then we have mighty short memories. As I said the other day it did not take them long to roll their tanks into Hungary and into Czechoslovakia.

I want to pass the blame around. I want to talk to the gentlemen on the other side. Mr. Dulles went all around the world saying that we are going to get rid of this stupid Democratic policy of containment. Oh, yes, we are going to have a policy of liberation, not containment but liberation. And the Hungarians were dumb enough to believe that. They said, "All right, we will start the liberation and the Americans will help." We did help. Mr. Dulles made a speech in which he said they were brave and he hoped they prevailed, or something to that effect. That is all the help they got.

The Russians waited for 10 days, my friends. I was there and I went down into Hungary against the advice of the State Department. In fact they said I could not go, and I said they would not tell me where I could go, and I went.

They waited 10 days to see what we would do about Mr. Dulles' policy of liberation. When they found out we were going to do nothing, the tanks rolled in and the blood flowed in the streets of Budapest and the Hungarian revolutionaries either died in their tracks or fled.

Now if this amendment is not an invitation for the Russians to take for the asking what they have not been able to get for 25 years, do the Members think they will not consider it that kind of invitation? Do the Members think if this passes that the Russians will negotiate for 30 seconds about mutual and balanced troop reductions?

I am for economy and I may vote if the amendment comes up for a 4-percent cut or whatever it is as a bipartisan cut. I think we can cut some money out of this but I am not going to say we have got to bring so many troops home from here or from there. If we decide to give them a few percentage points less money, that is fine, and then let them make the decision in consultation with the experts in Congress, but let us not do it in a meat-ax approach on this floor tonight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(On request of Mr. MATSUNAGA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman stated if it meant a cutting down of the end troop

strength of 100,000 he would support the measure, I wish to call to the attention of the gentleman that the amendment does in fact call for a cut in end strength.

Mr. HAYS. Oh no, the amendment calls for a cutting down of troop strength overseas. If we want to cut 100,000 in Hawaii and North Carolina and Dayton, Ohio, all right, but not overseas. We went around and around and around on this, and I know Hawaii is in the United States.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If the gentleman will yield further, I have the amendment in my hand and may I read it? This is section 301:

For the fiscal year beginning June 1, 1973, and ending June 30, 1974, each component of the Armed Forces is authorized an end strength for active duty personnel as follows—

And so on.

Mr. HAYS. I know all about that, but read the end of it where it says only 400,000 troops overseas.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. But the O'Neill amendment calls for an end strength of 100,000 less troops.

Mr. HAYS. But it says so many fewer overseas. That is the part I object to.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chariman, as a cosponsor of an amendment similar to the pending O'Neill amendment, I urge its support. Simply put, it would reduce the troop level authorized in H.R. 9286 by 100,000, from the number proposed by the Armed Services Committee which is approximately 2.2 million.

The one thing no one disagrees on, Mr. Chairman, is that our present force level is too large. The Pentagon itself recommended that the level be cut by some 51,000 from the 1973 level of 2.89 million men and women. The House Armed Services Committee effected a further reduction of over 13,000. Last week the Senate Armed Services Committee cut more than 150,000 troops from the Pentagon request. The level approved by the Senate committee is 2,076,000, which is 24,000 troops less than the pending O'Neill amendment would provide. The Senate committee vote, incidentally, was unanimous, Mr. Chairman. Surely every member of that distinguished committee cannot be accused of ignoring our defense needs.

There is a second notable feature of the pending amendment. Although the places where the troop levels would be reduced are not specified the amendment requires that the 100,000 reduction come from the 500,000 U.S. troops stationed overseas. We maintain nearly 2,000 military installations in foreign areas, so there is certainly no shortage of places where responsible troop level reductions could be effected.

I know that a number of Members are genuinely concerned that a reduction of U.S. forces overseas, particularly in Europe, would be interpreted by our allies as a signal of a lessened American resolve to help defend them in an emergency.

Yet during the past 10 years the British and Canadians have withdrawn troops from Europe. Portugal withdrew her troops. The French withdrew 10 divisions. Indeed, when the United States felt the need to send more troops to Southeast Asia in the late sixties, over 100,000 American troops were withdrawn from Europe.

Thousands of troops have been removed from NATO without precipitating a rush among Western European nations to reach a hasty accommodation with Russia.

One particularly appealing argument advanced against reduction of overseas troops, Mr. Chairman, is that we should not give away something when we can bargain for something in return for it, namely, a reciprocal troop reduction on the part of Warsaw Pact Nations. There is nothing in the O'Neill amendment that necessarily reduces NATO troop levels. If our NATO Allies feel that the organization's troop strength should be maintained at present levels despite modest U.S. cuts, nothing prevents them from maintaining that level by increasing their own commitments.

It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that the O'Neill amendment would not harm the U.S. defense posture. Moreover, it would address in a constructive way certain serious problems in our international relations.

Our overseas military presence costs nearly $30 billion annually, generating about a third of the U.S. balance of payments deficit.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that every Member of the House interested in fiscal responsibility would join in supporting the O'Neill amendment, for it could generate between $1.5 to $2 billion in savings, without compromising the military strength of the United States.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in part to make clear what the sequence of voting will be.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the first vote occur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN)?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is the intention of the Chair.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, that will happen as soon as we vote, and I hope it will be right away.

Mr. BUCHANAN's amendment is, in effect, saying, "move slowly on any cuts in NATO," and will be offered to the amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL, and the amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL calls for a net force reduction of 100,000 in total force strength, with that 100,000 to come from overseas.

I myself have opposed any cuts in NATO, but I am going to support the O'Neill amendment, because 100,000 is so small it does not require any cut in NATO.

If the Buchanan amendment is adopted, it will make it even more clear that we do not intend to make cuts in NATO, but whether the Buchanan amendment is adopted or not is not essential, because 100,000 can easily be found in the Pacific by taking the 45,000 forces out of Thailand who have no further purpose there; the Japanese would welcome a reduction, so we can take 30,000 out of Japan and it would not impair their security.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am a little concerned about the state of my amendment in the order of voting. I am trying to help, not hurt NATO. I am a little concerned about an overwhelming emotional "no" vote on my amendment.

I understand the feeling of this body, and how it is going to vote on the substitute. My amendment does not harm that substitute.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the language in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, because it is similar to the language that came up in the Democratic Caucus for the purpose of indicating the importance of NATO. It will be attached to the amendment offered by Mr. O'NEILL, and that will make very clear that NATO is not hurt.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the O'Neill amendment should prevail. We are now losing the economic battles of our day to Germany and to Japan. They are kicking hades out of us with pencils and computers—not military weapons.

What we need in Europe and Japan are 100,000 American businessmen with the enterprise to outsell the Russians on such items as enriched uranium services, and outsell our competitors in Asia with American products.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, they have been talking here about the voting for a long time. Someone has said "move the previous question," so that we can vote. We all want to vote; let us vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to put the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 163, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

AYES—242

Abdnor	Bafalis	Breaux
Anderson, Ill.	Baker	Breckinridge
Andrews, N.C.	Beard	Brinkley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bell	Brooks
Annunzio	Bennett	Broomfield
Archer	Bevill	Brotzman
Arends	Bolling	Brown, Mich.
Armstrong	Bowen	Brown, Ohio
	Bray	Broyhill, N.C.

Broyhill, Va.	Holt	Roberts
Burgener	Horton	Robinson, Va.
Burke, Fla.	Hosmer	Roncallo, N.Y.
Burleson, Tex.	Huber	Rooney, Pa.
Butler	Hudnut	Rose
Byron	Hunt	Rostenkowski
Casey, Tex.	Hutchinson	Rousselot
Cederberg	Ichord	Runnels
Chamberlain	Jarman	Ruppe
Chappell	Johnson, Calif.	Ruth
Clancy	Johnson, Pa.	Sandman
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Satterfield
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Okla.	Saylor
Clawson, Del	Jones, Tenn.	Scherle
Cleveland	Kazen	Schneebeli
Collier	Keating	Sebelius
Collins, Tex.	Kemp	Shoup
Conable	Ketchum	Shriver
Conlan	King	Shuster
Crane	Kluczynski	Sikes
Cronin	Kuykendall	Sisk
Daniel, Dan	Landrum	Slack
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Latta	Smith, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Lent	Spence
Davis, S.C.	Long, La.	Staggers
Davis, Wis.	Lott	Stanton, J. William
de la Garza	Lujan	Steed
Delaney	McClory	Steelman
Dennis	McCollister	Steiger, Ariz.
Derwinski	McDade	Steiger, Wis.
Devine	McEwen	Stratton
Dickinson	McFall	Stubblefield
Dorn	McKay	Stuckey
Downing	McSpadden	Symms
Dulski	Madigan	Talcott
Duncan	Mahon	Taylor, Mo.
du Pont	Mailliard	Taylor, N.C.
Edwards, Ala.	Mallary	Teague, Calif.
Erlenborn	Maraziti	Teague, Tex.
Eshleman	Martin, Nebr.	Thomson, Wis.
Fish	Martin, N.C.	Thone
Flood	Mathias, Calif.	Thornton
Flowers	Mathis, Ga.	Towell, Nev.
Flynt	Mayne	Treen
Ford, Gerald R.	Michel	Vander Jagt
Forsythe	Minshall, Ohio	Veysey
Fountain	Mitchell, N.Y.	Waggonner
Frelinghuysen	Mizell	Walsh
Frey	Mollohan	Wampler
Froehlich	Montgomery	Ware
Fuqua	Moorhead, Calif.	White
Gibbons	Morgan	Whitehurst
Gilman	Murphy, Ill.	Whitten
Ginn	Murphy, N.Y.	Wiggins
Goldwater	Myers	Williams
Gonzalez	Nelsen	Wilson, Bob
Goodling	Nichols	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Green, Oreg.	O'Brien	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Grover	Parris	Wright
Gubser	Passman	Wyatt
Guyer	Pettis	Wydler
Haley	Peyser	Wyman
Hanrahan	Poage	Young, Alaska
Hansen, Idaho	Powell, Ohio	Young, Fla.
Harsha	Preyer	Young, Ill.
Hastings	Price, Ill.	Young, S.C.
Hays	Price, Tex.	Young, Tex.
Hébert	Quie	Zablocki
Henderson	Quillen	Zion
Hillis	Randall	
Hinshaw	Regula	
Hogan	Rhodes	
Holifield	Rinaldo	

NOES—163

Abzug	Chisholm	Foley
Adams	Clay	Ford, William D.
Addabbo	Cohen	Fraser
Anderson, Calif.	Collins, Ill.	Frenzel
Ashbrook	Conte	Fulton
Ashley	Corman	Gaydos
Aspin	Cotter	Giaimo
Badillo	Coughlin	Grasso
Barrett	Culver	Green, Pa.
Bergland	Daniels, Dominick V.	Griffiths
Biaggi	Danielson	Gross
Biester	Dellenback	Gude
Bingham	Dellums	Hamilton
Blatnik	Denholm	Hanley
Boland	Dent	Harrington
Brademas	Diggs	Hawkins
Brasco	Dingell	Hechler, W. Va.
Brown, Calif.	Donohue	Heckler, Mass.
Buchanan	Drinan	Heinz
Burke, Calif.	Eckhardt	Helstoski
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Calif.	Hicks
Burlison, Mo.	Eilberg	Holtzman
Burton	Esch	Howard
Carey, N.Y.	Evans, Colo.	Hungate
Carney, Ohio	Fascell	Johnson, Colo.
Carter	Findley	Jordan
Karth	Nix	Sarbanes
Kastenmeier	Obey	Schroeder
Koch	O'Hara	Seiberling
Kyros	O'Neill	Shipley
Leggett	Owens	Snyder
Lehman	Patten	Stanton, James V.
Litton	Perkins	Stark
Long, Md.	Pickle	Steele
McCloskey	Pike	Stokes
McCormack	Podell	Studds
McKinney	Pritchard	Sullivan
Macdonald	Railsback	Symington
Madden	Rangel	Thompson, N.J.
Matsunaga	Rarick	Tiernan
Mazzoli	Rees	Udall
Meeds	Reid	Ullman
Melcher	Reuss	Van Deerlin
Metcalfe	Riegle	Vanik
Mezvinsky	Robison, N.Y.	Vigorito
Miller	Rodino	Waldie
Minish	Rogers	Whalen
Mink	Roncalio, Wyo.	Wolff
Mitchell, Md.	Rosenthal	Wylie
Moakley	Roush	Yates
Moorhead, Pa.	Roy	Yatron
Mosher	Roybal	Young, Ga.
Moss	Ryan	Zwach
Natcher	St Germain	
Nedzi	Sarasin	

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander	Gunter	Patman
Blackburn	Hammer-schmidt	Pepper
Boggs	Hanna	Roe
Camp	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, N.Y.
Cochran	Harvey	Skubitz
Conyers	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Iowa
Evins, Tenn.	Landgrebe	Stephens
Fisher	Milford	Widnall
Gettys	Mills, Ark.	Winn
Gray		

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), as modified, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Florida to withhold his unanimous-consent request for just one moment.

Mr. SIKES. I will be glad to hold my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) to temporarily withhold his unanimous consent request to limit debate was because I promised this House that I would not ask unanimous consent to limit debate nor make a motion to cut off debate, and I do not intend to violate that promise, and I intend to keep it.

However, Mr. Chairman, one very important factor is that I always believe that the majority has the right of rule. I certainly do not take any umbrage that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) wishes to make this unanimous consent request. I would submit it to the Members that if a majority of the Members wish to do this, if they want to expedite this legislation and go home early, which I hope they will, then it is up to the majority to express their will.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for temporarily withholding his unanimous consent request.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous consent request that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENZEL: In title III. Active forces, add section 302 after section 301:

"Notwithstanding any provision in Sections 301 or 302, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973 and ending June 30, 1974, the aggregate end strength for active duty commissioned officers in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Air Force combined shall not exceed 310,781."

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering is rather easy to understand. It sets a limit on the number of commissioned officers in our armed services. Currently, Congress sets a limit to the size of each service. This amendment will set an aggregate ceiling on the number of commissioned officers in all services and allows the Secretary of Defense to distribute the number among the various services in any way he deems suitable or necessary.

There are a number of strong reasons why I offer this amendment. First, it may save between $140 and $150—$420 and $450—million. In a time when the President is attempting to control inflation, and when we are already embarked on a course which will bust our own budget ceiling, saving a sum like this is very important. If we are to spend money on all the various social programs which many of us have fought for, we must cut the military budget in some way. I think that this may be one method to do this.

This amendment also sets a precedent for congressional oversight on the size of the officer corps. The Congress exercises oversight on a number of other defense related issues but has thus far apparently not deemed it necessary to control the number of commissioned officers. If Congress is to accept its responsibility in determining military policy, it should at least speak on the questions of the number of commissioned officers.

My reasons for submitting this amendment are not limited to fiscal responsibility and congressional oversight. I believe that we are about to encounter a problem in our military personnel situation which may have adverse effects on adequate defense planning.

The size of our officer corps has been growing larger and larger in relation to the total strength of our Armed Forces. At the height of the Indochina war, 11.3 percent of our men on active duty were officers. Since that time, this figure has reached 14.3 percent. In pre-Indochina period, a time of relative peacefulness, 1957–63, the figure was 12.5 percent. My amendment would set the ceiling by next year at 14 percent.

I believe that the military today is more complicated than it was even a short 10 years ago. It is very easy for our military to recruit men for a buildup like

Indochina. It is quite another thing for them to let these men go when the emergency is over. Unless there is a ceiling mandating that there be no more than a certain number of officers, the problem of too many officers may continue to cost the taxpayer and also harm our national defense.

Too many officers in our Armed Forces, in addition to causing needless cost, also causes a kind of threat to our national security. The United States has had a policy of flexible response. At present, we have, insofar as we know, an adequate nuclear force to destroy an enemy. However, not all situations will call for a nuclear strike; even of a strategic or tactical nature. We must also have a conventional deterrent capability in a strong Armed Forces. Our Armed Forces, in order to be a credible conventional deterrent, must be a select group of people, highly trained and combat ready. This force must be capable of great mobility and capable to mount a short-term, conventional deterrent to our enemies anywhere in the world.

With the percent of officers in our total active duty personnel growing, the percent of enlisted men must correspondingly shrink. If the trend continues we may not have a credible conventional deterrent force. An army of 2 million men with close to a third of a million officers may not be a credible deterrent. Officers, by and large, do not do the hardnose conventional fighting. Enlisted men do. The size of our officer corps should be limited to maintain our flexible response strategy with a conventional force. An all-officer army is not this force; an all-volunteer army with a small officer corps is.

The quality of our officers will improve by limiting the number of officers.

The United States offers a man who wants a career as an officer good benefits. The pay is good, and the pension plan is superior to most civilian occupations. We should have reasonable numbers of good men as officers and these men should be in a highly desirable occupation. By limiting the number of officers, not everyone who wishes to become an officer would be able to become one. Probably, the standards for men wishing to be officers will rise, making an already good group of men a prestigious group of highly trained, combat-ready professional soldiers.

The cut I am suggesting in this amendment is not deep. Currently, there are 324,000 officers in our Armed Forces. This amendment will cut that to 310,781—282,781—a cut of less than 14,000—42,000 or 3.5 percent—12 percent. I think that this is a responsible amount which will not result in wholesale reductions.

This amendment will not create an officer corps of all generals and colonels. The Officer Grade Limitations Act limits the size of each grade to the size of each services officer corps. The cut will be by and large proportional since the upper limit to this act has been reached for some of the higher grades.

I believe that this amendment is a responsible amendment. It will save the taxpayers some money, enhance rather than hurt national security, and upgrade the status of officers. It is imperative that we remember that this will increase congressional power insofar as oversight over another segment of our military policy is concerned. I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not have an opportunity to consider this matter. The gentleman from Minnesota did not bring it to the attention of the committee. I should like, however, to have the Committee of the Whole House here consider this. Each service has different missions and unique characteristics which influence officer and enlisted requirements.

The Air Force combat engagement force is composed almost exclusively of officers in aircrew and missile crew positions. This differs markedly from the combat arms of other services whose relatively smaller, high-ratio aviation components are counterbalanced by divisions and capital ships having relatively low ratios.

I am saying, Mr. Chairman, in effect that some of the services are labor intensive and others are capital intensive.

The officer-enlisted ratio programed for 1974 is almost identical to the ratio following World War II in 1946.

Today the services have the following officer ratios: Army, 1 to 7; Navy, 1 to 7; Air Force, 1 to 5.01; Marine Corps, 1 to 9.19.

The only services with a commissioned officer to enlisted ratio in excess of 1 to 7 is the Air Force, the only service affected by the Frenzel amendment.

I hope very much that the committee will reject the amendment.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I should like to ask a question and my question is this: We all have difficulty in determining how many men we should have and how many officers in relation to men. We had 323,000 less men in 1971 than we had in 1946, and yet we had 66,000 more captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels than we had in 1946, and we had 43,000 fewer second lieutenants and 77,000 fewer first lieutenants.

I wonder what the distinguished gentleman from Virginia could tell this committee what the committee can do to study the restructuring, a more sensible restructuring, of officers in relation to enlisted personnel.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. In response to the gentleman from Colorado, I will say again we did not have an opportunity to study this amendment. I assure the gentleman from Colorado that we are all anxious to have the proper ratio.

And I also am interested in saving such funds as we can. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment for several reasons.

First, there are already adequate laws to control the number of senior officers and the present officer quotas of the military that are the product of over 20 years experience.

Second, the number of officers in the grades of major and lieutenant commander and above are below the limitations permitted by law today.

Third, since the Armed Forces started to decrease from their peak armed strength in 1968–69, the officer forces will have been reduced by 100,000 by the end of fiscal year 1974. There have been over 10,000 reductions in grades of lieutenant colonel and commander and above.

Mr. Chairman, one of the big faults I find with the proposed amendment, and I am the ranking minority member on the Manpower Subcommittee and I agree we did not have an opportunity to study this, is that what is being called for is an aggregate or total strength and not an average strength. This means if we go by simply an aggregate strength there is no ability to fluctuate and there is no room for discretion. It is an arbitrary ceiling that would make the Department of Defense in violation at the moment the President signs it. I think it is unrealistic. I think we are cognizant of the problem within our committee. I think if we are left to work out the problem within our committee we will come up with a reasonable solution.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRENZEL) there were—ayes 53, and noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to be proposed to title III? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—RESERVE FORCES

SEC. 401. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, and ending June 30, 1974, the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces will be programed to attain an average strength of not less than the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 379,144;

(2) The Army Reserve, 232,591;

(3) The Naval Reserve, 116,981;

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 39,735;

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 92,291;

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 49,773;

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 11,800.

SEC. 402. The average strength prescribed by section 401 of this title for the Selected Reserve of any Reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such Reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments to be proposed to title IV, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 501. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973, and ending June 30 1974, each component of the Armed Forces is authorized an average military training student load as follows:

(1) The Army, 89,053;
(2) The Navy, 75,647;
(3) The Marine Corps, 27,976;
(4) The Air Force, 54,904;
(5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 19,100;
(6) The Army Reserve, 59,900;
(7) The Naval Reserve, 15,200;
(8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 5,600;
(9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 4,600;
(10) The Air Force Reserve, 24,300.

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed to title V? If not, the Clerk will read.

The clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. Subsection (a) (1) of section 401 of Public Law 89-367 approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) Not to exceed $1,300,000,000 of the funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes to support: (A) Vietnamese and other free world forces in support of Vietnamese forces, (B) local forces in Laos; and for related costs, during the fiscal year 1974 on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine. None of the funds appropriated to or for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States may be used for the purpose of paying any overseas allowance, per diem allowance, or any other addition to the regular base pay of any person serving with the free world forces in South Vietnam if the amount of such payment would be greater than the amount of special pay authorized to be paid for an equivalent period of service, to members of the Armed Forces of the United States (under section 310 of title 37, United States Code) serving in Vietnam or in any other hostile fire area, except for continuation of payments of such additions to regular base pay provided in agreements executed prior to July 1, 1970. Nothing in clause (A) of the first sentence of this paragraph shall be construed as authorizing the use of any such funds to support Vietnamese or other free world forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the Government of Cambodia or Laos: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prohibit support of actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal or disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of Americans held as prisoners of war."

SEC. 602. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended for the purpose of carrying out directly or indirectly any economic or military assistance for or on behalf of North Vietnam during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

SEC. 603. None of the funds authorized for appropriation to the Department of Defense pursuant to this Act shall be obligated under a contract entered into after the date of enactment of this Act under any multiyear procurement as defined in section 1-322 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations (as in effect on September 26, 1972) where the cancellation ceiling for such procurement is in excess of $5,000,000.

SEC. 604. (a) Chapter 4 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new sections after section 137 and inserting corresponding items in the chapter analysis:

"§ 138. Secretary of Defense: Annual authorization of appropriations for armed forces

"(a) No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year to or for the use of any armed force or obligated or expended for—

"(1) procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels;

"(2) any research, development, test, or evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto;

"(3) procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

"(4) procurement of other weapons; or

"(5) procurement of naval torpedoes and related support equipment;

unless the annual appropriation for such funds has been specifically authorized by law in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) Congress shall authorize the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the armed forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for the pay and allowances of members of any reserve component of the armed forces unless the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of that reserve component for that fiscal year has been authorized by law.

"(c) (1) Congress shall authorize the end strength, as of the end of each fiscal year for active-duty personnel for each component of the armed forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year to or for the use of the active-duty personnel of any components of the armed forces unless the end strength for active-duty personnel of that component for the fiscal year has been authorized by law.

"(2) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a written report, not later than January 31 of each fiscal year, recommending the annual active-duty end strength level for each component of the armed forces for the next fiscal year, and shall include in that report justification for the strength levels recommended and an explanation of the relationship between the personal strength levels recommended for that fiscal year and the national security policies of the United States in effect at the time. The justification and explanation shall specify in detail for all forces, including each land force division, carrier and other major combatant vessel, air wing, and other comparable unit the—

"(A) unit mission and capability;

"(B) strategy which the unit supports; and

"(C) area of deployment and illustrative areas of potential deployment, including a description of any United States commitment to defend such areas.

It shall also include a detailed discussion of the manpower required for support and overhead functions within the armed forces.

"(d) (1) Congress shall authorize the average military training student loads for each component of the armed forces. That authorization is not required for unit or crew training student loads, but is required for student loads for the following individual training categories—

"(A) recruit and specialized training;

"(B) flight training;

"(C) professional training in military and civilian institutions; and

"(D) officer acquisition training.

No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for training military personnel in the training categories described in clauses (A)-(D) of any component of the armed forces, unless the average student load of that component for that fiscal year has been authorized by law.

"(2) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a written report, not later than March 1 of each fiscal year, recommending the average student load for each category of training for each component of the armed forces for the next three fiscal years, and shall include in that report justification for, and explanation of, the average student loads recommended.

"§ 139. Secretary of Defense: weapons development and procurement schedules for armed forces; reports; supplemental reports

"(a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress each calendar year, at the same time the President submits the budget to Congress under section 11 of title 31, a written report regarding development and procurement schedules for each weapon system for which fund authorization is required by which fund authorization is required by section 138(a) of this title, and for which any funds for procurement are requested in that budget. The report shall include data on operational testing and evaluation for each weapon system for which funds for procurement are requested (other than funds requested only for the procurement of units for operational testing and evaluation, or long lead-time items, or both). A weapon system shall also be included in the annual report required under this subsection in each year thereafter until procurement of that system has been completed or terminated, or the Secretary of Defense certifies, in writing, that such inclusion would not serve any useful purpose and gives his reasons therefor.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit a supplemental report to Congress, not less than thirty, or more than sixty, days before the award of any contract, or the exercise of any option in a contract for the procurement of any such weapon system (other than procurement of units for operational testing and evaluation, or long lead-time items, or both), unless—

"(1) the contractor or contractors for that system have not yet been selected, and the Secretary of Defense determines that the submission of that report would adversely affect the source selection process and notifies Congress in writing, prior to such award, of that determination, stating his reasons therefor; or

"(2) the Secretary of Defense determines that the submission of that report would otherwise adversely affect the vital security interests of the United States and notifies Congress in writing of that determination at least thirty days prior to the award, stating his reasons therefor.

"(c) Any report required to be submitted under subsection (a) or (b) shall include detailed and summarized information with respect to each weapon system covered, and specifically include, but not be limited to—

"(1) the development schedule, including estimated annual costs until development is completed;

"(2) the planned procurement schedule, including the best estimate of the Secretary of Defense of the annual costs and units to be procured until procurement is completed; and

"(3) to the extent required by the second

sentence of subsection (a), the result of all operational testing and evaluation up to the time of the submission of the report, or, if operational testing and evaluation has not been conducted, a statement of the reasons therefor and the results of such other testing and evaluation as has been conducted.

"(d) In the case of any weapon system for which procurement funds have not been previously requested and for which funds are first requested by the President in any fiscal year after the Budget for that fiscal year has been submitted to Congress, the same reporting requirements shall be applicable to that system in the same manner and to the same extent as if funds had been requested for that system in that budget."

(b) The following laws are repealed:

(1) section 412 of the Act of August 10, 1959, Public Law 86–149 (73 Stat. 322), as amended by section 2 of the Act of April 27, 1962, Public Law 87–436 (76 Stat. 55); section 610 of the Act of November 7, 1963, Public Law 88–174 (77 Stat. 329); section 304 of the Act of June 11, 1965, Public Law 89–37 (79 Stat. 128); section 6 of the Act of December 1, 1967, Public Law 90–168 (81 Stat. 526); section 405 of the Act of November 19, 1969, Public Law 91–121 (83 Stat. 207); sections 505 and 509 of the Act of October 7, 1970, Public Law 91–441 (84 Stat. 912, 913); section 701 of the Act of September 28, 1971, Public Law 92–129 (85 Stat. 362); and sections 302 and 604 of the Act of September 26, 1972, Public Law 92–436 (86 Stat. 736, 739); and

(2) section 506 of the Act of November 17, 1971, Public Law 92–156 (85 Stat. 429).

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act, 1974".

Mr. HÉBERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPIN

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPIN: Page 15, between lines 8 and 9 insert the following:

"SEC. 605. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount of money authorized to be appropriated under titles I and II of this Act shall not exceed $20,445,255,000. Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate for referral to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report setting forth in detail how the Secretary proposes to apportion the reduction required under this section among the various procurement and other programs for which authorizations are provided under such titles I and II. The recommended apportionment shall not take effect for a period of 30 days following the receipt of the report from the Secretary of Defense in order to give Congress an opportunity to revise by law the recommended apportionment."

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering here is not my amendment alone. I have discovered, in talking to a number of other Members, that other people have similar ideas, so I offer this amendment as part of a bipartisan coalition in favor of cutting defense spending by a ceiling amendment.

Let me explain briefly what this amendment does, Mr. Chairman. What it does is that it takes last year's appropriation level of $19.5 billion; it adds on 4.5 percent for inflation and makes that the ceiling.

We say in this amendment that we shall not spend more than that amount. Mr. Chairman, it is a reduction. It is a reduction by $950 million from what the committee has recommended, but it is also more than we spent last year; it is more than we spent last year by about $1 billion, so that it is more than we spent last year but not as much as the committee would like.

The second aspect of this amendment is that it is not a meat-ax approach. Under the terms of this amendment, the Pentagon would not have a free hand in determining where the cuts are to be made. Under this amendment, the Department of Defense would report to the committee on what spending it wanted to do in order to stay within the overall ceiling. The committee could then decide to accept it, to reject it, or amend it so that Congress does not abdicate its responsibility under this amendment.

The arguments for this amendment are very, very clear. They are economics and they are consistencies. Mr. Chairman, we have heard last week a lot of talk about the economic problems of the country. We have heard a lot of talk about the problems of inflation. We have heard a lot of talk about the problems of deficits. We have heard a lot of talk about the problems that are internal, domestic, economic problems which are causing damage to the dollar abroad. All of this we talked about last week when we put on a total Federal spending ceiling of $267.1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments for this amendment are economics and consistency. Other programs have been cut by this body; other programs will have to be cut throughout the year by this body. We cannot stay within that ceiling unless we cut somewhere, and defense should be no exception. Defense should not be treated any differently than other programs.

Mr. Chairman, I am coming to what I believe is the most important thing I want to say about this amendment. Everybody can agree we ought to pass something like this amendment because of the economic situation. We should pass something like this. The question before us is, can we do it? Can we find some way in this budget to cut $950 million below what the committee recommended?

I am sure the Committee on Armed Services will tell us, "No." They came up in the general debate yesterday and said no, they could not cut it, that this was a bare-bones budget and we would be cutting muscle and we would be cutting bone if we cut further.

I do not believe that is true for one reason, Mr. Chairman, which is simply that the Appropriations Committee does it every year.

Every year we have an authorization process, and we pass an authorization bill. Then we have an appropriation process, and we pass an appropriation bill. Every year the amount we appropriate is a lesser amount than was authorized.

Last year the Appropriations Committee cut $1.4 billion from the authorization level. Over the past 5 years the Appropriations Committee has cut an average of $1.6 billion from the authorization levels.

But we are not asking for a cut of $1.6 billion. We are not asking for a cut of $1.4 billion. We are asking for a cut of $950 million.

If the Appropriations Committee can find cuts of $1.4 billion and $1.6 billion, why cannot the Committee on Armed Services come up with a cut of $950 million?

When various Members come up and tell us, "We cannot cut this budget," I hope they will also explain how the Appropriations Committee manages to cut it. Nobody ever tells us that the Appropriations Committee has cut the muscle or cut the bone. Nobody ever comes up and offers amendments to add on what the Appropriations Committee left out from what was authorized. Apparently what the Appropriations Committee does is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ASPIN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, the argument for this amendment are economics, consistency, and the fact that it can be done. If the Appropriations Committee can cut $1.4 billion or $1.6 billion a year, the Committee on Armed Services can certainly do half that well.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GUBSER. Is it not true that between 56 and 57 percent of the defense budget is for military pay and military benefits?

Mr. ASPIN. That is correct.

Mr. GUBSER. Is it not also true that as of January 1 this year the military active duty personnel were given a 7.2 percent pay increase?

Mr. ASPIN. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GUBSER. Is it not also true as of July 1 of this year military retirees received a 6.71-percent increase in pay?

Mr. ASPIN. That is absolutely correct.

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

(On request of Mr. GUBSER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ASPIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GUBSER. Is it not true that the civilians in the Department of Defense, who are over and above the 56 percent we previously mentioned, got a 5.5-percent increase in pay as of January 1?

Mr. ASPIN. That too is correct.

Mr. GUBSER. If we apply the percentage factors which are related to personnel and add the civilians involved, have we not effectively already wiped out the 4.5 percent that is being allowed for inflation?

Mr. ASPIN. No, we have not. The gen-

tleman will understand that there is no personnel in this bill. This is the procurement and research and development bill. It authorizes only procurement and research and development. Pay and all things concerned with personnel are covered in the appropriation bill, not in the authorization bill.

We have added a 4.5-percent rate of inflation because the durable goods sector of the economy, such as the cars and refrigerators, rose at a rate of 3.5 percent. The durable goods sector is the sector in which we buy the procurement and the R. & D.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman will agree he uses the argument that the Appropriations Committee always cuts below authorizations, and that bill includes personnel?

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill does include personnel, which is all the more reason why we should be able to cut the authorization.

Mr. GUBSER. But the gentleman seems to have effectively cut the military, and considerable amount of this is involved with military pay.

Mr. ASPIN. We have not, not in this bill. This bill is procurement and R. & D. The Committee on Appropriations every year cuts procurement and R. & D. below authorization. If the Committee on Appropriations cuts it, why should not the Committee on the Armed Forces be able to cut it?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain that motion. The Chair advises the gentleman that there can be no reservation of time. That request must be made as a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CARNEY of Ohio) there were—ayes 131, noes 55.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Members standing at the time debate was limited will each be recognized for three-quarters of a minute.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BEARD).

(By unanimous consent Messrs. GUBSER, YOUNG of Florida, and HUNT yielded their time to Mr. BEARD.)

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. MONTGOMERY, DICKINSON, and ARMSTRONG yielded their time to Mr. CARNEY of Ohio.)

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

To say that we are going to approve last year's spending plus a 4.5 percent increase for inflation strikes me as totally ridiculous and an indefensible way to determine something that is as large and as important at the defense budget.

To begin with, the rate of inflation is not constant. It has been more than 4.5 percent in some areas and lower than 4.5 in other areas. To say you are going to increase or decrease the defense budget on the basis of inflation is the most ridiculous proposition I have heard. You can never assume the defense needs are determined by an arbitrary dollar availability.

If we have a dramatic improvement in world conditions coupled with a genuine disarmament by the Soviet Union, we can reduce our defense budget far more than the gentleman proposes. Conversely, a serious worsening in world conditions might make it important and prudent to increase rather than reduce the budget. The point is the defense requirements are determined by the potential threat and not an arbitrary amount.

The gentleman says his amendment is not a meat ax approach. I say it is more the lottery approach. It involves taking a number out of a hat and hoping it is the right number, because it is fairly close to that of last year. It also requires the Secretary of Defense to go through a whole new exercise in setting budget priorities when he has already done it once this year. There is no reason to assume he will not come back with the same priorities he detailed to the Congress a few months ago. The committee then would have to go through the review exercise once again, and again there is no reason to assume the committee would not arrive at the same order of priorities as they did in the original hearings.

In essence the possibility of further reductions has been considered already by the committee and totally rejected by the committee, but the committee did it in a sensible manner by reviewing each of the items in the bill on their merits.

The gentleman is therefore trying to do something in an unthinking way on the floor which he was unable to do in committee.

I ask the Members totally and resoundingly to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual amendment. We sometimes object to legislation on an appropriation bill. This would appear to be appropriation on an authorization bill.

This committee spent four long months and collected over 4,400 pages of testimony in developing the detailed recommendations about what the spending ceilings should be in each particular category. Now this amendment would have us wipe it all out, declare that all our efforts amount to nothing, and leave the determination of what is to be spent in which categories up to the Secretary of Defense rather than up to Congress. And we claim we want to reestablish our prerogatives here in Congress.

The place to vote for economy is on the appropriation bill. You can't set spending ceilings on this kind of bill. Not only that, but by letting the Secretary of Defense decide on where the spending should occur we will very likely delay the Defense appropriation bill another 2 or 3 months longer than usual.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I heard my good colleague, the gentleman from California, say that this has now become the Rousselot-Abzug amendment. Fine. If Ms. ABZUG-GROSS-SYMMS are right on this issue, then I join her and my other colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this amendment because I think it is correct. It is an increase over last year as to what the Committee on Appropriations did. It represents a 4.5-percent increase. I believe it is wrong for those of us who believe in economy in government to say we will have economy every place but in the Defense Department. I take second place to no one in my strong support of the defense of this Nation. I believe in it. I have always supported it. But, I believe it is wrong to just automatically endorse what the committee says without the entire body considering reasonable efforts to provide some economy. I hope you will support the Aspin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TREEN).

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. GERALD R. FORD and COLLIER yielded their time to Mr. TREEN.)

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Chairman, I totally support the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BEARD) that we cannot judge our defense needs on any criterion except that which we believe is necessary to meet the potential threat to this country.

We are asked here tonight, in effect, to decide whether the measure of that threat is the $21.4 billion in this bill, or something approximating $1 billion less.

When it comes to highways, when it comes to education, when it comes to public works—and all of these things that are important—we can make errors, we can come in with a little bit too little, and we will have a shot at correcting it the next time around. But in a situation like this we may not have another chance.

Some of the Members may say that, well, a 5-percent reduction could not be too cataclysmic, but it could be. To short us by just 5 percent could mean the differences; and I for one do not want to have to face the day when our Nation may be overwhelmed by the threat of superior power, or lose in a conflict, and if I survive, have to face my children or my grandchildren and say, well, we almost made it but on July 31, 1973, we in the Congress voted for a 5-percent cut. I would rather make a spending error on the high side than on the low side when we are dealing with the security of the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

(Mr. CARNEY of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Aspin amendment, and to associate myself with the remarks that have been made in favor of it.

I believe that if we are serious about balancing the budget, if we are serious about not having to increase our taxes, and if we are serious about cutting back on inflation, then we should be serious and responsible now in cutting back at this point. I support the Aspin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, a man can be right or wrong, but one of the things about this job is making a decision, and as far as I am concerned, now, for the first time this afternoon I am going to vote "yes" on an amendment because my judgment is that this is a reasonable amendment, and I urge that it be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUBER).

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, the American Ordnance Association has a motto which says, "There will never be universal peace until the strongest army and navy and air force are in the hands of the most peaceful nation."

In World War I it was Germany that had it to start and we had World War I; in World War II it was Germany that had it to start and we had World War II. If we are not prepared to meet the Russian challenge, we are going to have world war III, and it will be because the strongest army and navy and air force are not in the hands of the most peaceful nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. It is a well-thought-out amendment. It provides that the Committee on Armed Services will be able to review the thrust of the reductions. I hope that the committee will adopt it.

It is clear from listening to the remarks of the Members today that support for this spending ceiling does not reflect any one partisan, regional or ideological viewpoint. I believe that many of us feel that our action in putting a $267.1 billion ceiling on the total budget now requires us to take a similar approach in dealing with the defense budget.

So often in the past the House has backed away from imposing sensible fiscal limits on the defense budget. The Congress has only just begun to dig into some of the areas of fat in the Defense Department budget. I was shocked to note, for example, that it has been recently disclosed that the single Safeguard ABM site now under construction will cost $1.3 billion more than the 1969 estimate for two such sites.

The Aspin amendment would have the Pentagon decide how its funds would be expended, subject to the approval of the Armed Services Committee. Our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin has shown, however, that his amendment could be so implemented as to avoid canceling any programs.

It is important to point out, moreover that the provisions of the amendment requiring DOD to report back to the Armed Services Committee will strengthen the committee's hand and ultimately increase the oversight responsibility of Congress.

In closing, I reiterate my support for the Aspin amendment. I think it is essential and fair in light of our overall budget ceiling and I think it will help to remind the Pentagon that the taxpayers' pocketbooks and patience have very definite limits.

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

Mr. GUDE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very responsible amendment.

I had intended to introduce a similar amendment that would have cut this authorization by 2 percent—although this amendment cuts approximately 4 percent from this bill—I think that no branch of our Government cannot take a small cut.

What our country needs is more conviction, not more hardware.

We need to decide whose side we are on. We have just lost a 10-year no-win war, because of a lack of conviction, not a lack of hardware.

Right today we are engaged in foreign grain giveaways to our enemies who we are supposed to be building our national defense to combat in this authorization.

Let us return to commonsense, and cut a little out of the defense bureaucracy, not a lot, just a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ).

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee which opposes this amendment, has made much of the fact that the committee has held weeks of hearings and expended countless man-hours examining testimony and marking up this bill. They have argued that it is inappropriate for the Members of Congress assembled here in the Chamber tonight to make any changes in the bill, because they are not members of the committee and cannot, therefore, be sufficiently informed. We cannot decide wisely, they say, whether we should hold the procurement authorization to a 4.5-percent increase beyond the funds appropriated last year. The amendment results, of course, in reducing this authorization some $900 million.

I would point out the fallacy of the committee's argument to my colleagues. Many of those on the committee, as well as others, have supported the President in some of the actions he has taken to impound or reserve money appropriated by the Congress.

Without any significant exception I am aware these impoundments have been made without hearings, without consultation, in many cases without notification and, in every case, without public debate.

Yet some of the very same people who in the name of fiscal responsibility have applauded the private process of executive branch impoundments condemn the publicly made suggestion that the bill now before us be modestly reduced here in public on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot have it both ways.

If you believe in fiscal responsibility for one program, you have to apply the same hardnosed approach to all programs.

If you believe that OMB is ever justified in reserving or impounding funds, you cannot possibly object to the Congress working its will. What is good for the goose is good for the gander, too.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. STUDDS).

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that this is just a very easy amendment to support merely because while we are voting to cut the defense budget, there is no way that the Committee on Appropriations will not cut it more. The Committee on Appropriations every year in the last 5 years has reported cuts much larger than the $950 million that we are suggesting here. There is no way that they will not come in with something less than this. We can vote to cut the amendment and still be certain that the Committee on Appropriations will make it lower.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, we know that when the military comes to the Committee on Armed Services, they always ask for more than they need, because they know that the gentleman from South Carolina and this able committee is going to cut them. This Armed Services Committee itself comes to the House knowing that the Commit-

tee on Appropriations is going to cut them. Let us speed up the process a little bit. Let us now cut 4½ percent or $950 million.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, in my opinion, is a step toward restoring fiscal sanity in this country, and it is badly needed. I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SIKES yielded his remaining time to Mr. HÉBERT.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RANDALL yielded his time to Mr. STRATTON.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, we have already found a number of errors in other amendments offered here today. There are similar errors in this one. The gentleman from Wisconsin said that his ceiling figures affected no personnel. Actually more than $500 million is in this bill for civilian personnel, and that figure is $120 million more than was in last year's budget because of the civilian pay increase. Not only that, but this bill we have come up with is so lean that it represents an increase of only 2.1 percent over the amount authorized by Congress last year, which is less than half of the 4½-percent cost-of-living increase proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY).

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, the author of the amendment is slightly confused. In his statement he made quite a point of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations always appropriated less than what was authorized. Certainly they do, because the apropriations committee cannot appropriate more than what is authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) to close the debate.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I will be as brief as I can because we recognize here a great exhibition of monetary legerdemain. First we see it and then we do not. We do not know where the shell is in this game along the highway or on the surface. But as a matter of fact let us not kid ourselves. If we take this reduction, where are we going to get the money to pay for that which we need? If a weapon costs $100,000 and we take away $15,000, they still are going to need $100,000 and we have to get it from someplace.

To demonstrate the philosophy of the distinguished gentleman who offers this amendment, do the Members know what he would do? He would not give the military one thin dime. He would not give them any money for procurement. He does not want them to have any money. Why do I say that? The vote of the committee when this bill came out was 38 to 1. Who was the one? It was the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 163, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—242

Abzug	Edwards, Calif.	Madden
Adams	Eilberg	Mailliard
Addabbo	Erlenborn	Mallary
Anderson, Calif.	Esch	Mathias, Calif.
	Eshleman	Matsunaga
Anderson, Ill.	Evans, Colo.	Mazzoli
Andrews, N.C.	Fascell	Meeds
Andrews, N. Dak.	Findley	Melcher
	Fish	Metcalfe
Annunzio	Foley	Mezvinsky
Ashbrook	Ford, William D.	Miller
Ashley		Minish
Aspin	Forsythe	Mink
Badillo	Fountain	Mitchell, Md.
Barrett	Fraser	Moakley
Bell	Frenzel	Moorhead, Pa.
Bergland	Frey	Morgan
Biaggi	Froehlich	Mosher
Biester	Fulton	Murphy, Ill.
Bingham	Gaydos	Myers
Blatnik	Giaimo	Nedzi
Boland	Ginn	Nelsen
Bolling	Grasso	Nix
Bowen	Green, Oreg.	Obey
Brademas	Green, Pa.	O'Hara
Brasco	Griffiths	O'Neill
Brooks	Gross	Owens
Broomfield	Gude	Perkins
Brotzman	Gunter	Pike
Brown, Calif.	Guyer	Podell
Brown, Mich.	Haley	Preyer
Broyhill, N.C.	Hamilton	Pritchard
Burke, Calif.	Hanley	Quie
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Wash.	Railsback
Burke, Mass.	Harrington	Rangel
Burlison, Mo.	Harsha	Rees
Burton	Hastings	Regula
Carey, N.Y.	Hawkins	Reid
Carney, Ohio	Hays	Reuss
Chisholm	Hechler, W. Va.	Riegle
Clark	Heckler, Mass.	Rinaldo
Clay	Heinz	Robison, N.Y.
Cleveland	Helstoski	Rodino
Cochran	Henderson	Rogers
Cohen	Holtzman	Roncalio, Wyo.
Collier	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Collins, Ill.	Howard	Rose
Conable	Hungate	Rosenthal
Conte	Hutchinson	Roush
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Rousselot
Cotter	Johnson, Colo.	Roy
Coughlin	Jordan	Roybal
Cronin	Karth	Runnels
Culver	Kastenmeier	Ruppe
Daniels, Dominick V.	Keating	Ryan
	Kluczynski	St Germain
Danielson	Koch	Sarasin
Delaney	Kyros	Sarbanes
Dellenback	Leggett	Schneebeli
Dellums	Lehman	Schroeder
Denholm	Litton	Sebelius
Dennis	Long, Md.	Seiberling
Dent	Lujan	Shipley
Diggs	McClory	Shoup
Dingell	McCloskey	Shriver
Donohue	McCormack	Sisk
Drinan	McDade	Skubitz
Dulski	McKay	Slack
du Pont	McKinney	Snyder
Eckhardt	Macdonald	Stanton, J. William
	Taylor, Mo.	Whalen
	Taylor, N.C.	Wilson,
Stanton, James V.	Thompson, N.J.	Charles H., Calif.
	Thomson, Wis.	
Stark	Thone	Wolff
Steele	Thornton	Wydler
Steelman	Tiernan	Wylie
Steiger, Wis.	Udall	Yates
Stokes	Ullman	Yatron
Stuckey	Van Deerlin	Young, Ga.
Studds	Vander Jagt	Young, Ill.
Sullivan	Vanik	Zablocki
Symington	Vigorito	Zwach
Symms	Waldie	

NOES—163

Abdnor	Gonzalez	Patten
Archer	Goodling	Pettis
Arends	Grover	Peyser
Armstrong	Gubser	Pickle
Bafalis	Hanrahan	Poage
Baker	Hansen, Idaho	Powell, Ohio
Beard	Hébert	Price, Ill.
Bennett	Hicks	Price, Tex.
Bevill	Hillis	Quillen
Boggs	Hinshaw	Randall
Bray	Hogan	Rarick
Breaux	Holifield	Rhodes
Breckinridge	Holt	Roberts
Brinkley	Hosmer	Robinson, Va.
Brown, Ohio	Huber	Roncallo, N.Y.
Broyhill, Va.	Hudnut	Rostenkowski
Buchanan	Hunt	Ruth
Burgener	Ichord	Sandman
Burleson, Tex.	Jarman	Satterfield
Butler	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Byron	Jones, Ala.	Scherle
Carter	Jones, Okla.	Shuster
Casey, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Sikes
Cederberg	Kazen	Smith, N.Y.
Chamberlain	Kemp	Spence
Chappell	Ketchum	Staggers
Clancy	Kuykendall	Steed
Clausen, Don H.	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
	Latta	Stratton
Clawson, Del	Lent	Stubblefield
Collins, Tex.	Long, La.	Talcott
Conlan	Lott	Teague, Calif.
Crane	McCollister	Towell, Nev.
Daniel, Dan	McEwen	Treen
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	McFall	Veysey
	Madigan	Waggonner
Davis, Ga.	Mahon	Walsh
Davis, S.C.	Mann	Wampler
Davis, Wis.	Maraziti	Ware
de la Garza	Martin, Nebr.	White
Derwinski	Martin, N.C.	Whitehurst
Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Whitten
Dickinson	Mayne	Wiggins
Dorn	Michel	Williams
Downing	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Duncan	Mizell	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Edwards, Ala.	Mollohan	
Flood	Montgomery	Wright
Flowers	Moorhead, Calif.	Wyatt
Flynt		Wyman
Ford, Gerald R.	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Alaska
Frelinghuysen	Natcher	Young, Fla.
Fuqua	Nichols	Young, S.C.
Gibbons	O'Brien	Young, Tex.
Gilman	Parris	Zion
Goldwater	Passman	

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander	Hanna	Patman
Blackburn	Harvey	Pepper
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Conyers	King	Rooney, N.Y.
Evins, Tenn.	Landgrebe	Smith, Iowa
Fisher	McSpadden	Stephens
Gettys	Milford	Teague, Tex.
Gray	Mills, Ark.	Widnall
Hammer-schmidt	Minshall, Ohio	Winn
	Moss	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEGGETT

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEGGETT: Page 7, line 2 insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 601.".

Page 7, line 5, strike out "$1,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000".

Page 8, immediately after line 9, insert the following:

(b) Section 401 of Public Law 89-367, approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37) is

amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) After June 30, 1973, no sale, credit sale, or guaranty of any defense article or defense service shall be made, or any military assistance (including supporting assistance) furnished to South Vietnam or Laos directly or through any other foreign country unless that sale, credit sale, or guaranty is made, or such assistance is furnished, under this Act.

"(f) Any sale, credit sale, or guaranty made, or assistance provided under this Act to South Vietnam or Laos shall be made or furnished with the objective of bringing about peace in Indochina and strict implementation of the cease-fire agreements in Vietnam and Laos.

"(g) Armaments, munitions, and war materials may be provided to South Vietnam and Laos under any provision of this Act only for the purpose of replacing, on the basis of piece for piece and with armaments, munitions, and war materials of the same characteristics and properties, those araments, munitions, and war materials destroyed, damaged, worn out, or used up (1) in the case of South Vietnam, after January 27, 1973, and which are included on lists previously furnished by the Government of South Vietnam to the International Commission of Control and Supervision for Vietnam, and (2) in the case of Laos, after February 21, 1973, and which are included on lists previously furnished by the Government of Laos to the International Commission of Control and Supervision for Laos.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize for offering an amendment at 10 minutes after 10, but it is the policy of the committee to finish this important bill tonight, and I think we ought to be prepared to stay here and take the time to do the job.

I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ASPIN) on the success he had with his last amendment. Apparently we are prepared to reduce this bill en gros but are not prepared to attack any particular individual sacred cows. I do think it wise to have the discretion of the committee which the Aspin amendment did with respect to the allocation of reductions, and so we really do not have much to complain about in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to title VI is very simple. What I propose to do is correspond this section not with a state of war but with a state of peace in Southeast Asia.

First we reduce the item offered by the Pentagon in the amount of $2.1 billion for the military assistance program for South Vietnam and Laos. The chairman erupted when this was presented to the Committee on Armed Services because it was not justified. The Pentagon then did a somersault and reduced it by $500 million. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) who had been at the hearings continued to erupt at this state of affairs and offered an additional $300 million amendment, which brought the figure down to the current amount stated in the bill of $1.3 billion for aid to South Vietnam and Loas.

As a practical matter, we aided South Vietnam and Laos militarily in 1973 $2.2 billion, in 1972 $2.1 billion, and in 1969 and 1968 the figures were $1.2 billion and $1.3 billion respectively, amounts which were less than the amount in this bill.

Under the Paris agreements which have been negotiated they provide for a piece for piece replacement in Southeast Asia. These briefings have been given to our committee by the Pentagon on a number of occasions. This particular language has been adopted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We cannot provide money for operations and maintenance or personnel support.

If you look at page 85 of the committee report, you will see that there is $615 million in this bill for operation and maintenance of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force in South Vietnam. We are not authorized to do that under these agreements.

There is $36.6 million for military personnel for the Army, Navy and Marine Corps in Vietnam, and we are not authorized to do that under the agreement executed in January.

There is an item of $432 million which probably refers to munitions and to replacement of materials which are authorized under the agreements. By Department of Defense definition the only thing we can replace on a piece for piece basis are tanks, military aircraft, military self-propelled vehicles such as armored tracked vehicles, military tactical wheeled vehicles, military radio facilities, land-based military tactical radar. Under armaments we have an itemization of what is allowed, and under munitions we have an itemization of what is allowed. But there is nothing in here in the agreements that have been executed that would allow us to authorize and appropriate in bulk $1.3 billion to carry on the war after we have negotiated a peace with honor in South Vietnam and in Laos.

The amendment that we have here has a great number——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to try to legislate intelligently at this hour and under these circumstances.

For example, the amendment which the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) has just offered, was not offered in committee. The gentleman only offered an amendment reducing funds, and that was overwhelmingly defeated. The gentleman did not offer the language which he had in here now which, as far as I can see with a fast reading, is only a repetition of the details of the cease-fire agreement.

But the important fact is that the money involved in this section is to enable South Vietnam and Laos to go it on their own in their own defense. That is what we said we wanted them to do. We have negotiated a peace, and we promised to give them the military weapons to defend themselves in South Vietnam, once that peace was agreed to. Now we are in the process of getting a detailed settlement in Laos, and we have promised to provide that same assistance to them.

In 1973 we gave $2.7 billion to South Vietnam and Laos for this purpose. This year the Department of Defense requested $2.1 billion for this same purpose and the committee cut that figure to $1.3 billion.

As far as South Vietnam was concerned, we reduced the total about a half billion dollars; and as far as Laos is concerned we reduced it by two-thirds.

This bears out what the gentleman from Louisiana was saying a moment ago, that as far as some people are concerned they will just not be happy until they get it down to zero.

I thought our major objective in Southeast Asia was to get all of our forces out, and let those people defend themselves. That is precisely what this section is providing for.

The gentleman from California says we cannot do such things under the terms of the agreement. But the Committee on Armed Services has a letter from the Department of Defense, in which the Department of State concurs, in which they say that these amounts can properly be provided under the terms of our agreement, and that such expenditures are consistent with the abovementioned agreements. I include the letter at this point in my remarks:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1973.

Mr. FRANK M. SLATINSHEK,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SLATINSHEK: The following information is provided in response to your question whether funds included in the military personnel and operation and maintenance accounts of the FY 1974 MASF request may be lawfully expended under the terms of the January 27, 1973 Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam and the February 21, 1973 Agreement on the Restoration of Peace and Reconciliation in Laos.

It is the position of the Department of Defense that such expenditures are consistent with the above-mentioned agreements.

As the Committee is aware, the revised requests for military assistance to Vietnamese and Laotian forces submitted to the Committee upon which the Committee acted reflect the reduced scale of operations resulting from the Agreements.

With respect to Vietnam, no provision of the January Agreement prohibits the furnishing of technical services to the Government of Vietnam by Department of Defense direct hire civilian employees or contractor personnel. Dr. Kissinger expressly addressed himself to this point in his News Conference of January 24, 1973, wherein he stated that:

"We are permitted to retain economic advisers, and civilian technicians serving in certain of the military branches."

Further, the January Agreement does not prohibit the furnishing of such supplies and materials as are chargeable to the military personnel and operation and maintenance accounts (e.g., subsistence, POL, spare parts, and other consumables). I should add in this connection that, in our opinion, such supplies are not limited by the January Agreement to a one-for-one replacement.

Insofar as Laos is concerned, the only part of the February Agreement which might possibly impact upon the MASF military personnel and operation and maintenance accounts is the requirement that foreign mili-

tary personnel withdraw 60 days after the date of establishment of the Provisional Government and the Joint National Political Council contemplated by that Agreement. Further, the withdrawal of such personnel receiving support from these accounts would not require the termination of any significant amount of such expenditures since their withdrawal has been anticipated in the FY 1974 request; any reduction in such expenditures following withdrawal of such personnel which has not already been reflected in the revised estimate would be minimal.

The Department of State concurs in the foregoing conclusions.

Sincerely yours,

L. NIEDERLEHNER,
Acting General Counsel.

Certainly our major objective is to insure that the cease-fire will really work. Let us carry out our commitments at this reduced rate, as the committee has recommended. But let us not strike it out, as the gentleman from California would do. If we do that we would renege on our commitment, and would almost certainly guarantee that the cease-fire we have won so painfully will be lost within the next few months.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from New York if it is not true that prior to this year we were giving troop support to the South Vietnamese? Now we propose that they go on their own with a very positively reduced budget; but the amendment offered by the gentleman from California would slam the door in their faces, and make it impossible for them to carry out any kind of defense by their own government.

Mr. STRATTON. That is exactly true. We achieved the cease-fire in part because we had solemnly assured the South Vietnamese that we were giving them a commitment of adequate equipment to carry on their part of the job. If this amendment is passed, we will be telling the Vietnamese that we have now reneged on that commitment, that we are going to throw them to the wolves, and that it does not matter a bit what happens thereafter.

This is an ill-conceived amendment and ought to be soundly defeated.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is only correct that I call the attention of this body to the report and to the language of this section. Indeed, the committee says on page 82 of the report that the Department of Defense has acknowledged that some of the language of this section no longer reflects the current factual situation.

If we read the bill and if we read the report, we note that there are references in this section 601 to the "Free World Forces" in support of Vietnamese forces, even though the "Free World Forces" have withdrawn from Vietnam and their reintroduction is prohibited by the Paris Agreement of January 27, 1973, that there are references to the fact that nothing herein shall prohibit supportive actions required to insure the safe and orderly withdrawal and disengagement of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia, or to aid in the release of Americans held prisoners of war even though our forces are withdrawn and our prisoners have been returned.

The fact is that this is not ordinary military assistance; this is a continuation the way in this bill and report reads, of actual military assistance on the part of this country to Laos and South Vietnam illegally as though the war has not ended, not only is the language obsolescent, but the substance, particularly, when one realizes that we are out of South Vietnam and Laos. Yet we continue a military program which can only be viewed as contemplative of war. I think it is quite shocking for us to pass legislation authorizing $1.3 billion worth of appropriations in this way at this time.

The report goes on, for example, to say that there is still difficulty in Laos, when, in fact, right now the papers are full of the fact that we are moving in Laos toward implementation of the cease-fire, that we are on the verge of signing an agreement with all of the parties there. This is done to justify this enormous appropriation—but justify we cannot.

What we are seeking to do here at the request of the Pentagon, at the request of the Committee on Armed Services, incorrectly, is to commit a billion or more dollars of America's money, based on an incorrect policy—a policy long since rejected by this Congress and the country. This is not ordinary military assistance; it is in fact assistance which indicates our determination to continue the kind of involvement of this country that we had before. I think that the language of the bill and the report makes it clear that that is what is being proposed to us, and I hope we will support the amendment.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ABZUG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her support on this amendment. I should like to ask the gentlewoman as she reads the peace agreements, does she find any support whatsoever for the purported justification for the amounts in this particular section as contained on page 85 of our committee report of some $650 million for operation and maintenance of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps? Does she think that might breach then, the agreement?

Ms. ABZUG. I think that it does, in fact, breach the Paris agreement of January 27 and the Laos cease-fire agreement of February. That is why if we read the language of the other body in this very bill, we will find that they very carefully restrict the kind of sales, the kind of military assistance, that can be furnished to South Vietnam and Laos.

Mr. LEGGETT. Does not this amendment leave $500 million in the bill for military assistance to South Vietnam and to Laos for a one-to-one replacement? And do we not, in addition to that, have $635 million of economic assistance that we voted in the foreign assistance bill here just the other day?

Ms. ABZUG. That is correct.

Mr. LEGGETT. So we have a $1.1 billion program as it is, and this amount would put it up to almost $2 billion to carry on peace?

Ms. ABZUG. That is correct. I think that we would be making a very serious error if we fail to amend this section, and we will regret it if we do not.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the factual situation, the Defense Department asked for $2.1 billion; the committee cut it to $1.3 billion; and the gentleman from California wants to cut it to $500 million. That is a 75-percent reduction.

We have withdrawn our forces. We have gotten our POW's back. It seems to me if we want to make an honest effort to keep the military situation stable in South Vietnam and North Vietnam and in Vietnam as a whole, we have to have an adequate military hardware situation for the South Vietnamese. If we do not have an adequate military hardware situation we do not have a prayer of getting an honest investigation as to the facts concerning the 1,400 MIA's.

We are having enough trouble now trying to find out where the alleged MIA's lost their lives or where their bodies are. If we have a disintegration of the military situation in Vietnam because of this kind of meat-ax cut, we will have given up all hope of any solution to the problem of the MIA's. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I would invite the attention of the Members to page 83 of the report, and I will read only one paragraph to show the movement of troops North Vietnam is making into South Vietnam.

It reads as follows:

Movement of troops and military supplies into South Vietnam has increased considerably the military capability of the communist forces there. As an example, since the 27 January ceasefire agreements, an estimated 41,000 North Vietnamese Army personnel have traversed the various infiltration routes from North Vietnam into South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Since October 1972, it is estimated the North Vietnamese have deployed about 500 tanks and 190 artillery pieces into South Vietnam. At the present time, the North Vietnamese Army has a substantial number of tanks and artillery pieces in the South—far more than ever before.

So, Mr. Chairman, in ending I think it is foolish for us to go along and say we should not help these people to protect themselves. I hope the Members will defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY OF OHIO

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNEY of Ohio: Page 15, immediately after line 8, insert the following:

SEC. 605. (a) No funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated under a contract entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act for procurement of goods which are other than American goods unless there is adequate consideration given to the matter of hidden costs. For the purposes of this section, hidden costs refer to—

(1) the increase in unemployment in the United States which may result from using goods which are other than American goods;

(2) the increased cost of unemployment compensation or welfare payments to American workers which may result from using goods which are other than American goods;

(3) the loss by the United States of personal and corporate income tax revenue which may result from using goods which are other than American goods;

(4) the loss to the money supply of the United States which may result from using goods which are other than American goods;

(5) the cost of shipping and inspecting goods which are other than American goods; and

(6) any duty, tariff, surcharge, or other expense which may enter into the cost of using goods which are other than American goods.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "goods which are other than American goods" means articles, materials, and supplies which have not been produced or manufactured in the United States or which have not been manufactured in substantial part from other articles, materials, and supplies which have been mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States.

(c) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) develop as soon as possible, for use in conjunction with the Department of Defense, a reporting system which will evaluate the effectiveness of the provisions of this section with respect to the balance of payments benefits and the additional costs incurred; and

(2) evaluate, and report to Congress as soon as possible, the operation of the provisions of subsection (b) respecting the inclusion of component parts in consideration of hidden costs.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to raise a point of order against the amendment. I will reserve that point of order and allow the gentleman to proceed.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for reserving his point of order, because I think when I get done there will be no point of order.

First of all, this is the one amendment which I think everybody here will agree adds no cost to this bill; it does not subtract any cost; it does not subtract any men or add any men. All this provides is that the work, whenever possible and equitable, defense work, be done by American workers. If anyone can find any fault with that, I cannot see it.

I first became aware of the need to strengthen the buy American policy on August 5, 1971, and I have to personalize this to explain. On that day five employees of the Youngstown Welding & Engineering Co. came to my office with a petition signed by 1,200 workers protesting the awarding of a U.S. Navy subcontract to a Canadian company subcontracting computer tubes and ejection pumps, which was awarded to Canadian Vickers, Ltd., Toronto, Canada. This was done even though Youngstown Welding & Enginering Co. had a proven track record of making these products since 1958. Four other American companies which submitted bids for this contract were also bypassed.

The justification given by the Navy for bypassing the American companies was that the Canadian company offered the lowest bid. However, the final two bids, Canadian Vickers was $3,950,000 and the American bid by Youngstown Welding & Engineering Co. was $3,994,000; a difference of $44,000.

I protested this to the Navy. I asked if they took into consideration the income tax American workers paid; the income tax the company paid; the effect of this on the economy of the Nation; the fact that it would mean more unemployment insurance and more unemployment compensation; all these were outlined. To each and every one of these they did not take any into consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I have a big written speech here, but I know the hour is late, so I say to the Members, look at this amendment. All it does is say that they take these things into consideration before awarding a bid to a foreign company.

How any American, the American taxpayers who paid for this with their lives and blood and money, can ignore this I do not know.

I say we have got to think of America first if we are going to think of defense.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order. As far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to this "buy American" amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I was going to present here today on a matter which many Members of the House, upon receiving my "Colleague" letter, indicated they were quite interested in. I therefore discussed the matter with the appropriate subcommittee chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

This amendment concerns itself with the issue of military surveillance and investigations into the beliefs, associations, and political activities of civilians and private organizations.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have learned of military surveillance and investigations into the beliefs, associations, and political activities of civilians and private organizations. Dossiers on more than 100,000 citizens and groups have been collected by the Army and stored in 350 centers throughout the country, according to the other body's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

The data in these files often contain matters of a private and personal nature, as well as matters pertaining to political activities. What have matters of marriage or divorce, sexual proclivities, or drinking habits to do with the prerequisities of military information? The answer is, in a word, nothing. These are irrelevant to the Army's informational needs as are political activities of civilians and private groups. In fact, as with many investigative reports, there is much that is inaccurate, unsubstantiated, innuendo, and hearsay. All these things make their way into military files about civilians.

This activity began, it is reported, with the civil disorders in the black ghettos in 1967 and continued through such obvious threats to the national security as Earth Day 1971. Reports of undercover surveillance and infiltration of peace, civil rights and antiwar groups—groups that were expressing their constitutional rights under the first amendment—have continued right through the Democratic and Republican Conventions last year in Miami.

Today the newspapers report the start of the trial of the "Gainesville Eight"—a group of eight members of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. Besides the allegations made by the defendants that there are connections between Watergate participants and this trial, there are also allegations that will probably come out in the trial, about the undercover infiltration and surveillance of this group by agents of the military intelligence establishment.

This must not be allowed to continue. One of the basic tenets of American democracy, one of the guiding principles articulated by the framers of our Constitution was the right of civilians—of citizens—to be free from control, domination, surveillance, or infiltration, by the military. We must maintain the separateness of our military and civilian populations.

I should like to ask the gentleman on the Committee on Armed Services (Mr. NEDZI) whether or not as a result of his own investigations and hearings he plans to have any legislation brought forward which will restrict the military surveillance of civilian activities.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ABZUG. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. NEDZI. As I indicated to the gentlewoman in our discussion earlier in the day, it has long been the intention of the Intelligence Subcommittee to look into the matter fully. The sentiment which I have gathered from the members of the subcommittee indicates they are favorably disposed toward controls on the military with respect to surveillance of civilians. I anticipate that in the very near future we will have legislation before the House.

Ms. ABZUG. And this legislation, I take it, will be directed toward restricting or prohibiting that kind of activity and the use of funds by the military for that purpose?

Mr. NEDZI. That is correct.

Ms. ABZUG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the Committee at this late hour. There is one thing which is happening I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee. I had intended to offer an amendment.

The Secretary of the Army has recommended to the Secretary of Defense that a large amount of GB nerve gas be transported from Rocky Mountain Arsenal in Denver to Tooele Army Depot in Utah, which is in my district.

There is no purpose in this transportation, in my opinion. We have in this country already adequate nerve gas literally to kill the world's population a thousand or 2,000 times over. This transportation would pose an intolerable threat to large areas of population. The gas ought to be detoxified rather than shipped. It is not necessary for whatever deterrent capacity we need, even if we accept the policy of the National Security Council on stockpiling of nerve gas.

I had intended to offer an amendment. I discussed it with the chairman. Instead I will offer a bill which in effect will require a review of that policy and will freeze all transportation of gas in this country until and unless the Secretary of Defense certifies or the President of the United States certifies it is necessary for our deterrent capacity.

A number of events in 1969 led to the public revelation of a program in chemical and biological warfare which was of far greater magnitude than many of us ever had realized. In the congressional hearings and investigations of these events, we became aware of the very great hazards associated with the storage, transportation, and destruction of obsolescent chemical weapons. Of particular concern at this time was the public disclosure of the large quantities of the so-called nerve agents which make up a significant portion of our chemical arsenal.

The President completed a review of the Nation's defense posture in 1969 and determined that biological warfare agents were not a necessary part of our arsenal for defense. At this same time, however, it was the President's decision that although we would not initiate the first of chemical weapons, we would continue to maintain chemical weapons for their potential value as a deterrent type of weapons system. Although his announcement in 1969 solved many of our problems concerning biological warfare agent stockpiles and our national policies concerning the use of these weapons, we were still left with the public health problem of coping with the chemical weapons in our storage and weapons loading sites. There are a number of these storage and loading sites throughout the Nation and shipment between these sites seems to be necessary on some occasions. We were reminded of this problem when the Department of Defense proposed to return to the continental United States a shipment of nerve agent munitions which had been stockpiled on the island of Okinawa. Public concern about this proposal led to a change in the DOD position and the munitions were stored on Johnston Island in the Pacific instead of being returned to this country. The Congress also has prohibited any further transportation and dumping at sea of these toxic munitions.

During this same period, the public became aware of the fact that a large quantity of nerve agent munitions were stored in a facility very close to the landing pattern of the airfield at Denver. In 1969, the public concern with this potential danger led to an announcement by the Army that some of these nerve agent munitions would be destroyed. As you know, we have learned that instead of destroying these munitions, a proposal has been made to ship most of these munitions and nerve agent supplies to a storage site at Tooele, Utah. Naturally, there has been public objection again to the shipment of these toxic agents and any further addition to the stockpile at Tooele.

When I began to investigate this issue of moving chemical munitions to Tooele my initial reaction was one of concern about the immediate potential hazard as well as with the question of the need for such a shipment. As I became more familiar with the problem, however, I became aware of the fact that deeper issues were involved. Of course I am most concerned with the immediate resolution of the proposal to move more toxic munitions from the dangerous storage site in Denver across country to Tooele. But I am even more concerned with the fact that we seem to have given insufficient consideration to the resolution of several major national issues associated with our policies for the use of chemical weapons.

In response to the call of the Congress, the President has returned the Geneva Protocol to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for advice and consent to ratification. In doing so, however, he attached certain reservations regarding the status of the chemical herbicides and the use of tear gas and the Senate committee was forced to go back to the President and ask for his reconsideration of this issue. As of this date, the President has not replied to the committee chairman's letter and the protocol still resides in the Foreign Relations Committee.

This inaction on the Geneva protocol certainly had an important bearing on the progress of our disarmament negotiations at Geneva. We find ourselves in this instance in the position of advocating chemical weapons disarmament while being one of the few nations in the world which has not signed the major treaty concerned with the use of chemical weapons.

I have also learned that the Army has been working for some time on a chemical weapons system, known as a binary system, which would permit the substitution of a relatively safe intermediate system in storage in place of the extremely toxic nerve agents while at the same time maintaining the capability of responding in kind in the event of attack by another Nation. If the new weapon system is as effective as has been discussed during the last few Appropriations hearings, it would seem that the Department of Defense would be more anxious to begin phasing the safer system into our storage systems.

Thus we find ourselves in a continuing dilemma. The political situation in the world has altered dramatically since the earlier decision regarding the Nations policy on the use of chemical weapons. We find ourselves stalled in our negotiations at Geneva to reach an accord on the control of chemical weapons. Although some observers point out the need for inspection and verification as being the major obstacle to reaching an accord on a chemical weapons treaty, other observers indicate that potentially adequate methods of verification are at hand.

While we continue to be confronted with the public health threat of handling and storing extremely toxic nerve agents in our stockpiles, we exhibit only a low priority of effort for the development of a system which would give us the same deterrent capability without the threat posed by existing stockpiles.

It would seem to me that there is as much need today for a new look at our national policies on chemical warfare as there was for our examination in 1969 on both our biological and chemical warfare policies. We may find that the need for chemical weapons as a deterrent weapon system is no longer a valid concept. We may find, if the policy is one of continued maintenance of such a capability, that acceleration of the binary system would alleviate what continues to be a serious public health hazard, still unresolved after 4 years of promises. Certainly, the situation near the Denver airfield should not be permitted to continue. As an interim measure, it seems to me that the stockpiles at Tooele are more than adequate to meet any immediate defense requirements and that destruction at Denver rather than transport to Tooele is the solution to the problem of the hazardous conditions at the Denver storage site. Admittedly, we need more information. If we are to legislate effectively, we need to know the basis for continuing the maintenance of a dangerous stockpile of toxic nerve agents. We need to know more about the benefit/risk assessments associated with the shift from current nerve agent systems to the binary system which has been under evaluation for such a long period of time and which has been promised as a system for so many years. We have come a long way from our earlier pre–1969 atmosphere of secrecy concerning these types of weapons. We need to know more about the risks which we are assuming with the continued maintenance of nerve agents in our stocks as well as the real advantages of such system. I find little justification for holding such materials near highly populated areas—and would like to be convinced of the necessity for continuing to maintain such weapons in a total arsenal of weapons which includes nuclear devices. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 should receive immediate attention in the Senate, the President should make his position clear regarding the need for excluding herbicides and tear gas. Even the military reports seem to offer little

justification as to the effectiveness of these latter agents in combat. We need to consider the advantages and disadvantages of maintaining a chemical capability in the new political climate which seem to be developing within the world.

And finally, we cannot continue to tolerate the continual and unexpected threat of shifting and moving such toxic munitions and bulk chemical warfare agents from one section to another within the country. If chemical agents are necessary, as should be determined by a reevaluation of our need for these agents, we need to look at the storage and distribution of these agents in a comprehensive fashion in order to assure that the threat to populated areas is held to an absolute minimum, even if this means that destruction at certain sites is utilized rather than the risk of transportation to safer sites. If necessary, some slight additional production at a safe production site and shift to a safe storage site by absolutely safe transportation systems could be adopted to restore stocks to those levels considered essential. There is no reason why we should continue to tolerate the exposure of our population to such dangerous conditions.

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

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this matter with the gentleman.

The gentleman indicated he would introduce a bill along these lines, and I informed him that the Committee on Armed Services would give it its immediate consideration.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before we conclude consideration of this bill, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of our committee (Mr. HÉBERT) for the very patient and tolerant manner in which he conducted hearings on this bill under what were sometimes very exasperating circumstances. I am sure that he would not curtail debate or cut anyone off.

I would like also to draw attention to the splendid job our staff did. When I mention the staff, I think I should call attention to the fact that one of the members of the staff retired effective July 1, but was kind enough to come back here and assist us in the consideration of the bill. He was the counsel for our Subcommittee on Research and Development, headed so ably by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE). I am referring to Mr. Earl Morgan. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Morgan will be leaving us, and we will miss him. I certainly, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, want to thank him for all he has done and wish him well in the future.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) if I may, a question or two.

Would the gentleman be able to tell me: Are there any funds in this bill for the Central Intelligence Agency?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir.

Mr. WALDIE. None whatsoever?

Mr. HÉBERT. No, sir.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill as reported out by the Committee on Armed Services reduced the F–15 air superiority aircraft procurement by almost half of the 77 aircraft requested by the Air Force. The committee took this action because the members determined that the program should be slowed down at least until the final endurance qualification test was complete.

Although it is true that in February 1973, difficulties were encountered which prevented completion of the 150-hour endurance test of the Pratt and Whitney F–100 engine, the Air Force was authorized to proceed with the fiscal year 1974 increment of the F–15 production subject to certain limitations—including the successful completion of the engine 150–hour endurance test. However, due to the fact that excessive flexing in the fan stator assembly could have been encountered at the highest pressures at the engine inlet, the Air Force elected to modify the second 150-hour endurance test criteria to exclude two test points at mach 2.3 until the fan stator assembly could be stiffened. This modified 150-hour endurance run was successfully completed in April using an engine which incorporated thicker fan blade tips and improved turbine cooling to correct deficiencies discovered during the initial 150-hour test run in February. This test established that the F–100 engine had the capability to meet the ruggedness demanded by the Air Force.

Moreover, since the endurance run in April, a modification to correct the design deficiency in the fan stator assembly has been fabricated and is currently undergoing verification testing and an engine with the modified fan stator assembly has been successfully operated at the design maximum engine inlet pressure without incident. Additionally the Secretary of the Air Force has directed that an engine with the modified fan stator assembly will be tested to the original 150-hour endurance test criteria. This test, which will constitute the formal 150-hour endurance qualification, is planned for completion by September 30, 1973—in sufficient time to be included in the flight test program, and 14 months ahead of the delivery of the first production F–15.

The successful completion of the modified durability run, the outstanding flight test program—including flights at mach 2.3—and other engine performance tests in the high pressure regime, reinforce the high confidence that this additional 150-hour endurance test can be completed as planned.

Despite these problems, I want to remind my colleagues that the Pratt & Whitney F–100 engine has demonstrated an exceptional performance record in the F–15 flight test program and has undergone hundreds of hours of inflight testing and thousands of hours of ground testing, including the successful completion of the modified, but very strenuous endurance test. This experience clearly shows this to be an excellent engine with high promise of fulfilling the demanding performance requirements of the F–15.

The F–4E, as great an airplane as it is, has at best a marginal superiority over current Russian fighters. Should the Soviets produce an advanced fighter, we can expect to see the F–4E, even when modified with leading edge slats, completely outclassed. Should this happen, our pilots will once again be forced to face an enemy with inferior equipment as in 1942 when we sent our boys against Japanese Zeros and German Messerschmidts in the antiquated P–40.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, the flight test performance of the F–15 has been nothing less than outstanding. Rarely has there been an aircraft flight test program which has been so trouble free in the first 700 hours of flight. As an example, flight test milestones which were scheduled to be accomplished within 8 weeks of first flight were completed in 17 days. In all, there have been over 630 flights during which the aircraft has been flown above 60,000 feet and at speeds in excess of mach 2. In addition, all milestones in the flight test program have been completed on or ahead of schedule—an accomplishment unique in Air Force fighter programs. Through all of this, the F–100 engine has performed without a major incident.

It is for these technical reasons—coupled with the fact that this air superiority aircraft is sorely needed in the Air Force, that I believe we should support this program and that we should strive to get this superior aircraft into the Air Force inventory as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the need for new U.S. air superiority fighter aircraft is clear. The Soviets have been steadily improving their air-to-air capability with regular introduction of new fighters into their inventory. In recent years they have produced six new fighters and improved three older ones with major modifications. These represent a whole new family of fighters possessing high performance capabilities in terms of maneuverability, acceleration, and weaponry.

Since the appearance of Soviet fighters in the Korean war, these fighters have possessed performance characteristics which challenge U.S. fighter aircraft in many areas.

To reverse this dangerous trend toward having our air forces equipped with second rate fighter aircraft, it is imperative that the United States upgrade its fighter capability with such aircraft as the Air Force F–15 and the Navy F–14.

The F–15 will be the Air Force's first air superiority fighter since the F–86, which made its first flight more than 25 years ago. The F–15 will meet the post-1975 superiority challenge, since it is designed specifically to excel in the air-to-air combat role.

F–15 tactical missions will be fighter sweep, escort, and combat air patrol, all of which require that the F–15 be able to acquire, identify, engage, and destroy enemy aircraft in either contested or

enemy airspace and in enemy-controlled radar environment.

The F–15 is designed to meet a composite threat—not that of any one specific aircraft. The assessed performance of current and projected Soviet aircraft has been considered in defining F–15 performance characteristics. As a result, where air-to-air combat might take place, the F–15 will out climb, out maneuver, and out accelerate any enemy fighter built in the next decade.

The ability of these advanced fighters to achieve their outstanding performance is due in large part to advanced technology jet engines. The Pratt & Whitney Aircraft division of United Aircraft Corp. at its research center in Florida, is developing the new high-performance F–100 jet engine for the F–15 and the F–401 engine for advanced Navy fighters. The F–401 will be tested in the F–14B airplane.

The F–100 and the F–401 engines represent the greatest single advance ever achieved in gas turbine engine technology, as shown on chart I. These remarkable engines produce about 25 percent more power for each pound of engine weight than the highest performance engine now in the U.S. inventory. In terms of performance, the high thrust to weight characteristic would allow the aircraft to make very tight turns at high speed, enabling our pilots to turn "inside" an enemy aircraft and gain the combat advantage which means air superiority. These new engines will enable the F–15 and the F–14 to fly farther with more payload, or fly higher and faster, with more combat maneuverability than fighter aircraft in our present arsenal.

The F–100 engine is performing extremely well in the F–15 flight test program, even though there have been some problems in the engine development program. These problems have been much publicized but are not extraordinary. Recent incidents involving the engines are typical of those experienced in developing any completely new high-performance propulsion system. The fundamental purpose of any engine development program is to identify problem areas through such incidents and make corrections before the engine goes into operational use. And the first planned operational use of the F–100 engine is more than a year away.

Engines employed in development programs are deliberately pushed to extremes on the test stand to determine the limits of their durability and to prove the integrity of their design. As a result, component failures are expected during the development period. It is significant to note that the number of development failures which have occurred in the F–100 engine development program is essentially the same as occurred during development of current generation high performance engines, as shown on chart II, in spite of the fact that the technological gains in this program were significantly higher than in previous developments. If the F–100 incident rate is compared to the earlier development of high successful engines for the F–111, the F–105, and the A–3D, we find that a dramatic improvement in development success has been demonstrated in the current program. This is even more impressive when you consider that today's modern development test facilities have made it possible to subject the engines to much more rigorous test conditions of speed, altitude, and endurance much earlier in development than was possible in previous programs. This ability significantly reduces the potential for expensive, time-consuming problems which in earlier programs were detected only after the aircraft had begun flying.

In April of this year, an F–100 engine completed a very successful 150-hour endurance ground test. This test was designed to demonstrate the functional durability of the engine by imposing operating conditions and durations representing the extremes of those expected in actual service. This test covered the entire envelope except for two conditions which were run at slightly different simulated altitudes and at mach numbers of 2.0 and 2.2, instead of at mach 2.3. Chart III provides a comparison of the original test conditions against actual test points. This test was equivalent to what the engine will encounter during several thousand hours of operational flight. This grueling test was completed in record time and the engine came through in excellent condition. The test verified that the F–100 is already an extremely durable engine.

The April 1973, 150-hour ground engine test included operation at the F–15's maximum design flight speed and included more than 90 hours of operation at maximum turbine inlet temperature and over 80 hours of operation with afterburning. The engine was subjected to 350 punishing "snap" accelerations from idle to intermediate or maximum power. In a related but separate series of test, the F–100 "swallowed" water, ice, sand, and other foreign objects it might encounter in operational use, and continued to operate reliably.

Shortly before the 150-hour test began in April, the testing program indicated that a nonmoving part of the engine, known as the fan stator assembly, might flex under high load, contact rotating parts, and cause engine failure. The Air Force logically changed the test requirements to reduce the high load on the stator, thus avoiding a delay in the program and a possible loss of the test engine. The Air Force, McDonnell Douglas and Pratt & Whitney Aircraft all recognized that a redesigned, stiffened stator made of a different material was to be installed and tested after completion of the April test. It is this decision of the Air Force which has received comment in the press and in Government circles. It has since been decided that the test completed in April will not be considered the official qualification test.

A redesigned fan stator assembly has been installed on an F–100 engine and successfully tested at altitude and flight speed conditions identical to those in the qualification test schedule. Additional durability testing is in progress. This new fan stator assembly has been installed in production engines and is currently being flight tested in the F–15 aircraft. The official qualification test of an engine incorporating the improved stator assembly design will be conducted in full accordance with the complete test conditions. This test is scheduled for completion before September 30 of this year. All test results to date point to a successful completion of the qualification test on schedule.

The F–100 and F–401 engines have now accumulated over 15,000 hours of development testing. This total includes 1,300 flight hours accumulated by eight F–15 aircraft without a single major failure. All flight demonstration milestones have been accomplished ahead of schedule in the F–15 flight test program, which began more than 1 year ago at Edwards Air Force Base in California. This flight evaluation program has been the most productive and trouble-free the Air Force has ever conducted with an entirely new aircraft system. As an example, flight test milestones, that were scheduled to be accomplished within 8 weeks after the first F–15 flight, were completed in just 17 days, less than one-third of the time allotted. These aircraft have made more than 630 flights demonstrating air superiority performance over a large portion of the plane's flight envelope, as shown on chart IV. An altitude of over 60,000 feet has been attained at supersonic speeds; a speed equal to the design goal for the F–15 has been flown. The maneuverability and handling qualities have met all estimates and the performance has exceeded predictions. All milestones in the flight test program have been completed on or ahead of schedule—an accomplishment unparalleled in previous Air Force programs involving new fighter aircraft.

The experience gained in development testing and the outstanding record of the F–100 engine in the F–15 flight test program provide assurance that the official 150-hour endurance test will be completed on schedule by the end of September, in sufficient time for the engine configuration to be thoroughly flight tested before delivery of the first production F–15 aircraft a year later.

As the world's leading designer and builder of high performance aircraft engines, Pratt & Whitney Aircraft is eminently qualified to produce the F–100 and F–401 advanced technology engines. P. & W.A. engines power many first-line military aircraft such as the A–4, A–6, A–7A, F–105, and F–111 fighters; the 2,000 mile-per-hour YF–12A interceptor and the SR–71 reconnaissance aircraft; the B–52 bomber, and the C–141 cargo transport. The company's engines also power most of the commercial airliners built in this country, including the Boeing 707, 727, 737, and 747 and the McDonnell-Douglas DC–8, DC–9, and DC–10–40 airliners.

An article follows:

SHAH OGLES U.S. JETS

(By Orr Kelly and George Sherman)

The Defense Department closed down Andrews Air Force Base for two hours this morning to put on a spectacular flying demonstration of its two newest fighterplanes for Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlevi of Iran.

The demonstration also was the first unofficial "fly-off" between the Navy F14 Tomcat and the newer Air Force F15 Eagle.

The Shah has told American officials he wants to buy either the F14 or the F15—or some of both.

The Shah also announced that his government on Tuesday signed the first comprehensive agreement with an American company, Ashland Oil, Inc., to share 50–50 in building refineries and filling stations for Iranian oil marketed in the United States.

This "downstream" oil agreement is the first such well to market operation between an American oil company and a foreign oil supplier. The Shah said the Ashland agreement involved between 100,000 and 200,000 barrels of oil a day, "and may be repeated with other oil companies."

(Later the Iranian embassy said that the Shah has misspoken and that the deal was for 10,000 to 20,000 barrels of oil a day, not 100,000 to 200,000 barrels.)

The Ashland Oil chairman, Orin E. Atkins, had announced Tuesday that an illegal $100,000 contribution had been made to the re-election campaign of President Nixon. The company said that the contribution had been returned last week.

The Shah, in a reference to Watergate, warned-against dangerous erosion of presidential authority. "I can say emphatically," he stressed, "about the power of the President of the United States in split-second decision-making, if weakened and jeopardized, that it would be a grave danger to the world."

Sources say Iran is thinking in terms of 30 F14s and 50 F15s—a deal which could run to $1 billion. Last year Iran ordered $2 billion in aircraft including 100 Phantoms to add to the 78 already in the Iranian Air Force.

In the demonstration flights today, Grumman Aerospace Corp., maker of the F14, and McDonnell Douglas Aircraft Corp., maker of the F15, clearly were vying for the shah's nod.

The press was kept on a nearby knoll, a hundred yards from where the shah inspected the planes and watched the fly-off.

In the demonstration, a light-blue F15 with bright orange tail, flown only 15 hours since its delivery to the Air Force, made a maximum take-off and climbed almost straight up to 17,000 feet, then descended and passed over the field at 500 feet flying nearly 600 m.p.h.

The pilot then made a low-speed pass over the field, circled within the confines of the field and landed on the first third of the runway.

The F14's pilot put his plane through an even more spectacular demonstration.

He took off downwind, pulled the nose back and headed straight up. At about a thousand feet over the field he went over onto his back and then rolled out in an Immelman loop.

He then circled the field in maneuvers that left even Air Force pilots gasping.

The Shah insisted yesterday that the final number of F14s and F15s would depend upon "the quality of the threat" he faces. The F14 Tomcat, equipped with new Phoenix missiles, is the only American jet thought to be able to conquer the Soviet MIG 23 Foxbat which is reported to have made several overflights of Iran recently.

The Shah refused to point the finger at the Soviet Union yesterday as a threat to Iran. He made clear that the major problem is neighboring Iraq, which, he said, has "a superior number" of planes to Iran, and which is "unfriendly."

According to U.S. sources, Iraq is receiving MIGs from the Soviet Union. It has made an Iraqi base at the head of the Persian Gulf available to Soviet Navy ships.

The Shah told newsmen time and again that Iran, which sits abreast of the Persian Gulf with 31 million people and with an annual oil revenue of $6 billion a year, must be treated differently from other countries in the Middle East.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the committee has added 12 F–111F's to the bill we have before us. It is a responsible act, and a perceptive one.

It brings to mind Winston Churchill's rather frequent admonition to the effect that it is sometimes useful to recognize the obvious. And what could be more obvious, than the need in today's world, to preserve the only bomber aircraft production line in the free world. That statement is literally correct. The line that produces the F–111 fighter-bomber is the only active aircraft production facility capable of producting not only the unique F–111 tactical aircraft but also its strategic version should that become necessary.

This is not the first time that the House Armed Services Committee has been called upon to preserve the capability that is represented by this well proven aircraft and to maintain the integrity of the people and the plant that produce it. Two years ago the committee had to take the same action as it is recommending to the House today. At that time the Air Force and the Department of Defense, for reasons that are anybody's guess, failed to request authority and funds for the F–111.

Events since that time have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that the action was a correct one. And the action also proved again that the Congress and its committees must play an active part in the determination of national policy. Examples of that principle literally surround us, and to a lesser or greater degree have always surrounded us.

The simple fact is that the F–111 is the most modern, most capable, and most effective aircraft in the tactical inventory of this country, and is an aircraft that is unmatched in its capability and function by any aircraft in the inventory of any nation in the world. Let us look upon ourselves as either very perceptive or very lucky because in the F–111 we find that this country has available to it a hedge against all of the uncertainties of other aircraft at this time, the limitations of the B–52, budgetary constraints, and even the SALT agreements themselves.

We have it within our power and discretion to make but one simple decision and that is to continue this production line for this fiscal year and the next and the next after that, and as long as is necessary to assure the availability of the only alternative we have.

But we are doing much more than hedging our bets, we are also assuring the production of an aircraft for which there is a clear and immediate need. There is no "waste" here. Every aircraft produced is needed to keep the tactical F–111 force near its full four wing strength. As a matter of fact some 80 or 90 additional aircraft are required to maintain this tactical force at its approved level.

I congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I congratulate every member of the committee who voted to keep this line open and producing, by what the press described as an "overwhelming vote."

This is Congress at its best, and I am confident and proud to support this action of our Armed Services Committee.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill on several grounds:

First. The people and their representatives in the Congress have expressed the firm opinion that this country must disengage itself from Asian wars. The peace agreements signed in January, March, and June provided some hope that the basis was laid for so doing. This bill, on the contrary, provides $1.3 billion in military assistance to South Vietnam and Laos, in direct violation of those agreements.

Second. The people and their representatives have expressed the desire to turn from spending half of our national resources on death and destruction, to filling the needs of our own people. This bill, on the contrary, asks us to commit over $21 billion to the already bloated Pentagon budget, at a time when supposedly we no longer will be conducting any war.

Third. The people and their representatives have expressed alarm, especially in the past few weeks of soaring inflation, at the cost of keeping more than half a million men overseas while the American dollar value declines steadily.

Fourth. The people and their representatives are attempting to regain the power that has been eroded over the past few decades. Now we are being asked routinely to rubberstamp the requests of the administration and the Pentagon. Though many members of the Armed Services Committee tried in vain to make real cuts, there is apparently justification for the charge that this committee is "the Pentagon's lobby on the Hill." Every cut made by the committee was approved in advance by the Pentagon. Therefore we have the appearance of an attempt to hold the line on spending, but no real attempt, except in the amendment to be offered, to challenge the bloated Pentagon budget.

I realize that these are serious charges and I ask you to examine them with me.

First. The effect upon this country of our involvement in Southeast Asia has been so devastating that sociologists warn that it may take decades to recover. Our national conscience and sense of purpose, as well as our economy, are severely wounded. Every poll shows that the public insists we must get out of Asia entirely. Both bodies have voted decisively that the continued illegal bombing of Cambodia must stop on August 15.

This last week has brought even more dismaying news and an even stronger revulsion from constituents: The President himself authorized the continued, secret, illegal bombing of Cambodia for 14 months, dropping 100,000 tons of bombs in more than 3,600 raids, while permitting the civilian Secretary of the Air Force to transmit falsified reports to the Congress, saying we were clean of hand and pure of heart. It is simply too much. And the one way to stop it is to cut off funds that permit our military dictators and those in other countries to link forces—and profits, at the expense of the millions who suffer and die.

Both Houses have heard at some length in recent months about the treatment accorded political prisoners by South Vietnam's President Thieu. We have heard of the repressive nature of the regime we created and continued to sup-

port—with $1.3 billion in military assistance to South Vietnam and Laos, if this bill is passed.

The committee charges that Hanoi has not implemented the Paris peace agreement and that we must therefore maintain our support for the legitimate governments of Laos and South Vietnam so as to provide the peoples of these embattled countries the opportunity to retain their sovereignty and their independence. It is the administration that continues to insist that the Thieu government is the "legitimate" government of South Vietnam; the peace agreements specifically disavow this concept.

The Laotians are on the verge of signing an agreement establishing a provisional government—with the stipulation that the United States will dismantle its CIA force and training bases in Laos. It is imperative that we permit the people in each of the Asian countries to settle their own problems, at last, without the intervention of U.S. funds in support of one faction. Therefore, it is imperative that we support the Leggett amendment cutting funds that give blanket assistance to South Vietnam and Laos. The Senate bill at least provides for compliance with the peace agreement, allowing replacement of armaments on a piece by piece basis.

It is alleged, and undoubtedly it is true, that Hanoi is violating the agreements in this and other ways. That does not justify our doing the same—and on a scale which could not be equaled by forces with far less sophisticated equipment.

Second, as an example of the priorities we are asked to ratify, let us take note of the words of experts. Senator SYMINGTON, acting chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said during debate that—

> No economy, not even that of the US, can continue indefinitely to police and babysit the world . . . sound economy is just as important to the security of the US as is the latest weapons system.

William C. Foster, former Arms Control and Disarmament Director, warned that:

> Much more could have been accomplished (at the SALT talks) had we not fallen into the trap of believing that we would only be able to reach successful agreements by . . . building the very weapons we most needed to control . . . Stopping these weapons programs in place now will not hurt our security. It may well enhance it by giving us and the Soviet Union breathing space in which to devise lasting and effective ways to stop the arms race.

Paul C. Warnke, former Assistant Secretary of Defense, joined other experts in presenting a report on military policy and budget priorities, which states that "the Nixon military budget could safely be reduced by more than 15 percent."

Therefore, in supporting the Aspin amendment we were being extremely conservative—but support it we did and I am gratified that it passed.

Third. According to the Warnke report just mentioned, $4 billion could be cut from general purpose forces—the most expensive item in our so-called defense budget, taking 75 percent of the defense dollar. We must achieve the most efficient possible use of such funds and link them to political and diplomatic objectives. "It is neither militarily nor diplomatically necessary, nor practically feasible, permanently to maintain the present structure of U.S. forces in Europe."

We must remember that these forces are stationed primarily by executive fiat, were put in place during a very different historical period and are no longer appropriate to the situation. We are abdicating the decisionmaking function if we permit NATO commanders to decide whether or not forces such as those in Europe should be maintained—with the United States footing the bill.

Fourth. It is this abdication of responsibility that most concerns me if we permit this atrocious military budget to gobble up the funds we need so badly—for child care, for the elderly, for the cities. We have seen all too clearly how the President and the military rulers use the funds we have authorized in the past. There is no possible excuse for continuing to do so. We owe it to the Nation to reassert a measure of control. I urge the passage of every amendment that would lop off a branch of this monstrous military tree.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the military procurement bill, and intend to vote against it and the misguided concept of national priorities and security that it represents.

Despite the decline in Southeast Asia war costs and improved relations with our major strategic adversaries, the administration's fiscal year 1974 request for $22 billion in authorizations for new weapons systems exceeds the amount appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 1973 for the same purposes by $2.46 billion, or about $1.5 billion more than needed to keep pace with cost increases resulting from inflation.

Many contend that significant savings could result from terminating or deferring many of these expensive new systems, without endangering our national security. Members of Congress for Peace Through Law itemize up to $7 billion that could be saved by slowing and/or terminating development of new weapons systems. A group of defense specialists under the chairmanship of former Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Warnke suggests weapons reductions of $2 billion in general-purpose forces and $3 billion in strategic systems. Troop-level cuts—particularly in the 600,000 U.S. troops overseas—would add additional billions to these savings. I concur.

The $564.1 million in "reductions" claimed by the House Armed Services Committee from the administration's request of $21.96 billion—a 2.6-percent cut—result largely from adjustments in DOD requests. The only major action taken by the committee that resulted in a significant fund reduction was the decision to slow procurement of the F–15 fighter. The committee partially offset this $330.9 million in potential savings by adding $172.7 million for 12 F–111 fighter-bombers not requested by DOD, leaving a net saving of $158.2 million.

In addition to the F–15 cut, the committee did reduce R. & D. funds for the Safeguard and Site Defense ABM systems by $25 million each. Aside from these reductions and cuts in a few minor programs, every reduction made by the committee resulted from a prior DOD decision regarding the affected program. In cases where the committee did make decisions on various weapons systems, such as reducing Navy funding for F–4 procurement or for construction of LHA assault ships, the potential savings were allocated by the committee to other weapons systems.

Actual committee cuts not resulting from service or DOD decisions total $287.5 million—a net reduction of $158.2 million in Air Force funds resulting from the F–15/F–111 decisions, $50 million in Army R. & D. funds for missile defense, and a total of $79.3 million in fund reductions for nine minor programs. Most of the cuts within this $287.5 million total—a 1.3 percent cut—were made without opposition from the affected services.

The bill as reported by the House Armed Services Committee provides $21.39 billion for procurement and R. & D. on new weapons systems, a reduction of $565.1 million in the weapons requests. With the exception of a reduction of $330.9 million in the request of $918.5 million for the F–15 fighter, the committee approved intact all important programs requested by DOD. Such reductions as the committee recommends were generally made possible by a prior DOD decision, or at least without the opposition of the service involved. The committee partially offset the F–15 cut by adding $172.7 million for 12 F–111's not requested by DOD.

The committee approved virtually intact the requested active troop and reserve levels recommended by DOD, since about 12,000 of the 13,000 manpower reduction was made possible by altered Southeast Asia requirements. The committee did reduce the authorization ceiling requested for military assistance to South Vietnam and Laos from $1.6 billion to $1.3 billion, but even the $1.3 billion ceiling provides for assistance far in excess of that permitted by the cease-fire agreements.

I have previously outlined my objections to the methods and procedures of defense procurement legislation, as practiced by the House Armed Services Committee. As a former member of that body, I have experienced firsthand the Pentagon's methods in getting consistent approval for unneeded weapons systems. The structure and workings of the committee, with its deference to the Defense Establishment, make any logical analysis of security needs impossible.

The time has come to begin a fresh approach to setting defense policy priorities. They can no longer be considered in an atmosphere dominated by generals and their admirers. It is no longer a question of adequate defense, but defense at what cost. The bill before us today fails to make even a token effort toward that kind of approach, and I am therefore forced to vote against it.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years some of our colleagues have argued the merits of an American presence in the world. Positions taken

have run the gamut from total involvement to complete disengagement.

It appears to me there are three positions we can take in the world community:

First, we can declare our intent to impose our will on the weaker nations by whatever means felt suitable—economic or military. I do not believe any reasonable person would choose this approach.

A second choice would be to abandon any participation in undertakings beyond our shores. That is, we can assume our pre-World War II "fortress America" position, and deny any concern for the rest of the world. We have already done this within this century—and suffered the consequences. I do not believe many people are persuaded that this, either, is the best approach for our Nation to take, for we will thereby create a vacuum which will more than likely be filled by the land- and resource-hungry who have maintained or developed a strong military capability.

The only other option, then, is to seek mutually advantageous arrangements—again, economic and military—which will provide protection and allow advancement of the best interests of all.

We are well into a period of negotiation with our treaty partners and with Russia and the Warsaw Pact nations. If we cancel out our relationships with our friends, and further cancel out the need for the Warsaw Pact nations to reduce their military commitments in Western Europe, we may just as well cancel out any promise of a future—not a better future, just a future, period—to our own people.

I believe the Members of this Congress possess a wider vision than is implied by the statements of some. I do not believe they will allow disillusionment with the war in Vietnam and its aftermath to becloud this vision. I believe they are above the petty bickerings and quarrelsomeness that make up the present governmental scene. I believe they desire to move forward in this Nation's commitment to a role—diminished though it be—in maintaining peace in our world.

NEED TO SPEND FOR DEFENSE

Those who would rearrange our priorities, who would cancel out our defense efforts, should consider this: Our defense dollars are the one sure successful expenditure we have made over the past 20-odd years. Because we have prepared for the defense of the United States in a manner calculated to show a potential enemy we mean business, that we are unequivocally determined to protect ourselves, we have not had to fight world war III. We have not had to see our loved ones under the bombs of a foreign power. We have not seen the tanks of an aggressor nation in our streets. But to a grave degree, we are the victims of our own success. Because we have stayed militarily strong, some among us have come to see the absence of attack as the absence of threat. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Why is it necessary for us to maintain a high level of readiness?

Why must we spend so much time and money on national defense?

It is because there are forces loose—both at home and abroad—seeking by devious and dastardly means to destroy the foundation upon which our country rests.

In short, we live in a hostile world where honest men continue to have honest differences of opinion and dishonorable men continue to exploit these differences.

Military power is essential to peacekeeping. The Berlin crisis would have turned into world war III except for superior U.S. military strength.

Military strength faced down the Russians in the Cuban missile crisis. The presence of the bristling guns of the 6th Fleet averted a major world conflict in the Middle East in 1967. These are lessons of history.

American power has kept a semblance of world peace for two decades. American power has preserved the right of man to live, to flourish, and to aspire.

We hope and pray that the services beyond the training role will never be required of our service personnel, that none of our weapons systems will ever be used, that they will serve their purpose of deterring aggression, that current negotiation will result in a mutual and balanced reduction of arms and personnel, that summit talks will continue to produce peace dividends. However, until there is enforceable peace, we must stand with the Father of our Country who said:

The most effective way to keep the peace is to be prepared for war.

Our country, our system, our way of life, with all its imperfection, is worth preserving—worth whatever sacrifice required.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, the long-standing feud in Congress between the big spenders and little spenders is disappearing. Increasingly the real fight is over where we are to spend our money. Both the administration and Congress are big spenders on some fronts and budget cutters on others.

There is waste in all areas—some resulting from mismanagement and some from badly planned legislation. However, most of the excess money in today's bill, for the Department of Defense authorization, is for unnecessary items. It is money to support absurdly high troop levels around the world and for weapons programs which we do not need now and perhaps never will.

The war in Vietnam is drawing to a close; détente with both the Soviet Union and China is an established fact and cooperation grows. Western Europe and Japan have become strong and stable allies; the dollar is shaky; and the administration claims we cannot afford adequate health care or education programs; yet the bill before us substantially increases last year's funding and eliminates little of the wasted manpower in our armed services at home and abroad.

We continue to maintain 600,000 troops oversea, 300,000 of them in Europe. Reducing this number would release Federal funds for domestic needs and help solve the balance-of-payments deficit.

An estimated $17 billion will be devoted toward our NATO commitments alone in 1974. The resultant balance-of-payments deficit will be over $1.5 billion. I believe in a strong NATO but the time is long past for large scale subsidy by the United States of European security needs. Western Europe is in a solid financial position while we are in effect subsidizing social welfare programs in these countries which are unavailable to American citizens.

We have no treaty responsibilities which entail this large commitment. The five divisions maintained in Europe are an arbitrary number continued from year to year in the name of national security without an evaluation as to their true effectiveness. Only 15 percent of the Americans stationed in Europe are actually combat soldiers, the rest perform support functions. If the troop levels are limited, the Army will be forced to improve this inefficient system.

Today the House should reject its traditional policy of accepting all military and administration requests to maintain the status quo. We must take independent action. Numerous amendments to this end have been offered but at the least we should reduce our bloated overseas forces by 100,000 troops so that our military policy will reflect the new world situation.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Chairman, in considering H.R. 9286, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1974, Members of the House are confronted with one of the most important, yet frustrating, pieces of legislation to be presented this session.

We are not only dealing with an enormous authorization request of $21.3 billion, but, in approving these manpower and weapon items, we are, at the same time, in effect approving basic national defense policy for our country. It is extremely difficult, for example, to separate a strategic weapon system from the policy which claims to be dependent on that system.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the hearings on this bill have run to over 4,400 printed pages of testimony. I must say that I have only the greatest respect for the members of the Armed Services Committee, who have labored for hundreds of hours over this legislation. Their diligence, devotion, and patience is to be admired by all of us.

With this extraordinary amount of input, it is most difficult for a Member of this body, who is not also a member of the Armed Services Committee, to make a thorough examination of this proposed legislation and accompanying testimony. We are really being asked to approve on faith vast lump sums, with few if any specific use details. To open any crack of inquiry is to launch into a complete review of strategy and intelligence, with much of the essential information classified. This is a sad but true admission, and one which can hardly cheer the American people.

The citizens of the United States are very much aware of the Defense Department budget demands. They know that we are no longer living in the horror of the Vietnam war and that, hopefully, after August 15, we will no longer be waging war of any kind. We have all been told that there are solid indications of improved international relations, and a

general easing of world tensions, at least among the major powers. A war-weary America prayerfully anticipates an era of peace, negotiation, and stability.

For the past several months, Mr. Chairman, the House has been asked to consider a variety of legislation pertaining to our domestic needs and requirements, and in many cases we have been asked to approve a cutback and even an elimination of a domestic program. This has not been an easy task, for while most of us strongly support holding the budget ceiling, we also clearly recognize the pressing needs of our country. Thus it comes as a great disappointment to me, given the balance of our priorities, given our substantially improved world situation, that the same budgetary philosophy applied to our domestic programs was not exercised on the Defense Department budget.

I am well aware one can twist statistics around to prove most any point of view, but it is a fact that total requested defense expenditures for fiscal 1974 are $4.2 billion higher than for fiscal 1973. Even allowing for a cost-of-living increase, this is a hard concept to swallow, when we have dedicated ourselves to controlling Federal spending.

Mr. Chairman, while I am certain there will be many thoughtful amendments offered to H.R. 9286, I will be supporting at least one in particular, and that is a proposal to reduce active duty personnel by 200,000. This is a sound, reasonable, even modest, amendment that leaves to the Pentagon the final decision as to which forces would be specifically reduced, providing that at least 50 percent of the reductions be made in U.S. forces deployed overseas.

The United States has over 600,000 troops stationed at 1,963 overseas installations. These troops have some 350,000 dependents living with them, and are supported by another 167,000 direct hire or indirect hire civilians. The cost of all this, the personnel and the maintenance of the installations, has been estimated at $30 billion annually. A reduction of 200,000 troops, with 100,000 from overseas, would result in an eventual direct labor cost savings of $2.5 billion, plus reducing our balance-of-payments deficit. Just last week the Pentagon announced a special cost-of-living allowance for 100,000 of our troops stationed in Germany, as well as the fifth housing allowance increase this year for troops forced to rent from German landlords. Now is the time to begin reducing this substantial burden.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that as we debate the merits of H.R. 9286, and whatever amendments which might be offered, we will carefully consider our national priorities, our defense requirements and our economic status. Although we may disagree among ourselves as to the best means to secure this country's goals, let no one outside this body forget that the paramount interest of every Member of Congress is the security and well-being of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is no question as to the need for new U.S. air superiority fighter aircraft. The Soviets have been steadily improving their air-to-air capability with regular introduction of new fighters into their inventory. In recent years they have produced six new fighters and improved three older ones with major modifications. These represent a whole new family of fighters possessing high performance capabilities in terms of maneuverability, acceleration, and weaponry.

Since the appearance of Soviet fighters in the Korean war, these fighters have possessed performance characteristics which challenge U.S. fighter aircraft in many areas.

To reverse this dangerous trend toward having our Air Forces equipped with second-rate fighter aircraft, it is imperative that the United States upgrade its fighter capability with such aircraft as the Air Force F–15 and the Navy F–14.

The F–15 will be the Air Force's first air superiority fighter since the F–86, which made its first flight more than 25 years ago. The F–15 will meet the post-1975 superiority challenge, since it is designed specifically to excel in the air-to-air combat role.

F–15 tactical missions will be fighter sweep, escort, and combat air patrol, all of which require that the F–15 be able to acquire, identify, engage, and destroy enemy aircraft in either contested or enemy airspace and in enemy-controlled radar environment.

The F–15 is designed to meet a composite threat—not that of any one specific aircraft. The assessed performance of current and projected Soviet aircraft has been considered in defining F–15 performance characteristics. As a result, where air-to-air combat might take place, the F–15 will out-climb, out-maneuver, and out-accelerate any enemy fighter built in the next decade.

The ability of these advanced fighters to achieve their outstanding performance is due in large part to advanced technology jet engines. The Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp., at its research center in Florida, is developing the new high-performance F–100 jet engine for the F–15 and the F–401 engine for advanced Navy fighters. The F–401 will be tested in the F–14B airplane.

The F–100 and the F–401 engines represent the greatest single advance ever achieved in gas turbine engine technology. These engines produce about 25 percent more power for each pound of engine weight than the highest performance engine now in the U.S. inventory. In terms of performance, the high thrust-to-weight characteristic would allow the aircraft to make very tight turns at high speed, enabling our pilots to turn "inside" an enemy aircraft and gain the combat advantage which means air superiority. These new engines will enable the F–15 and the F–14 to fly farther with more payload, or fly higher and faster, with more combat maneuverability than any fighter aircraft in our present arsenal.

The F–100 engine is performing extremely well in the F–15 flight test program, even though there have been some problems in the engine development program. These problems have been much pubilicized but are not extraordinary. Recent incidents involving the engines are typical of those experienced in developing any completely new high-performance propulsion system. The fundamental purpose of any engine development program is to identify problem areas through such incidents and make corrections before the engine goes into operational use. And the first planned operational use of the F–100 engine is more than a year away.

Engines employed in development programs are deliberately pushed to extremes on the test stand to determine the limits of their durability and to prove the integrity of their design. As a result, component failures are expected during the development period. It is significant to note that the number of development failures which have occurred in the F–100 engine development program is essentially the same as occurred during development of current generation high performance engines, in spite of the fact that the technological gains in this program were significantly higher than in previous developments. If the F–100 incident rate is compared to the earlier development of high successful engines for the F–111, the F–105, and the A3D, we find that a dramatic improvement in development success has been demonstrated in the current program. This is even more impressive when you consider that today's modern development test facilities have made it possible to subject the engines to much more rigorous test conditions of speed, altitude, and endurance much earlier in development than was possible in previous programs. This ability significantly reduces the potential for expensive, time-consuming problems which in earlier programs were detected only after the aircraft had begun flying.

In April of this year, an F–100 engine completed a very successful 150-hour endurance ground test. This test was designed to demonstrate the functional durability of the engine by imposing operating conditions and durations representing the extremes of those expected in actual service. This test covered the entire envelope except for two conditions which were run at slightly different simulated altitudes and at mach numbers of 2.0 and 2.2, instead of at mach 2.3. This test was equivalent to what the engine will encounter during several thousand hours of operational flight. This grueling test was completed in record time and the engine came through in excellent condition. The test verified that the F–100 is already an extremely durable engine.

The April 1973, 150-hour ground engine test included operation at the F–15's maximum design flight speed and included more than 90 hours of operation at maximum turbine inlet temperature and over 80 hours of operation with afterburning. The engine was subjected to 350 punishing "snap" accelerations from idle to intermediate or maximum power. In a related but separate series of tests, the F–100 "swallowed" water, ice, sand, and other foreign objects it might encounter in operational use, and continued to operate reliably.

Shortly before the 150-hour test began in April, the testing program indicated that a nonmoving part of the engine, known as the fan stator assembly, might flex under high load, contact rotating parts, and cause engine failure. The Air Force changed the test requirements to reduce the high load on the stator, thus avoiding a delay in the program and a possible loss of the test engine. The Air Force, McDonnell-Douglas and Pratt & Whitney Aircraft all recognized that a redesigned, stiffened stator made of a different material was to be installed and tested after completion of the April test. It is this decision of the Air Force which has received comment in the press and in Government circles. It has since been decided that the test completed in April will not be considered the official qualification test.

A redesigned fan stator assembly has been installed on an F–100 engine and successfully tested at altitude and flight speed conditions identical to those in the qualification test schedule. Additional durability testing is in progress. This new fan stator assembly has been installed in production engines and is currently being flight tested in the F–15 aircraft. The official qualification test of an engine incorporating the improved stator assembly design will be conducted in full accordance with the complete test conditions. This test is scheduled for completion before September 30 of this year. All test results to date point to a successful completion of the qualification test on schedule.

The F–100 and F–401 engines have now accumulated over 15,000 hours of development testing. This total includes 1,300 flight hours accumulated by eight F–15 aircraft without a single major failure. All flight demonstration milestones have been accomplished ahead of schedule in the F–15 flight test program, which began more than 1 year ago at Edwards Air Force Base in California. This flight evaluation program has been the most productive and trouble free the Air Force has ever conducted with an entirely new aircraft system. As an example, flight test milestones, that were scheduled to be accomplished within 8 weeks after the first F–15 flight, were completed in just 17 days, less than one-third of the time allotted. These aircraft have made more than 630 flights demonstrating air superiority performance over a large portion of the plane's flight envelope, as shown on chart IV. An altitude of over 60,000 feet has been attained at supersonic speeds; a speed equal to the design goal for the F–15 has been flown. The maneuverability and handling qualities have met all estimates and the performance has exceeded predictions. All milestones in the flight test program have been completed on or ahead of schedule—an accomplishment unparalleled in previous Air Force programs involving new fighter aircraft.

The experience gained in development testing and the outstanding record of the F–100 engine in the F–15 flight test program provide assurance that the official 150-hour endurance test will be completed on schedule by the end of September, in sufficient time for the engine configuration to be thoroughly flight tested before delivery of the first produced F–15 aircraft a year later.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I support the Aspin amendment. It is a reasonable amendment. It applies to the armed services the same principle as is being applied to the Nation's wage earners by the administration's wage controls—that is they are limited to a cost-of-living increase.

To hear the opponents of these efforts to bring the cost of overinflated Military Establishment into line, you would think that nothing had changed in the world scene in recent years. They completely overlook the fact that our military have been withdrawn from Vietnam. They ignore the fact that Russia, because of its economic problems, is turning to the United States for food and, because of its fear of China, is trying to make its peace in Europe.

Above all, the supporters of continued military extravagances completely ignore the change in the economic position of the United States. Does anyone seriously believe that this country's Military Establishment can still go on as though it had no balance-of-trade deficit, no balance-of-payments deficit, no out-of-control inflation, and no dollar crisis?

Does anyone seriously think that the administration can go on impounding billions of dollars voted by Congress for the needs of the American people and cutting back dozens of programs designed to serve those needs, while at the same time expanding the military budget billions of dollars above its wartime peak?

The issue is clear and simple: either the Congress will voluntarily bring our military programs into line with our economic capabilities and into balance with our civilian needs or else it will allow a continuance of these wasteful military programs until the United States suffers an internal collapse of such enormous magnitude to destroy the position of the United States as a major power.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) for the following reasons. It would appear that with intense diplomatic efforts to reach détente between our Nation and the Soviet Union and between ourselves and the People's Republic of China, reason would dictate that a troop reduction is necessary. The presence of 325,000 troops in Europe is less a protection than it is a provocation to those whom we seek to convince that our intentions are peaceful.

Furthermore, with the decline of the value of the American dollar, we can no longer afford to support these troops. As Mr. MANSFIELD of the other body, has said:

> It costs the people of the United States about $30 billion annually to maintain bases, troops, and facilities abroad.

We also have stationed, at present, some 40,000 troops in South Korea which has 600,000 of its own men under arms. North Korea maintains only 360,000 troops and sustained combat has not occurred in the area since 1953. Recently, there has been an encouraging movement on both sides of the cease-fire line to establish cooperative relationships. It would surely be, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the United States to further any cooperative relationships between North and South Korea. A major withdrawal of U.S. forces from this area would go a long way toward easing tensions and might actually promote the friendship.

The Pentagon justifies its manpower requests on the basis of our commitments. But these are commitments made by the executive branch, not under the NATO or the SEATO treaties. Congress has had little role in determining the use of military manpower; it is high time we asserted some authority in this area.

We cannot wait for decisions made by NATO commanders, nor can we allow our own foreign policy to be dictated by other countries. If we are to build a truly peaceful world, the first step is to acknowledge that we are not the world's policemen. Verbally, we abandoned this role some time ago—now we must give substance to our words, by passing this amendment.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Military Procurement and Research and Development Authorization bill for fiscal 1974. I am deeply disappointed in the minimal cuts made by the House Armed Services Committee in the Nixon administration's defense budget requests.

The bloated defense budget we are asked to pass upon today is an insult to our constituents who are forced to make such tremendous sacrifices in the domestic sphere. Why has this administration not scrutinized the defense request with the same analytical ruthlessness it has used in reviewing expenditures for health care, the elderly, housing, or education?

I am totally committed to the maintenance of a strong and muscular military capacity. But this bill provides no assurances in this regard. If there was ever a case of "throwing money at problems" rather than truly resolving them we can find it in this authorization request today.

For example, we are asked to approve spending of up to $20.45 billion, approximately one-half billion dollars over the 1973 requests, for defense development and research at a time when this country is supposedly orchestrating a "peace that will last for generations." A large part of this request is to be devoted to measures for which the Defense Department has made no compelling showing of necessity. For example, we are asked to approve expenditures of $1.53 billion this year for the accelerated development of the Trident nuclear submarine at a time when our existing submarines will soon have the capacity to launch more than 5,000 nuclear missiles—surely a more than adequate nuclear deterrent. The American taxpayer will be forced to spend over $13 billion—barring the usual cost overruns—on this project before it is completed.

Another $453 million is to be spent on

new supersonic long-range bombers which would cost the taxpayer $11 billion before completion. However, no showing has been made by the Nixon administration that would demonstrate that this bomber would provide improvement over the present B–52 fleet.

Until the administration demonstrates a compelling need for these and similar projects, I refuse to approve a single cent for these requests. This money can be better spent on domestic reform—on housing, education, care for the elderly, or improved social services or for tax cuts.

We all want this nation to be strong. But we must have a balanced and realistic conception of strength. It does not lie in weaponry alone. It lies in the dedication of the American people to our way of life. If we continue to deny large segments of the public the services they need to meet the minimal requirements of our technological society, we will not be a strong nation whatever our military capabilities.

In the last analysis, this bill reflects an appalling intellectual laxness. Rather than rethinking what is truly needed to provide us with a lean and vigorous military capability, we are simply presented with the same old thing. The country is crying out for a responsible Congress. Yet in this bill we are leaving the people disappointed and disillusioned with no real alternative to the Pentagon's discredited policies.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, today we are being asked to approve what amounts to a ratification of the Department of Defense's announcement of their fiscal year 1974 military procurement budget amounting to over $21 billion.

Although some minor reductions in recommended spending levels have been made by the Armed Services Committee, their usually unrequested additions to other programs and projects result in a net reduction of only $158 million. I am disappointed that the committee does not see fit to make DOD budget considerations subject to the vigorous give and take and open debate that other areas of Federal budget requests must encounter.

It is amazing, also, to realize that the Vietnam war has supposedly ended, but our defense spending has actually gone up. It is even more amazing that Congress appears to have swallowed completely the DOD's rationalizations for this historically unprecedented situation.

Of the several areas where reductions should be made and can be made most effectively and without threatening our national security, the one with the largest potential is the category of troop levels; 56 percent of our defense budget is accounted for by manpower requirements with 85 percent of the manpower serving in support roles and only 15 percent available for combat. These are alarming figures, indicative of enormous logistical "fat," bureaucracy, and potentially disastrous ineffectiveness in our armed services.

In an area of computer technology and modern weaponry, it simply makes no sense to have over 2.2 million men and women on the payroll, especially considering the abnormally high percentage of officers in that number. There are more general officers in the armed services today than during the height of World War II.

I am particularly concerned with our continued high troop levels in Europe. Of the 600,000 American men and women stationed overseas, half of that number are in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, this huge army adds to an already intolerable balance-of-payments situation. We allow NATO countries to continue to depend on the United States 25 years after World War II, despite the fact that the NATO agreement was meant, certainly, to be a cooperative alliance.

Mr. Chairman, to illustrate one point in my argument for reduced European troop strength, let me submit for the RECORD a portion of a letter I received just recently from the wife of a constituent who is an Army enlisted man stationed in Germany. It concerns a situation that they "and all the other enlisted men are in":

> I am sure you know that the dollar has devalued considerably. What I don't think many people realize is that it is getting extremely difficult to make ends meet. We live on the German economy but there is not enough housing on the base. Every month we have to turn in our dollars for marks and each month we turn in more dollars for the same amount of marks. During the winter months, it will be even more difficult to budget as we must pay out one hundred and twenty marks extra per month for heat, regardless of how much or how little we use. Besides our rent and utilities, we have our food, gas, and clothing bills. By the time all these have been paid for, there is enough left for some entertainment. We have no way to save money, because there is none to save. Right now, many of the men who are a lower rank than my husband are considering sending their wives home. This will not help the already low morale of the soldiers. All the men who are serving in the Armed Forces here in Europe deserve something a lot better than what they are receiving.

They do deserve better—and so does the American taxpayer. It is time that these men and these dollars were brought home.

As a partial solution to the balance-of-payments-deficit, Mr. Chairman, I would advocate a program whereby NATO countries be required to train some of their troops in the United States, at the same time we train our troops in Europe. The NATO alliance is supposedly a reciprocal agreement, but in recent years it appears to be more reciprocal for some countries than others.

I ask my colleagues to consider a reciprocal training program—of say, two American soldiers to NATO European countries for each one NATO soldier training in the United States. In the meantime, I will support the troop level decreases proposed as amendments to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of European troop decreases never tire of telling the Congress of "America's vital stake in Western Europe." Their cry of "no unilateral reduction" rings in our ears and has become a maxim in the vocabulary of the contemporary cold war that we continue to pursue.

But, Mr. Chairman, the boy has cried wolf too often. Reasonable deliberation shows that the nature of the threat to NATO forces is not commensurate to our heavy troop commitments. Now is the time to decrease our foreign military garrisons.

Another area of huge expense in this fiscal year 1974 bill is a $657 million appropriation for the CVN–70 nuclear aircraft carrier. Quite simply, the CVN–70 will be the biggest floating target in naval history and certainly has little chance of survival in modern combat. The Department's arguments for its deployment are hollow: the Soviets have no aircraft carriers as we traditionally know them, but the DOD continues to define two Soviet ships as aircraft carriers although they can handle only helicopters.

Furthermore, the DOD claims their intelligence has determined that a large new ship is being built in Russia as an aircraft carrier. There is no conclusive proof it is indeed a carrier; other U.S. experts claim it appears to be only a half-covered deck anyway—thus limiting its use to VSTOL aircraft and helicopters—hardly a match for even the oldest of the U.S. carriers.

If the aircraft carrier is as important a part of naval dominance and strategy as the Navy asks us to believe, and the Soviets so strong and cunning as the Navy leads us to believe, it is very difficult to explain why the Soviets have not one single traditional aircraft carrier.

The CVN–70 appropriation should be opposed on the grounds that it is a completely unnecessary waste of what could be a total of over $3 billion after outfitting and naval escort protection.

In our consideration of this bill and any amendments, we must all remember where the largest amount of information and statistics come from that we must base our decisions on. Practically all support—or opposition—to DOD proposals must be fashioned out of figures that DOD itself supplies us. Attempts by interested Members or independent agencies to see the other side of the military coin are usually discounted by the DOD as being "unwarranted and unwise." Often, independent studies that prove to be contrary to DOD positions are attacked by the DOD in only vague generalities or accused of having improper "criteria," while at the same time the DOD either cannot or will not establish what such criteria should be.

Despite the fact that we know we must depend on the DOD and its agencies for our information, we have not pressed them to respond better to studies disagreeing with their positions. A good example of the Navy's refusal to be pinned down is Admiral Zumwalt's initial agreement to a confrontation with Admiral LaRocque, retired, of the Center for Defense Information. His subsequent failure to show up, his replacement by an editor of Janes Fighting Ships, and a rebuttal letter of Admiral LaRocque's testimony from one of our colleagues all fail to clarify the Navy's position. Despite all the testimony, no one knows yet what the Navy position is.

Our overwhelming reliance on the Department for information to justify the programs we are considering can lead to

a natural abuse by the Department. We can be no more sure of the number of nuclear subs we have, or the Soviets have, than we now find we could be about the Cambodian bombing in 1969. If the USAF would lie repeatedly and consistently about bombing raids in Asia, there is no reason other branches would not lie to us about the very facts under consideration now.

Mr. Chairman, a policy of restraint is what led to the great Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of the 1960's. We can not abide with the spirit or letter of SALT if we continue to support the type of military budget provided in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9286) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1974 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces, and the military training student loads, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 505, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 37, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

YEAS—367

Abdnor	Bergland	Broyhill, N.C.
Adams	Bevill	Broyhill, Va.
Addabbo	Biaggi	Buchanan
Anderson, Calif.	Biester	Burgener
Anderson, Ill.	Blackburn	Burke, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.	Blatnik	Burke, Fla.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Boggs	Burke, Mass.
Annunzio	Boland	Burleson, Tex.
Archer	Bolling	Burlison, Mo.
Arends	Bowen	Butler
Armstrong	Brademas	Byron
Ashbrook	Brasco	Carey, N.Y.
Ashley	Bray	Carney, Ohio
Aspin	Breaux	Carter
Bafalis	Breckinridge	Casey, Tex.
Baker	Brinkley	Cederberg
Barrett	Brooks	Chamberlain
Beard	Broomfield	Chappell
Bell	Brotzman	Clancy
Bennett	Brown, Calif.	Clark
Bergland	Brown, Mich.	Clausen, Don H.
Bevill	Brown, Ohio	Clawson, Del
Biaggi	Broyhill, N.C.	Cleveland
Biester	Broyhill, Va.	Cochran
Blackburn	Buchanan	Cohen
Blatnik	Burgener	Collier
Boggs	Burke, Calif.	Collins, Ill.
Boland	Burke, Fla.	Collins, Tex.
Bolling	Burke, Mass.	Conable
Bowen	Burleson, Tex.	Conlan
Brademas	Burlison, Mo.	Conte
Brasco	Butler	Corman
Bray	Byron	Cotter
Breaux	Carey, N.Y.	Coughlin
Breckinridge	Carney, Ohio	Crane
Brinkley	Carter	Cronin
Brooks	Casey, Tex.	Culver
Broomfield	Cederberg	Daniel, Dan
Brotzman	Chamberlain	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Brown, Calif.	Chappell	Daniels, Dominick V.
Brown, Mich.	Clancy	Danielson
Brown, Ohio	Clark	Davis, Ga.
Broyhill, N.C.	Clausen, Don H.	Davis, S.C.
Broyhill, Va.	Clawson, Del	Davis, Wis.
Buchanan	Cleveland	de la Garza
Burgener	Cochran	Delaney
Burke, Calif.	Cohen	Dellenback
Burke, Fla.	Collier	Denholm
Burke, Mass.	Collins, Ill.	Dennis
Burleson, Tex.	Collins, Tex.	Dent
Burlison, Mo.	Conable	Derwinski
Butler	Conlan	Devine
Byron	Conte	Dickinson
Carey, N.Y.	Corman	Diggs
Carney, Ohio	Cotter	Dingell
Carter	Coughlin	Donohue
Casey, Tex.	Crane	Dorn
Cederberg	Cronin	Downing
Chamberlain	Culver	Dulski
Chappell	Daniel, Dan	Duncan
Clancy	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	du Pont
Clark	Daniels, Dominick V.	Edwards, Ala.
Clausen, Don H.	Danielson	Eilberg
Clawson, Del	Davis, Ga.	Erlenborn
Cleveland	Davis, S.C.	Esch
Cochran	Davis, Wis.	Eshleman
Cohen	de la Garza	Evans, Colo.
Collier	Delaney	Fascell
Collins, Ill.	Dellenback	Findley
Collins, Tex.	Denholm	Fish
Conable	Dennis	Flood
Conlan	Dent	Flowers
Conte	Derwinski	Flynt
Corman	Devine	Foley
Cotter	Dickinson	Ford, Gerald R.
Coughlin	Diggs	Ford, William D.
Crane	Dingell	Fountain
Cronin	Donohue	Frelinghuysen
Culver	Dorn	Frenzel
Daniel, Dan	Downing	Frey
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Dulski	Froehlich
Daniels, Dominick V.	Duncan	Fulton
Danielson	du Pont	Fuqua
Davis, Ga.	Edwards, Ala.	Gaydos
Davis, S.C.	Eilberg	Giaimo
Davis, Wis.	Erlenborn	Gibbons
de la Garza	Esch	Gilman
Delaney	Eshleman	Ginn
Dellenback	Evans, Colo.	Goldwater
Denholm	Fascell	Gonzalez
Dennis	Findley	Goodling
Dent	Fish	Grasso
Derwinski	Flood	Green, Oreg.
Devine	Flowers	Griffiths
Dickinson	Flynt	Gross
Diggs	Foley	Grover
Dingell	Ford, Gerald R.	Gubser
Donohue	Ford, William D.	Gude
Dorn	Fountain	Gunter
Downing	Frelinghuysen	Guyer
Dulski	Frenzel	Haley
Duncan	Frey	Hamilton
du Pont	Froehlich	Hanley
Edwards, Ala.	Fulton	Hanrahan
Eilberg	Fuqua	Hansen, Idaho
Erlenborn	Gaydos	Hansen, Wash.
Esch	Giaimo	Hastings
Eshleman	Gibbons	Hawkins
Evans, Colo.	Gilman	Hays
Fascell	Ginn	Hébert
Findley	Goldwater	Heckler, Mass.
Fish	Gonzalez	Heinz
Flood	Goodling	Henderson
Flowers	Grasso	Hicks
Flynt	Green, Oreg.	Hillis
Foley	Griffiths	Hinshaw
Ford, Gerald R.	Gross	Hogan
Ford, William D.	Grover	Holifield
Fountain	Gubser	Holt
Frelinghuysen	Gude	Horton
Frenzel	Gunter	Hosmer
Frey	Guyer	Howard
Froehlich	Haley	Huber
Fulton	Hamilton	Hudnut
Fuqua	Hanley	Hunt
Gaydos	Hanrahan	Hutchinson
Giaimo	Hansen, Idaho	Ichord
Gibbons	Hansen, Wash.	Jarman
Gilman	Hastings	Johnson, Calif.
Ginn	Hawkins	Johnson, Colo.
Goldwater	Hays	Johnson, Pa.
Gonzalez	Hébert	Jones, Ala.
Goodling	Heckler, Mass.	Jones, Okla.
Grasso	Heinz	Jones, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.	Henderson	Jordan
Griffiths	Hicks	Karth
Gross	Hillis	Kazen
Grover	Hinshaw	Keating
Gubser	Hogan	Kemp
Gude	Holifield	Ketchum
Gunter	Holt	Kluczynski
Guyer	Horton	Kuykendall
Haley	Hosmer	Kyros
Hamilton	Howard	Landrum
Hanley	Huber	Latta
Hanrahan	Hudnut	Leggett
Hansen, Idaho	Hunt	Lehman
Hansen, Wash.	Hutchinson	Lent
Hastings	Ichord	Litton
Hawkins	Jarman	Long, La.
Hays	Johnson, Calif.	Long, Md.
Hébert	Johnson, Colo.	Lott
Heckler, Mass.	Johnson, Pa.	Lujan
Heinz	Jones, Ala.	McClory
Henderson	Jones, Okla.	McCloskey
Hicks	Jones, Tenn.	McCollister
Hillis	Jordan	McCormack
Hinshaw	Karth	McDade
Hogan	Kazen	McEwen
Holifield	Keating	McFall
Holt	Kemp	McKay
Horton	Ketchum	McKinney
Hosmer	Kluczynski	McSpadden
Howard	Kuykendall	Macdonald
Huber	Kyros	Madden
Hudnut	Landrum	Madigan
Hunt	Latta	Mahon
Hutchinson	Leggett	Mailliard
Ichord	Lehman	Mallary
Jarman	Lent	Mann
Johnson, Calif.	Litton	Maraziti
Johnson, Colo.	Long, La.	Martin, Nebr.
Johnson, Pa.	Long, Md.	Martin, N.C.
Jones, Ala.	Lott	Mathias, Calif.
Jones, Okla.	Lujan	Mathis, Ga.
Jones, Tenn.	McClory	Matsunaga
Jordan	McCloskey	Mayne
Karth	McCollister	Mazzoli
Kazen	McCormack	Meeds
Keating	McDade	Melcher
Kemp	McEwen	Metcalfe
Ketchum	McFall	Mezvinsky
Kluczynski	McKay	Michel
Kuykendall	McKinney	Miller
Kyros	McSpadden	Minish
Landrum	Macdonald	Mink
Latta	Madden	Mitchell, N.Y.
Leggett	Madigan	Mizell
Lehman	Mahon	Moakley
Lent	Mailliard	Mollohan
Litton	Mallary	Montgomery
Long, La.	Mann	Moorhead, Calif.
Long, Md.	Maraziti	Moorhead, Pa.
Lott	Martin, Nebr.	Morgan
Lujan	Martin, N.C.	Murphy, Ill.
McClory	Mathias, Calif.	Myers
McCloskey	Mathis, Ga.	Natcher
McCollister	Matsunaga	Nelsen
McCormack	Mayne	Nichols
McDade	Mazzoli	Nix
McEwen	Meeds	O'Brien
McFall	Melcher	O'Hara
McKay	Metcalfe	O'Neill
McKinney	Mezvinsky	Owens
McSpadden	Michel	Parris
Macdonald	Miller	Passman
Madden	Minish	Patten
Madigan	Mink	Perkins
Mahon	Mitchell, N.Y.	Pettis
Mailliard	Mizell	Peyser
Mallary	Moakley	Pickle
Mann	Mollohan	Pike
Maraziti	Montgomery	Poage
Martin, Nebr.	Moorhead, Calif.	Podell
Martin, N.C.	Moorhead, Pa.	Powell, Ohio
Mathias, Calif.	Morgan	Preyer
Mathis, Ga.	Murphy, Ill.	Price, Ill.
Matsunaga	Myers	Price, Tex.
Mayne	Natcher	Pritchard
Mazzoli	Nelsen	Quie
Meeds	Nichols	Quillen
Melcher	Nix	Railsback
Metcalfe	O'Brien	Randall
Mezvinsky	O'Hara	Rarick
Michel	O'Neill	Regula
Miller	Owens	Reid
Minish	Parris	Reuss
Mink	Passman	Rhodes
Mitchell, N.Y.	Patten	Rinaldo
Mizell	Perkins	Roberts
Moakley	Pettis	Robinson, Va.
Mollohan	Peyser	Robison, N.Y.
Montgomery	Pickle	Rodino
Moorhead, Calif.	Pike	Rogers
Moorhead, Pa.	Poage	Roncalio, Wyo.
Morgan	Podell	Roncallo, N.Y.
Murphy, Ill.	Powell, Ohio	Rooney, Pa.
Myers	Preyer	Rose
Natcher	Price, Ill.	Rostenkowski
Nelsen	Price, Tex.	Roush
Nichols	Pritchard	Rousselot
Nix	Quie	Roy
O'Brien	Quillen	Runnels
O'Hara	Railsback	Ruppe
O'Neill	Randall	Ruth
Owens	Rarick	Ryan
Parris	Regula	Sandman
Passman	Reid	Sarasin
Patten	Reuss	Sarbanes
Perkins	Rhodes	Satterfield
Pettis	Rinaldo	Saylor
Peyser	Roberts	Scherle
Pickle	Robinson, Va.	Schneebeli
Pike	Robison, N.Y.	Schroeder
Poage	Rodino	Sebelius
Podell	Rogers	Shipley
Powell, Ohio	Roncalio, Wyo.	Shoup
Preyer	Roncallo, N.Y.	Shriver
Price, Ill.	Rooney, Pa.	Shuster
Price, Tex.	Rose	Sikes
Pritchard	Rostenkowski	Sisk
Quie	Roush	Skubitz
Quillen	Rousselot	Slack
Railsback	Roy	Smith, N.Y.
Randall	Runnels	Snyder
Rarick	Ruppe	Spence
Regula	Ruth	Staggers
Reid	Ryan	Stanton, J. William
Reuss	Sandman	Stanton, James V.
Rhodes	Sarasin	Steed
Rinaldo	Sarbanes	Steele
Roberts	Satterfield	Steelman
Robinson, Va.	Saylor	Steiger, Ariz.
Robison, N.Y.	Scherle	Steiger, Wis.
Rodino	Schneebeli	Stephens
Rogers	Schroeder	Stratton
Roncalio, Wyo.	Sebelius	Stubblefield
Roncallo, N.Y.	Shipley	Stuckey
Rooney, Pa.	Shoup	Sullivan
Rose	Shriver	Symington
Rostenkowski	Shuster	Symms
Roush	Sikes	Talcott
Rousselot	Sisk	Taylor, Mo.
Roy	Skubitz	Taylor, N.C.
Runnels	Slack	Teague, Calif.
Ruppe	Smith, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Ruth	Snyder	Thomson, Wis.
Ryan	Spence	Thone
Sandman	Staggers	Thornton
Sarasin	Stanton, J. William	Tiernan
Sarbanes	Stanton, James V.	Towell, Nev.
Satterfield	Steed	Treen
Saylor	Steele	Udall
Scherle	Steelman	Ullman
Schneebeli	Steiger, Ariz.	Van Deerlin
Schroeder	Steiger, Wis.	Vander Jagt
Sebelius	Stephens	Veysey
Shipley	Stratton	Vigorito
Shoup	Stubblefield	Waggonner
Shriver	Stuckey	Walsh
Shuster	Sullivan	Wampler
Sikes	Symington	Ware
Sisk	Symms	White
Skubitz	Talcott	Whitehurst
Slack	Taylor, Mo.	Whitten
Smith, N.Y.	Taylor, N.C.	Wiggins
Snyder	Teague, Calif.	Williams
Spence	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson, Bob
Staggers	Thomson, Wis.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Stanton, J. William	Thone	Wolff
Stanton, James V.	Thornton	Wright
Steed	Tiernan	Wyatt
Steele	Towell, Nev.	Wydler
Steelman	Treen	Wylie
Steiger, Ariz.	Udall	Wyman
Steiger, Wis.	Ullman	Yatron
Stephens	Van Deerlin	Young, Alaska
Stratton	Vander Jagt	Young, Fla.
Stubblefield	Veysey	Young, Ga.
Stuckey	Vigorito	Young, Ill.
Sullivan	Waggonner	Young, S.C.
Symington	Walsh	Young, Tex.
Symms	Wampler	Zablocki
Talcott	Ware	Zion
Taylor, Mo.	White	Zwach
Taylor, N.C.	Whitehurst	
Teague, Calif.	Whitten	
Thompson, N.J.	Wiggins	
Thomson, Wis.	Williams	
Thone	Wilson, Bob	
Thornton	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.	
Tiernan	Wolff	
Towell, Nev.	Wright	
Treen	Wyatt	
Udall	Wydler	
Ullman	Wylie	
Van Deerlin	Wyman	
Vander Jagt	Yatron	
Veysey	Young, Alaska	
Vigorito	Young, Fla.	
Waggonner	Young, Ga.	
Walsh	Young, Ill.	
Wampler	Young, S.C.	
Ware	Young, Tex.	
White	Zablocki	
Whitehurst	Zion	
Whitten	Zwach	
Wiggins		
Williams		
Wilson, Bob		
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.		
Wolff		
Wright		
Wyatt		
Wydler		
Wylie		
Wyman		
Yatron		
Young, Alaska		
Young, Fla.		
Young, Ga.		
Young, Ill.		
Young, S.C.		
Young, Tex.		
Zablocki		
Zion		
Zwach		

NAYS—37

Abzug	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Badillo	Helstoski	Roybal
Burton	Holtzman	St Germain
Chisholm	Hungate	Seiberling
Clay	Kastenmeier	Stark
Dellums	Koch	Stokes
Drinan	Mitchell, Md.	Studds
Eckhardt	Mosher	Vanik
Edwards, Calif.	Nedzi	Waldie
Forsythe	Obey	Whalen
Fraser	Rangel	Yates
Green, Pa.	Rees	
Harrington	Riegle	

NOT VOTING—29

Alexander	Harsha	Pepper
Bingham	Harvey	Roe
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Conyers	King	Smith, Iowa
Evins, Tenn.	Landgrebe	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	Milford	Widnall
Gettys	Mills, Ark.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Gray	Minshall, Ohio	Winn
Hammerschmidt	Moss	
Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.	
	Patman	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Bingham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Milford.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Gettys, with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Moss with Mr. King.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Landgrebe.

The result of the vote and announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 9286

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 9286 the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in cross-references, section numbers and punctuation to reflect the action of the House.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed (H.R. 9286).

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express appreciation for the fact that the members of the Armed Services Committee these last 2 days were here and worked so hard on this bill. I want to express special appreciation for the fact that the eight minority freshmen members of the committee participated actively in the debate and in fact many times carried the load of the debate in these last 2 days.

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

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I too concur in the statement the gentleman from Indiana made not only with respect to the minority Members and the young Members from that side, but I am particularly pleased with the manner in which those on the Democratic side of the committee performed here. Of course I am very grateful for the recognition given me by the gentleman from California. I may say this, that I certainly would not have been sustained and with the patience necessary to handle this bill had it not been for the full cooperation of the committee. Their actions for the last 2 days have been worthy of tribute.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1888) entitled an act "to extend and amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the purpose of assuring consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1888, AGRICULTURE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1973

Mr. POAGE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1888) to extend and amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the purpose of assuring consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93-427)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1888), to extend and amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the purpose of assuring consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1888), to extend and amend the Agricultural Act of 1970 for the purpose of assuring consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of S. 1888 and inserted in lieu thereof the language of H.R. 8860 as passed by the House.

There were 111 substantive differences between S. 1888 and the House amendment. The conferees were able to reconcile 110 of these differences, but were unable to agree on the provision in the House amendment which would, under specified conditions, prohibit food stamp assistance to strikers.

The language upon which the conferees reached agreement (omitting the one point upon which they were unable to agree) is as follows:

That the Agricultural Act of 1970 is amended as follows:

(1) Title I is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATION

"SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) The total amount of payments which a person shall be entitled to receive under one or more of the annual programs established by titles IV, V, and VI of this Act for the 1974 through 1977 crops of the commodities shall not exceed $20,000.

"(2) The term 'payments' as used in this section shall not include loans or purchases, or any part of any payment which is determined by the Secretary to represent compensation for resource adjustment or public access for recreation.

"(3) If the Secretary determines that the total amount of payments which will be earned by any person under the program in effect for any crop will be reduced under this section, the set-aside acreage for the farm or farms on which such person will be sharing in payments earned under such program shall be reduced to such extent and in such manner as the Secretary determines will be fair and reasonable in relation to the amount of the payment reduction.

"(4) The Secretary shall issue regulations defining the term 'person' and prescribing such rules as he determines necessary to assure a fair and reasonable application of such limitation: *Provided*, That the provisions of this Act which limit payments to any person shall not be applicable to lands owned by States, political subdivisions, or agencies thereof, so long as such lands are farmed primarily in the direct furtherance of a public function, as determined by the Secretary. The rules for determining whether corporations and their stockholders may be considered as separate persons shall be in accordance with the regulations issued by the Secretary on December 18, 1970."

DAIRY PROGRAM

MILK MARKETING ORDERS

(2) Section 201 is amended by—

(A) amending section 201(e) by striking out "1973" and inserting "1977", and by striking out "1976" and inserting "1980", and

(B) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) The Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by:

"(1) striking the period at the end of subsection 8c(17) and adding in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided further*, That if one-third or more of the producers as defined in a milk order apply in writing for a hearing on a proposed amendment of such order, the Secretary shall call such a hearing if the proposed amendment is one that may legally be made to such order. Subsection (12) of this section shall not be construed to permit any cooperative to act for its members in an application for a hearing under the foregoing proviso and nothing in such proviso shall be construed to preclude the Secretary from calling an amendment hearing as provided in subsection (3) of this section. The Secretary shall not be required to call a hearing on any proposed amendment to an order in response to an application for a hearing on such proposed amendment if the application requesting the hearing is received by the Secretary within ninety days after the date on which the Secretary has announced his decision on a previously proposed amendment to such order and the two proposed amendments are essentially the same.'

"(2) inserting after the phrase 'pure and wholesome milk' in section 8c(18) the phrase 'to meet current needs and further to assure a level of farm income adequate to maintain productive capacity sufficient to meet anticipated future needs'."

MILK PRICE SUPPORT, BUTTERFAT PRICE SUPPORT SUSPENSION

(3) Section 202 is amended by—

(A) striking the introductory clause which precedes subsection (a);

(B) effective April 1, 1974, inserting in subsection (b) before the period at the end of the first sentence in the quotation the following: "of pure and wholesome milk to meet current needs, reflect changes in the cost of production, and assure a level of farm income adequate to maintain productive capacity sufficient to meet anticipated future needs"; and

(C) inserting in subsection (b) after the first sentence in the quotation the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing, effective for the period beginning with the date of enactment of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 and ending on March 31, 1975, the price of milk shall be supported at not less than 80 per centum of the parity price therefor."

TRANSFER OF DAIRY PRODUCTS TO THE MILITARY AND TO VETERANS HOSPITALS

(4) Section 203 is amended by striking out "1973" and inserting "1977".

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(5) Section 204 is amended by—

(A) striking out "1973" and inserting "1977"; and

(B) striking subsection (b) and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) Section 1 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'SECTION 1. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make indemnity payments for milk or cows producing such milk at a fair market value, to dairy farmers who have been directed since January 1, 1964 (but only since the date of enactment of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 in the case of indemnity payments not authorized prior to such date of enactment), to remove their milk, and to make indemnity payments for dairy products at fair market value to manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed since the date of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1970 to remove their dairy products from commercial markets because of residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government at the time of such use. Any indemnity payment to any farmer shall continue until he has been reinstated and is again allowed to dispose of his milk on commercial markets.' "

DAIRY IMPORT STUDY

(6) Title II is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 205. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to carry out a comprehensive study to determine the effect upon domestic dairy producers, handlers, and processors and upon consumers of increases in the level of imports, if any, of dairy products and report his findings, together with any recommendations he may have with respect to import quotas or other matters, to the Congress of the United States no later than January 1, 1975. For the purposes of this section dairy products include (1) all forms of milk and dairy products, butterfat, milk solids-not-fat, and any combination or mixture thereof; (2) any article, compound, or mixture containing 5 per centum or more of butterfat, or milk solids-not-fat, or any combinations of the two; and (3) lactose, and other derivatives of milk, butterfat, or milk solids-not-fat, if imported commercially for any food use. Dairy products do not include (1) casein, caseinates, industrial casein, industrial caseinates, or any other industrial products, not to be used in any form for any food use, or an ingredient of food; or (2) articles not normally considered to be dairy products, such as candy, bakery goods, and other similar articles."

"PRODUCER HANDLERS

"SEC. 206. The legal status of producer handlers of milk under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, shall be the same subsequent to the adoption of the amendments made by the Agriculture Act of 1973 as it was prior thereto."

WOOL PROGRAM

(7) Section 301 is amended by—

(A) striking out "1973" each place it occurs and inserting "1977", and by striking out the word "three" each place it occurs; and

(B) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(6) Strike out the first sentence of section 708 and insert the following: 'The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into agreements with, or to approve agreements entered into between, marketing cooperatives, trade associations, or others engaged or whose members are engaged in the handling of wool, mohair, sheep, or goats or the products thereof for the purpose of developing and conducting on a national, State, or regional basis advertising and sales promotion programs and programs for the development and dissemination of information on product quality, production management, and marketing improvement, for wool, mohair, sheep, or goats or the products thereof. Advertising and sales promotion programs may be conducted outside of the United States for the purpose of maintaining and expanding foreign markets and uses for mohair or goats or the products thereof produced in the United States.'."

WHEAT PROGRAM

WHEAT PRODUCTION INCENTIVES

(8) Effective beginning with the 1974 crop section 401 is amended by striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" and inserting "1971 through 1977" and section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as it appears therein is amended by—

(A) amending section 107(a) to read as follows:

"(a) Loans and purchases on each crop of wheat shall be made available at such level as the Secretary determines appropriate, taking into consideration competitive world prices of wheat, the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains, and the level at which price support is made available for feed grains: *Provided*, That in no event shall such level be in excess of the parity price for wheat or less than $1.37 per bushel."

(B) substituting the word "payments" for the word "certificates" in section 107(b);

(C) striking the quotation mark at the end of section 107(b); and

(D) adding at the end of the section the following:

"(c) Payments shall be made for each crop of wheat to the producers on each farm in an amount determined by multiplying (i) the amount by which the higher of—

"(1) the national weighted average market price received by farmers during the first five months of the marketing year for such crop, as determined by the Secretary, or

"(2) the loan level determined under subsection (a) for such crop

is less than the established price of $2.05 per bushel in the case of the 1974 and 1975 crops, $2.05 per bushel adjusted to reflect any change during the calendar year 1975 in the index of prices paid by farmers for production items, interest, taxes, and wage rates in the case of the 1976 crop, and the established price for the 1976 crop adjusted to reflect any change during the calendar year 1976 in such index in the case of the 1977 crop, times in each case (ii) the allotment for the farm for such crop, times (iii) the projected yield established for the farm with such adjustments as the Secretary determines necessary to provide a fair and equitable yield: *Provided*, That any increase that would otherwise be made in the established price to reflect a change in the index of prices paid by farmers shall be adjusted to reflect any change in (i) the national average yield per acre of wheat for the three calendar years preceding the year for which the determination is made, over (ii) the national average yield per acre of wheat for the three calendar years preceding the year previous to the one for which the determination is made. If the Secretary determines that the producers are prevented from planting, any portion of the farm acreage allotment to wheat or other nonconserving crop, because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the producer, the rate of payment on such portion shall be the larger of (A) the foregoing rate, or (B) one-third of the established price. If the Secretary determines that, because of such a disaster or condition, the total quantity of wheat (or other nonconserving crop planted instead of wheat) which the producers are able to harvest on any farm is less than 66⅔ percent of the farm acreage allotment times the projected yield of wheat (or other nonconserving crop planted instead of wheat) for the farm, the rate of payment for the deficiency in production below 100 percent shall be the larger of (A) the foregoing rate, or (B) one-third of the established price. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payments made under this subsection for any farm among the producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis."

TERMINATION OF WHEAT CERTIFICATE PROGRAM, FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

(9) Section 402 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section designation and adding the following at the end of the section:

"(b)(A) Section 379b of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (which provides for a wheat marketing certificate program) shall not be applicable to the 1974 through 1977 crops of wheat, except as provided in paragraphs (B) and (C) of this subsection.

"(B) Section 379b(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by subsection (a) of this section (which provides for a set-aside program), shall be effective with respect to the 1974 through 1977 crops of wheat with the following changes:

"(i) The phrase 'payments authorized by section 107(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949' shall be substituted for the word 'certificates' and the phrases 'certificates authorized in subsection (b)' and 'marketing certificates' each place they occur.

"(ii) The word 'domestic' shall be stricken each place it occurs.

"(iii) The second sentence of section 379b (c)(1) is amended to read as follows: 'If a set-aside of cropland is in effect under this subsection (c), then as a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, and payments authorized by section 107(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the producers on a farm must set aside and devote to approved conservation uses an acreage of cropland equal to (i) such percentage of the wheat allotment for the farm as may be specified by the Secretary and will be estimated by the Secretary to result in a set-aside not in excess of thirteen and three-tenths million acres in the case of the 1971 crop; plus, if required by the Secretary, (ii) the acreage of cropland on the farm devoted in preceding years to soil conserving uses, as determined by the Secretary.'

"(iv) The third sentence in 379b(c)(1) is amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary is authorized for the 1974 through 1977 crops to limit the acreage planted to wheat on the farm to a percentage of the acreage allotment.'

"(v) '1971 through 1977' shall be substituted for '1971, 1972, and 1973' each place it occurs other than in the third sentence of section 379b(c)(1).

"(vi) the last sentence of section 379b(c)(1) is amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary shall permit producers to plant and graze on set-aside acreage sweet sorghum, and the Secretary may permit, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all or any of the set-aside acreage to be devoted to hay and grazing or the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, flaxseed, tritacale, oats, rye, or other commodity, if he determines that such production is needed to provide an adequate supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income.'

"(vii) After the second sentence of section 379b(c)(3) the following shall be inserted: 'The Secretary may, in the case of programs for the 1974 through 1977 crops, pay an appropriate share of the cost of practices designed to carry out the purposes of the foregoing sentences.'

"(C) Sections 379b (d), (e), (g), and (i) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be effective for the 1974 through 1977 crops amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payments made under this section for any farm among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis.

"'(e) In any case in which the failure of a producer to comply fully with the terms and conditions of the program formulated under this section precludes the making of loans, purchases, and payments, the Secretary may, nevertheless, make such loans, purchases, and payments in such amounts as he determines to be equitable in relation to the seriousness of the default.

"'(g) The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"'(i) The Secretary shall carry out the program authorized by this section through the Commodity Credit Corporation.'

"(D) Section 379c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, effective only with respect to the 1974 through 1977 crops of wheat is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 379c. (a)(1) The farm acreage allotment for each crop of wheat shall be determined as provided in this section. The Secretary shall proclaim the national acreage allotment not later than April 15 of each

calendar year for the crop harvested in the next succeeding calendar year. Such national allotment shall be the number of acres he determines on the basis of the estimated national average yield for the crop for which the determination is being made will produce the quality (less imports) that he estimates will be utilized domestically and for export during the marketing year for such crop. If the Secretary determines that carryover stocks are excessive or an increase in stocks is needed to assure a desirable carryover, he may adjust the allotment by the amount he determines will accomplish the desired decrease or increase in carryover stocks. The national acreage allotment for any crop of wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the States on the basis of the apportionment to each State of the naional acreage allomeni for the preceding crop (1973 national domestic allotment in the case of apportionment of the 1974 national acreage allotment) adjusted to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary to establish a fair and equitable apportionment base for each State taking into consideration established crop rotation practices, the estimated decrease in farm acreage allotments, and other relevant factors.

"'(2) The State acreage allotment for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State, on the basis of the apportionment to each such county of the wheat allotment for the preceding crop, adjusted to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary in order to establish a fair and equitable apportionment base for each county taking into consideration established crop-rotation practices, the estimated decrease in farm allotments, and other relevant factors.

"'(3) The farm allotment for each crop of wheat shall be determined by apportioning the county wheat allotment among farms in the county which had a wheat allotment for the preceding crop on the basis of such allotment, adjusted to reflect established crop-rotation practices and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing a fair and equitable allotment. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the farm allotment shall be adjusted downward to the extent required by subsection (b).

"'(4) Not to exceed 1 per centum of the State allotment for any crop may be apportioned to farms for which there was no allotment for the preceding crop on the basis of the following factors: suitability of the land for production of wheat, the past experience of the farm operator in the production of wheat, the extent to which the farm operator is dependent on income from farming for his livelihood, the production of wheat on other farms owned, operated, or controlled by the farm operator, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable farm allotments. No part of such reserve shall be apportioned to a farm to reflect new cropland brought into production after the date of enactment of the set-aside program for wheat.

"'(5) The planting on a farm of wheat of any crop for which no farm allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible for an allotment under subsection (a)(3) nor shall such farm by reason of such planting be considered ineligible for an allotment under subsection (a)(4).

"'(6) The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage under this Act as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography, and in addition, in the case of conserving use acreages to such other factors as he deems necessary in order to establish a fair and equitable conserving use acreage for the farm.

"'(b)(1) If for any crop the total acreage of wheat planted on a farm is less than the farm allotment, the farm allotment used as a base for the succeeding crop shall be reduced by the percentage by which such planted acreage was less than such farm allotment, but such reduction shall not exceed 20 per centum of the farm allotment for the preceding crop. If no acreage has been planted to wheat for three consecutive crop years on any farm which has an allotment, such farm shall lose its allotment. Producers on any farm who have planted to wheat not less than 90 per centum of the allotment for the farm shall be considered to have planted an acreage equal to 100 per centum of such allotment. An acreage on the farm which the Secretary determines was not planted to wheat because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the producer shall be considered to be an acreage of wheat planted for harvest. For the purpose of this subsection, the Secretary may permit producers of wheat to have acreage devoted to soybeans, feed grains for which there is a set-aside program in effect, guar, castor beans, cotton, triticale, oats, rye, or such other crops as the Secretary may deem appropriate considered as devoted to the production of wheat to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will not impair the effective operation of the program.

"'(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b)(1), no farm allotment shall be reduced or lost through failure to plant the farm allotment, if the producer elects not to receive payments for the portion of the farm allotment not planted, to which he would otherwise be entitled under the provisions of section 107(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949.'"

REPEAL OF PROCESSOR CERTIFICATE

(10) Section 403 is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section designation and by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Sections 379d, 379e, 379f, 379g, 379h, 379i, and 379j of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1936 (which deal with marketing certificate requirements for processors and exporters) shall not be applicable to wheat processed or exported during the period July 1, 1973 through June 30, 1978; and section 379g is amended by adding the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to take such action as he determines to be necessary to facilitate the transition from the certificate program provided for under section 379d to a program under which no certificates are required. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, such authority shall include, but shall not be limited to the authority to exempt all or a portion of wheat or food products made therefrom in the channels of trade on July 1, 1973, from the marketing restrictions in subsection (b) of section 379d, or to sell certificates to persons owning such wheat or food products made therefrom at such price and under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine. Any such certificate shall be issued by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Nothing herein shall authorize the Secretary to require certificates on wheat processed after June 30, 1973."

SUSPENSION OF WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

(11) Section 404 is amended by striking "1971, 1972, and 1973" wherever it appears and inserting "1971 through 1977", and by striking "1972 and 1973" and inserting "1972 through 1977".

STATE AGENCY ALLOTMENTS, YIELD CALCULATIONS

(12)(a) Section 405 is amended by striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" and inserting "1971 through 1977"; and by repealing paragraph (2) effective with the 1974 crop; by inserting "(a)" after the section designation; by changing the period and quotation mark at the end of the section to a semicolon; and by adding at the end of the section the following:

"(b) Effective with respect to the 1974 through 1977 crops, section 301(b)(13)(K) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended by adding after 'three calendar years' the following: '(five calendar years in the case of wheat)', and section 708 of Public Law 89-321 is amended by inserting in the second sentence after 'determining the projected yield' the following '(except that in the case of wheat, if the yield is abnormally low in any one of the calendar years of the base period because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary shall take into account the actual yield proved by the producer in the other four years of such base period)'."

SUSPENSION OF QUOTA PROVISIONS

(13) Section 406 is amended by striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" and inserting "1971 through 1977".

REDUCTION IN WHEAT STORED TO AVOID PENALTY

(14) Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Secretary may authorize release of wheat stored by a producer under section 379c(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, prior to the 1971 crop, whenever he determines such release will not significantly affect market prices for wheat. As a condition of release, the Secretary may require a refund of such portion of the value of certificates received in the crop year the excess wheat was produced as he deems appropriate considering the period of time the excess wheat has been in storage and the need to provide fair and equitable treatment among all wheat program participants.".

APPLICATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

(15) Section 408 is amended by striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" and inserting "1971 through 1977".

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES PRICE RESTRICTIONS

(16) Section 409 is amended by striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" and inserting "1971 through 1977".

SET-ASIDE ON SUMMER FALLOW FARMS

(17) Section 410 is amended by striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" and inserting "1971 through 1977".

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

(18) Effective only with respect to the 1974 through 1977 crops of feed grains, section 501 is amended by—

(A) striking out that portion through the first colon and section 105(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as it appears therein, and inserting the following:

"SEC. 501. (a) Effective only with respect to the 1971 through 1977 crops of feed grains, section 105(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(a)(1) The Secretary shall make available to producers loans and purchases on each crop of corn at such level, not less than $1.10 per bushel nor in excess of 90 per centum of the parity price therefor, as the Secretary determines will encourage the exportation of feed grains and not result in

excessive total stocks of feed grains in the United States.

"'(2) The Secretary shall make available to producers loans and purchases on each crop of barley, oats, and rye, respectively, at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level that loans and purchases are made available for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn and the other factors specified in section 401(b), and on each crop of grain sorghums at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level that loans and purchases are made available for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value and average transportation costs to market of grain sorghums in relation to corn.'."

(B) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Effective only with respect to the 1974 through 1977 crops of feed grains, section 105 (b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"'(b)(1) In addition, the Secretary shall make available to producers payments for each crop of corn, grain sorghums, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley, computed by multiplying (1) the payment rate, times (2) the allotment for the farm for such crop, times (3) the yield established for the farm for the preceding crop with such adjustments as the Secretary determines necessary to provide a fair and equitable yield. The payment rate for corn shall be the amount by which the higher of—

"'(1) the national weighted average market price received by farmers during the first five months of the marketing year for such crop, as determined by the Secretary, or

"'(2) the loan level determined under subsection (a) for such crop

is less than the established price of $1.38 per bushel in the case of the 1974 and 1975 crops, $1.38 per bushel adjusted to reflect any change during the calendar year 1975 in the index of prices paid by farmers for production items, interest, taxes, and wage rates in the case of the 1976 crop, and the established price for the 1976 crop adjusted to reflect any change during the calendar year 1976 in such index in the case of the 1977 crop: *Provided*, That any increase that would otherwise be made in the established price to reflect a change in the index of prices paid by farmers shall be adjusted to reflect any change in (i) the national average yield per acre of feed grains for the three calendar years preceding the year for which the determination is made, over (ii) the national average yield per acre of feed grains for the three calendar years preceding the year previous to the one for which the determination is made. The payment rate for grain sorghums and, if designated by the Secretary, barley, shall be such rate as the Secretary determines fair and reasonable in relation to the rate at which payments are made available for corn. If the Secretary determines that the producers on a farm are prevented from planting any portion of the farm acreage allotment to feed grains or other nonconserving crop, because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the producer, the rate of payment on such portion shall be the larger of (A) the foregoing rate, or (B) one-third of the established price. If the Secretary determines that, because of such a disaster or condition, the total quantity of feed grains (or other nonconserving crop planted instead of feed grains) which the producers are able to harvest on any farm is less than 66⅔ percent of the farm acreage allotment times the yield of feedgrains (or other nonconserving crop planted instead of feed grains established for the farm, the rate of payment for the deficiency in production below 100 percent shall be the larger of (A) the foregoing rate, or (B) one-third of the established price.

"'(2) The Secretary shall, prior to January 1 of each calendar year, determine and proclaim for the crop produced in such calendar year a national acreage allotment for feed grains, which shall be the number of acres he determines on the basis of the estimated national average yield of the feed grains included in the program for the crop for which the determination is being made will produce the quantity (less imports) of such feed grains that he estimates will be utilized domestically and for export during the marketing year for such crop. If the Secretary determines that carryover stocks of any of the feed grains are excessive or an increase in stocks is needed to assure a desirable carryover, he may adjust the feed grain allotment by the amount he determines will accomplish the desired decrease or increase in carryover stocks. State, county, and farm feed grain allotments shall be established on the basis of the feed grain allotments established for the preceding crop (for 1974 on the basis of the feed grain bases established for 1973), adjusted to the extent deemed necessary to establish a fair and equitable apportionment base for each State, county, and farm. Not to exceed 1 per centum of the State fed grain allotment may be reserved for apportionment to new feed grain farms on the basis of the following factors: suitability of the land for production of feed grains, the extent to which the farm operator is dependent on income from farming for his livelihood, the production of feed grains on other farms owned, operated, or controlled by the farm operator, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable feed grain allotments.

"'(3) If for any crop the total acreage on a farm planted to feed grains included in the program formulated under this subsection is less than the feed grain allotment for the farm, the feed grain allotment for the farm for the succeeding crops shall be reduced by the percentage by which the planted acreage is less than the feed grain allotment for the farm, but such reduction shall not exceed 20 per centum of the feed grain allotment. If no acreage has been planted to such feed grains for three consecutive crop years on any farm which has a feed grain allotment, such farm shall lose its feed grain allotment: *Provided*, That no farm feed grain allotment shall be reduced or lost through failure to plant, if the producer elects not to receive payment for such portion of the farm feed grain allotment not planted, to which he would otherwise be entitled under the provisions of this Act. Any such acres eliminated from any farm shall be assigned to a national pool for the adjustment of feed grain allotments as provided for in subsection (e)(2). Producers on any farm who have planted to such feed grains not less than 90 per centum of the feed grain allotment shall be considered to have planted an acreage equal to 100 per centum of such allotment. An acreage on the farm which the Secretary determines was not planted to such feed grains because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster or condition beyond the control of the producer shall be considered to be an acreage of feed grains planted for harvest. For the purpose of this paragraph, the Secretary may permit producers of feed grains to have acreage devoted to soybeans, wheat, guar, castor beans, cotton, triticale, oats, rye, or such other crops as the Secretary may deem appropriate, considered as devoted to the production of such feed grains to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will not impair the effective operation of the program.'.".

(C) amending the last sentence of section 105(c)(1) to read as follows:

"The Secretary shall permit producers to plant and graze on setaside acreage sweet sorghum, and the Secretary may permit, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all or any of the setaside acreage to be devoted to hay and grazing or the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, flaxseed, triticale, oats, rye, or other commodity, if he determines that such production is needed to provide an adequate supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income."

(C) striking out "1971, 1972, 1973" where it appears in that part which amends section 105(c)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and inserting "1971 through 1977", and by amending the second sentence of section 105 (c)(1) to read as follows: "If a setaside of cropland is in effect under this subsection (c), then as a condition of eligibility for loans, purchases, and payments on corn, grain sorghums, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley, respectively, the producers on a farm must set aside and devote to approved conservation uses an acreage of cropland equal to (i) such percentage of the feed grain allotment for the farm as may be specified by the Secretary, plus, if required by the Secretary (ii) the acreage of cropland on the farm devoted in preceding years to soil conserving uses, as determined by the Secretary."

(D) amending the third sentence of section 105(c)(1) to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized for the 1974 through 1977 crops to limit the acreage planted to feed grains on the farm to a percentage of the farm acreage allotment.",

(E) striking out paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (e), changing "bases" to "allotments" wherever it appears in paragraph (2) of subsection (e), and striking out all of subsection (g).

(F) inserting after the second sentence of section 105(c)(3) the following: "The Secretary may, in the case of programs for the 1974 through 1977 crops, pay an appropriate share of the cost of practices designed to carry out the purposes of the foregoing sentences."

COTTON PROGRAM

SUSPENSION OF MARKETING QUOTAS FOR COTTON, MINIMUM BASE ACREAGE ALLOTMENT

(19) Section 601 is amended by—

(A) striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" wherever it appears therein and inserting "1971 through 1977",

(B) striking "1970, 1971, and 1972" from paragraph (2) and inserting "1970 through 1976",

(C) effective beginning with the 1974 crop, striking out the following from section 344a (a) in section 601 "for which a farm base acreage allotment is established (other than pursuant to section 350(e)(1)(A))",

(D) striking "1974" from paragraph (3)(1) and inserting "1978", and by striking "1972 and 1973" from paragraph (4) and inserting "1972 through 1977",

(E) effective beginning with the 1974 crop, adding at the end of section 350(a) in paragraph (4) of section 601 the following: "The national base acreage allotment for the 1974 through 1977 crops shall not be less than eleven million acres.",

(F) effective beginning with the 1974 crop, striking "soybeans, wheat or feed grains" from the last sentence of section 350(e)(2) in paragraph (4) of section 601 and inserting "soybeans, wheat, feed grains, guar, castor beans, triticale, oats, rye or such other crops as the Secretary may deem appropriate",

(G) effective beginning with the 1974 crop, striking the words "an adjoining" in the first sentence of section 350(h) as found in paragraph (4) of section 601, and inserting in lieu thereof "any other nearby".

COTTON PRODUCTION INCENTIVES

(20) Section 602 is amended by—

(A) striking "1971, 1972, and 1973" wherever it appears therein and inserting "1971 through 1977", by striking "the 1972 or 1973 crop" where it appears in that part amending section 103(e)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and inserting "any of the 1972 through 1977 crops", and by striking out "acreage world price" in that part amending section 103(e)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and substituting "average price of American cotton in world markets";

(B) in that part amending section 103(e)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 striking out "two-year period" wherever it appears therein and substituting "three-year period"; and by striking out that part beginning with "except that" in the first sentence and substituting "except that if the loan rate so calculated is higher than the then current level of average world prices for American cotton of such quality, the Secretary is authorized to adjust the current calculated loan rate for cotton to 90 per centum of the then current average world price.";

(C) effective, beginning with the 1974 crop, amending section 103(e)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as it appears in such section 602 to read as follows:

"(2) Payments shall be made for each crop of cotton to the producers on each farm at a rate equal to the amount by which the higher of—

"(1) the average market price received by farmers for upland cotton during the calendar year which includes the first five months of the marketing year for such crop as determined by the Secretary, or

"(2) the loan level determined under paragraph (1) for such crop

is less than the established price of 38 cents per pound in the case of the 1974 and 1975 crops, 38 cents per pound adjusted to reflect any change during the calendar year 1975 in the index of prices paid by farmers for production items, interest, taxes, and wage rates in the case of the 1976 crop, and the established price for the 1976 crop adjusted to reflect any change during the calendar year 1976 in such index in the case of the 1977 crop: *Provided*, That any increase that would otherwise be made in the established price to reflect a change in the index of prices paid by farmers shall be adjusted to reflect any change in (i) the national average yield per acre of cotton for the three calendar years preceding the year for which the determination is made, over (ii) the national average yield per acre of cotton for the three calendar years preceding the year previous to the one for which the determination is made. If the Secretary determines that the producers on a farm are prevented from planting, any portion of the allotment to cotton because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster, or condition beyond the control of the producer, the rate of payment for such portion shall be the larger of (A) the foregoing rate, or (B) one-third of the established price. If the Secretary determines that, because of such a disaster or condition, the total quantity of cotton which the producers are able to harvest on any farm is less than 66⅔ percent of the farm base acreage allotment times the average yield established for the farm, the rate of payment for the deficiency in production below 100 percent shall be the larger of (A) the foregoing rate, or (B) one-third of the established price. The payment rate with respect to any producer who (i) is on a small farm (that is, a farm on which the base acreage allotment is ten acres or less, or on which the yield used in making payments times the farm base acreage allotment is five thousand pounds or less, and for which the base acreage allotment has not been reduced under section 350(f), (ii) resides on such farm, and (iii) derives his principal income from cotton produced on such farm, shall be increased by 30 per centum; but, notwithstanding paragraph (3), such increase shall be made only with respect to his share of cotton actually harvested on such farm within the quantity specified in paragraph (3)."

(D) effective, beginning with the 1974 crop, amending the third sentence of section 103(e)(4)(A) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as it appears in such section 602 of read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized for the 1974 through 1977 crops to limit the acreage planted to upland cotton on the farm in excess of the farm base acreage allotment a percentage of the farm base acreage allotment.".

(E) The second sentence of Section 103(e)(4)(A) is amended to read as follows: "If a set-aside of cropland is in effect under this paragraph (4), then as a condition of eligibility for loans and payments in upland cotton the producers on a farm must set aside and devote to approved conservation uses an acreage of cropland equal to (i) such percentage of the farm base acreage allotment for the farm as may be specified by the Secretary (not to exceed 28 per centum of the farm base acreage allotment), plus, if required by the Secretary, (ii) the acreage of cropland on the farm devoted in preceding years to soil conserving uses, as determined by the Secretary."

(F) the fourth sentence of section 103(e)(4)(A) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as found in section 602 is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall permit producers to plant and graze on set-aside acreage sweet sorghum, and the Secretary may permit, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all or any of the set-aside acreage to be devoted to hay and grazing or the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, plantago ovato, flaxseed, triticale, oats, rye, or other commodity, if he determines that such production is needed to provide an adequate supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price-support program, and will not adversely affect farm income."

(G) inserting after the second sentence of section 103(e)(5) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as it appears in such section 602 the following: "The Secretary may in the case of programs for the 1974 through 1977 crops, pay an appropriate share of the cost of practices designed to carry out the purposes of the foregoing sentences."

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES PRICE RESTRICTIONS FOR COTTON

(21) Section 603 is amended by striking out "1974" and inserting "1978".

MISCELLANEOUS COTTON PROVISIONS

(22) Sections 604, 605, 606, 607, and 608 are each amended by striking out "1971, 1972, and 1973" and inserting "1971 through 1977".

COTTON MARKET DEVELOPMENT

(23) Section 610 is amended by inserting after the words "shall be" in the second sentence the following words "10 million dollars," and by striking the balance of said sentence, and further by striking out "1972 and 1973" and inserting "1972 through 1977" in the third sentence.

COTTON INSECT ERADICATION

(24) Title VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 611. Section 104 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"'(d) In order to reduce cotton production costs, to prevent the movement of certain cotton plant insects to areas not now infested, and to enhance the quality of the environment, the Secretary is authorized and directed to carry out programs to destroy and eliminate cotton boll weevils in infested areas of the United States as provided herein and to carry out similar programs with respect to pink bollworms or any other major cotton insect if the Secretary determines that methods and systems have been developed to the point that success in eradication of such insects is assured. The Secretary shall carry out the eradication programs authorized by this subsection through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In carrying out insect eradication projects, the Secretary shall utilize the technical and related services of appropriate Federal, State, private agencies, and cotton organizations. Producers and landowners in an eradication zone, established by the Secretary, who are receiving benefits from any program administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, shall, as a condition of receiving or continuing any such benefits, participate in and cooperate with the eradication project, as specified in regulations of the Secretary.

"'The Secretary may issue such regulations as he deems necessary to enforce the provisions of this subsection with respect to achieving the compliance of producers and landowners who are not receiving benefits from any program administered by the United States Department of Agriculture. Any person who knowingly violates any such regulation promulgated by the Secretary under this subsection may be assessed a civil penalty of not to exceed $5,000 for each offense. No civil penalty shall be assessed unless the person shall have been given notice and opportunity for a hearing on such charge in the county, parish, or incorporated city of the residence of the person charged. In determining the amount of the penalty the Secretary shall consider the appropriateness of such penalty to the size of the business of the person charged, the effect on the person's ability to continue in business and the gravity of the violation. Where special measures deemed essential to achievement of the eradication objective are taken by the project and result in a loss of production and income to the producer, the Secretary shall provide reasonable and equitable indemnification from funds available for the project, and also provide for appropriate protection of the allotment, acreage history, and average yield for the farm. The cost of the program in each eradication zone shall be determined, and cotton producers in the zone shall be required to pay up to one-half thereof, with the exact share in each zone area to be specified by the Secretary upon his finding that such share is reasonable and equitable based on population levels of the target insect and the degree of control measures normally required. Each producer's pro rata share shall be deducted from his cotton payment under this Act or otherwise collected, as provided in regulations of the Secretary. Insofar as practicable, cotton producers and other persons engaged in cotton production in the eradication zone shall be employed to participate in the work of the project in such zone. Funding of the program shall be terminated at such time as the Secretary determines and reports to the Congress that complete eradication of the insects for which programs care undertaken pursuant to this subsection has been accomplished. Funds in custody of agencies carrying out the program shall, upon termination of such program, be accounted for to the Secretary for appropriate disposition.

"'The Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the Government of Mexico in carrying out operations or measures in Mexico which he deems necessary and feasible to prevent the movement into the United States from Mexico of any insects eradicated under the provisions of this subsection. The measure and character of cooperation carried out under this subsection on the part of the United States and on the part of the Government of Mexico, including the expenditure or use of funds made available by the Secretary

under this subsection, shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Arrangements for the cooperation authorized by this subsection shall be made through and in consultation with the Secretary of State. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this subsection unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this subsection. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.'."

SKIPROW PRACTICES

(25) Title VI is further amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 612. Section 374(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new sentence: 'Where cotton is planted in skiprow patterns, the same rules that were in effect for the 1971 through 1973 crops for classifying the acreage planted to cotton and the area skipped shall also apply to the 1974 through 1977 crops.'."

PUBLIC LAW 480

(26) Section 701 is amended by striking out "1973" and inserting "1977"; and title VII is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

Section 103 of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subsection (o) the following: "and that commercial supplies are available to meet demands developed through programs carried out under this Act."

"SEC. 704. Title IV of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'SEC. 411. No agricultural commodities shall be sold under title I or title III, or donated under title II of this Act to North Vietnam, unless by an Act of Congress enacted subsequent to July 1, 1973, assistance to North Vietnam is specifically authorized.'"

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

(27) Title VIII is amended as follows:

BEEKEEPER INDEMNITIES

(A) Section 804 is amended by striking out "December 31, 1973" and inserting "December 31, 1977".

(B) By adding at the end thereof the following:

"FHA LOANS

"SEC. 807. The first sentence of section 305 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by striking out '$100,000' and inserting '$225,000'; and by striking out 'or (b)' and inserting '(b) the loans under such sections to any one borrower to exceed $100,000, or (c)'.

"COST OF PRODUCTION STUDY

"SEC. 808. The Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the land grant colleges, commodity organizations, general farm organizations, and individual farmers, shall conduct a cost of production study of the wheat, feed grain, cotton, and dairy commodities under the various production practices and establish a current national weighted average cost of production. This study shall be updated annually and shall include all typical variable costs, a return on fixed costs equal to the existing interest rates charged by the Federal Land Bank, and return for management comparable to the normal management fees charged by other comparable industries. These studies shall be based upon the size unit that requires one man to farm on a full-time basis.

"LIVESTOCK STUDY

"SEC. 809. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to carry out a comprehensive study and investigation to determine the reasons for the extensive loss of livestock sustained each year, through injury and disease, while such livestock is being transported in interstate commerce for commercial purposes. The Secretary is also authorized and directed to conduct, in connection with such study and investigation, an intensive research program for the purpose of developing measures that can be taken to reduce materially the number of animals lost, through injury and disease, during transportation for commercial purposes.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Congress not more than four years after the date of enactment of this section a final report on the results of his study and investigation and research together with such recommendations for administrative and legislative action as he deems appropriate. He shall submit such interim reports to the Congress as he deems advisable, but at least one at the end of each twelve month period following the date of enactment of this section.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, but not more than $500,000 in any fiscal year.

"WHEAT AND FEED GRAINS RESEARCH

"SEC. 810. In order to reduce fertilizer and herbicide usage in excess of production needs, to develop wheat and feed grain varieties more susceptible to complete fertilizer utilization, to improve the resistance of wheat and feed grain plants to disease and to enhance their conservation and environmental qualities, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to carry out regional and national research programs.

"In carrying out such research, the Secretary shall utilize the technical and related services of the appropriate Federal, State, and private agencies.

"There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, but not more than $1,000,000 in any fiscal year.

"TECHNICAL SUPPORT

"SEC. 811. The Department of Agriculture shall provide technical support to exporters and importers of United States agricultural products when so requested. Such support shall include, but not be limited to, a review of the feasibility of the export proposal, adequacy of sources of supply, compliance with trade regulations of the United States and the importing country and such other information or guidance as may be needed to expand and expedite United States agricultural exports by private trading interests.

"EXPORT SALES REPORTING

"SEC. 812. All exporters of wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, oil seeds, cotton and products thereof, and other commodities the Secretary may designate produced in the United States shall report to the Secretary of Agriculture, on a weekly basis, the following information regarding any contract for export sales entered into or subsequently modified in any manner during the reporting period: (a) type, class, and quantity of the commodity sought to be exported, (b) the marketing year of shipment, (c) destination, if known. Individual reports shall remain confidential but shall be compiled by the Secretary and published in compilation form each week following the week of reporting. All exporters of agricultural commodities produced in the United States shall upon request of the Secretary of Agriculture immediately report to the Secretary any information with respect to export sales of agricultural commodities and at such times as he may request. Any person (or corporation) who knowingly fails to report export sales pursuant to the requirements of this section shall be fined not more than $25,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. The Secretary may, with respect to any commodity or type or class thereof during any period in which he determines that there is a domestic supply of such commodity substantially in excess of the quantity needed to meet domestic requirements, and that total supplies of such commodity in the exporting countries are estimated to be in surplus, and that anticipated exports will not result in excessive drain on domestic supplies, and that to require the reports to be made will unduly hamper export sales, provide for such reports by exporters and publishing of such data to be on a monthly basis rather than on a weekly basis."

"DISASTER RESERVE

"SEC. 813. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall under the provisions of this Act establish, maintain, and dispose of a separate reserve of inventories of not to exceed 75 million bushels of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans for the purpose of alleviating distress caused by a natural disaster.

"Such reserve inventories shall include such quantities of grain that the Secretary deems needed to provide for the alleviation of distress as the result of a natural disaster.

"(b) The Secretary shall acquire such commodities through the price support program.

"(c) Except when a state of emergency has been proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress declaring that such reserves should be disposed of, the Secretary shall not offer any commodity in the reserve for sale or disposition.

"(d) The Secretary is also authorized to dispose of such commodities only for (1) use in relieving distress (a) in any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands and (b) in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855 et seq.), or (2) for use in connection with a state of civil defense emergency as proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251–2297).

"(e) The Secretary may sell at an equivalent price, allowing for the customary location and grade price differentials, substantially equivalent quantities in different locations or warehouses to the extent needed to properly handle, rotate, distribute, and locate such reserve.

"(f) The Secretary may use the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent feasible to fulfill the purposes of this section; and to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the fulfillment of the purposes of this section and the effective and efficient administration of this section shall utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce.

"(g) The Secretary may issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(h) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"IMPORTED COMMODITIES

"SEC. 814. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall encourage the production of any crop of which the United States is a net importer and for which a price support program is not in effect by permitting the planting of such crop on set-aside acreage and with no reduction in the rate of payment for the commodity.

"EMERGENCY SUPPLY OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

"SEC. 815(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture

shall assist farmers, processors, and distributors in obtaining such prices for agricultural products that an orderly, adequate and steady supply of such products will exist for the consumers of this nation.

"(b) The President shall make appropriate adjustments in the maximum price which may be charged under the provisions of Executive Order 11723 (dated June 13, 1973) or any subsequent Executive Order for any agricultural products (at any point in the distribution chain) as to which the Secretary of Agriculture certifies to the President that the supply of the product will be reduced to unacceptably low levels as a result of any price control or freeze order or regulation and that alternative means for increasing the supply are not available.

"(c) Under this section, the term 'agricultural products' shall include meat, poultry, vegetables, fruits and all other agricultural commodities in raw or processed form, except forestry products or fish or fishery products.

"RURAL DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 816. (a) Section 401 of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 670) is amended by substituting the words 'fire' and 'fires' for the words 'wildfire' and 'wildfires', respectively, wherever such words appear.

"(b) Section 404 of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (86 Stat. 671) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 404. APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title $7,000,000 for each of three consecutive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year for which funds are first appropriated and obligated by the Secretary of Agriculture carrying out this title.'

"(c) Section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(13)(A) The Secretary, under such reasonable rules and conditions as he shall establish, shall make grants to eligible volunteer fire departments for up to 50 per centum of the cost of firefighting equipment needed by such departments but which such departments are unable to purchase through the resources otherwise available to them, and for the cost of the training necessary to enable such departments to use such equipment efficiently.

"'(B) For the purposes of this subsection, the term "eligible volunteer fire department" means any established volunteer fire department in a rural town, village, or unincorporated area where the population is less than two thousand but greater than two hundred, as reasonably determined by the Secretary.'

"SEC. 817. Section 310B(d) of subtitle A of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(4) No grant or loan authorized to be made under this Act shall require or be subject to the prior approval of any officer, employee, or agency of any State.

"'(5) No loan commitment issued under this section, section 304, or section 312 shall be conditioned upon the applicant investing in excess of 10 per centum in the business or industrial enterprise for which purpose the loan is to be made unless the Secretary determines there are special circumstances which necessitate an equity investment by the applicant greater than 10 per centum.

"'(6) No provision of law shall prohibit issuance by the Secretary of certificates evidencing beneficial ownership in a block of notes insured or guaranteed under this Act or Title V of the Housing Act of 1949; and sale by the Secretary of such certificates shall be treated as a sale of assets for the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. Any security representing beneficial ownership in a block of notes guaranteed or insured under this Act or Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 issued by a private entity, shall be exempt from laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission, except sections 17, 22, and 24 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended; however, the Secretary shall require (i) that the issuer place such notes in the custody of an institution chartered by a Federal or State agency to act as trustee and (ii) that the issuer provide such periodic reports of sales as the Secretary deems necessary.

"AGRICULTURAL CENSUS

"SEC. 818. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a census of agriculture in 1974 as required by section 142 of title 13, United States Code, and shall submit to the Congress, within thirty days after the date of enactment of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, an estimate of the funds needed to conduct such census."

(28) By adding at the end thereof the following new title X:

"TITLE X—RURAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

"SEC. 1001. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 7(a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, section 16(b) of such Act, and in the Water Bank Act (16 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) by entering into contracts of three, five, ten, or twenty-five years with, and at the option of, eligible owners and operators of land as determined by the Secretary and having such control as the Secretary determines to be needed on the farms, ranches, wetlands, forests, or other lands covered thereby. In addition, the Secretary is hereby authorized to purchase perpetual easements to promote said purposes of this Title, including the sound use and management of flood plains, shore lands, and aquatic areas of the Nation. Such contracts shall be designed to assist farm, ranch, wetland, and nonindustrial private forest owners and operators, or other owners or operators, to make, in orderly progression over a period of years, such changes, if any, as are needed to effectuate any of the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 7(a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; section 16(b) of such Act; the Water Bank Act (16 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.); in enlarging fish and wildlife and recreation sources; in improving the level of management of nonindustrial private forest lands; and in providing long-term wildlife and upland game cover. In carrying out the provisions of this title, due regard shall be given to the maintenance of a continuing and stable supply of agricultural commodities and forest products adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers.

"(1) to effectuate the plan for his farm, ranch, forest, wetland, or other land substantially in accordance with the schedule outlined therein;

"(2) to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the land if the Secretary, after considering the recommendations of the Soil and Water Conservation District Board, or the State forester or other appropriate official in a contract entered into under the provisions of section 1009 of this title, determines that such violation is of such a nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make refunds or accept such payment adjustments as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the violation by the owner or operator does not warrant termination of the contract;

"(3) upon transfer of his right and interest in the farm, ranch, forest, wetland, or other land during the contract period to forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder unless the transferee of any such land agrees with the Secretary to assume all obligations of the contract;

"(4) not to adopt any practice specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

"SEC. 1002. Eligible landowners and operators for contracts under this title shall furnish to the Secretary a plan of farming operations or land use which incorporates such practices and principles as may be determined by him to be practicable and which outlines a schedule of proposed changes, if any, in cropping systems or land use and of the conservation measures which are to be carried out on the farm, ranch, wetland, forests, or other land during the contract period to protect the farm, ranch, wetland, forests or other land and surrounding areas, its wildlife, and nearby populace and communities from erosion, deterioration, pollution by natural and manmade causes or to insure an adequate supply of timber and related forest products. Said plans may also, in important migratory waterfowl nesting and breeding areas which are identified in a conservation plan developed in cooperation with a soil and water conservation district in which the lands are located, and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may provide, include a schedule of proposed changes, if any, to conserve surface waters and preserve and improve habitat for migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources and improve subsurface moisture, including, subject to the provisions of section 1001 of this title, the reduction of areas of new land coming into production, the enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape, and the promotion of comprehensive and total water management study.

"SEC. 1003. (a) Approved conservation plans of eligible landowners and operators developed in cooperation with the soil and water conservation district or the State forester or other appropriate State official in which their lands are situated shall form a basis for contracts under this title. Under the contract the landowner or operator shall agree—

"(5) to comply with all applicable Federal, State, or local laws, and regulations, including those governing environmental protection and noxious weed abatement; and

"(6) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of the program or to facilitate the practical administration of the program: *Provided*, That all contracts entered into to effectuate the purposes of the Water Bank Act for wetlands shall contain the further agreement of the owner or operator that he shall not drain, burn, fill, or otherwise destroy the wetland character of such areas, nor use such areas for agricultural purposes: *And provided further*, That contracts entered into for the protection of wetlands to effectuate the purposes of the Water Bank Act may include wetlands covered by Federal or State government easement which permits agricultural use, together with such adjacent areas as determined desirable by the Secretary.

"(b) In return for such agreement by the landowner or operator the Secretary shall agree to make payments in appropriate circumstances for the use of land maintained for conservation purposes as set forth in this title, and share the cost of carrying out those conservation practices and measures set forth in the contract for which he determines that cost-sharing is appropriate and in the public interest. The portion of such cost (including labor) to be shared shall be that part which the Secretary determines is necessary and appropriate to effectuate the physical installation of the conservation

practices and measures under the contract, but, in the case of a contract not entered into under an advertising and bid procedure under the provisions of section 1009(d) of this title, not less than 50 per centum or more than 75 per centum of the actual costs incurred by the owner or operator.

"(c) The Secretary may terminate any contract with a landowner or operator by mutual agreement with the owner or operator if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest, and may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of the program or facilitate the practical administration thereof or to accomplish equitable treatment with respect to other similar conservation, land use, or commodity programs administered by the Secretary.

"SEC. 1004. The Secretary is authorized to make available to eligible owners and operators conservation materials including seeds, seed inoculants, soil conditioning materials, trees, plants, and, if he determines it is appropriate to the purposes of this title, fertilizer and liming materials.

"SEC. 1005. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other title, the Secretary may establish multiyear set-aside contracts for a period not to extend beyond the 1977 crop. Such contracts may be entered into only as a part of the programs in effect for wheat, feed grains, and cotton for the years 1974 through 1978, and only producers participating in one or more of such programs shall be eligible to contract with the Secretary under this section. Producers agreeing to a multiyear set-aside agreement shall be required to devote this acreage to vegetative cover capable of maintaining itself throughout such period to provide soil protection, water quality enhancement, wildlife production, and natural beauty. Grazing of livestock under this section shall be prohibited. Producers entering into agreements under this section shall also agree to comply with all applicable State and local law and regulation governing noxious weed control.

"(b) The Secretary shall provide cost-sharing incentives to farm operators for such cover establishment, whenever a multiyear contract is entered into on all or a portion of the set-aside acreage.

"SEC. 1006. The Secretary shall issue such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. The total acreage placed under agreements which result in their retirement from production in any county or local community shall in addition to the limitations elsewhere in this title be limited to a percentage of the total eligible acreage in such county or local community which the Secretary determines would not adversely affect the economy of the county or local community. In determining such percentage the Secretary shall give appropriate consideration to the productivity of the acreage being retired, if any, as compared to the average productivity of eligible acreage in such county or local community which the Secretary determines would not adversely affect the economy of the county or local community.

"SEC. 1007. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint an advisory board in each State to advise the State committee of that State (established under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act) regarding the types of conservation measures that should be approved to effectuate the purposes of this title. The Secretary shall appoint at least six individuals to the advisory board of each State who are especially qualified by reason of education, training, and experience in the fields of agriculture, soil, water, wildlife, fish, and forest management. The advisory board appointed for any State shall meet at least once each calendar year. Said appointed members shall include, but not be limited to, the State soil conservationist, the State forester, the State administrator of the water quality programs, and the State wildlife administrator or their designees: *Provided,* That such board shall limit its advice to the State committees to the types of conservation measures that should be approved affecting the water bank program; the authorization to purchase perpetual easements to promote the purposes of this title, as described in section 1001 of this title; the providing of long-term upland game cover; and the establishment and management of approved practices on multiyear set-aside contracts as provided in section 1005 of this title.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, through the establishment of a national advisory board to be named in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall seek the advice and assistance of the appropriate officials of the several States in developing the programs under this title, especially in developing guidelines for (1) providing technical assistance for wildlife habitat improvement practices, (2) evaluating effects on surrounding areas, (3) considering aesthetic values, (4) checking compliance by cooperators, and (5) carrying out programs of wildlife management authorized under this title: Provided, That such board shall limit its advice to subjects which cover the types of conservation measures that should be approved regarding the water bank program; the authorization to purchase perpetual easements to promote the purposes of this Act, as described in section 1001 of this title; the providing of long-term upland game cover; and the establishment and management of approved practices on multiyear set-aside contracts as provided in section 1005 of this title.

"SEC. 1008. In carrying out the programs authorized under sections 1001 through 1006 of this title, the Secretary shall, in addition to appropriate coordination with other interested Federal, State, and local agencies, utilize the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. The Secretary is also authorized to utilize the facilities and services of the Commodity Credit Corporation in discharging his functions and responsibilities under this program. The Secretary shall also utilize the technical services of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, State forestry organizations, soil and water conservation districts, and other State, and Federal agencies, as appropriate, in development and installation of approved conservation plans under this title.

"SEC. 1009. (a) In furtherance of the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to develop and carry out a forestry incentives program to encourage the development, management, and protection of nonindustrial private forest lands. The purposes of such a program shall be to encourage landowners to apply practices which will provide for the afforestation of suitable open lands and reforestation of cutover and other nonstocked and understocked forest lands and intensive multiple-purpose management and protection of forest resources so as to provide for production of timber and related benefits.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'non-industrial private forest lands' means lands capable of producing crops of industrial wood and owned by any private individual, group, association, corporation, or other legal entity. Such term does not include private entities which regularly engage in the business of manufacturing forest products or providing public utilities services of any type, or the subsidiaries of such entities.

"(c) The Secretary shall consult with the State forester or other appropriate official of the respective States in the conduct of the forestry incentives program under this section, and Federal assistance shall be extended in accordance with section 1003(b) of this title. The Secretary shall for the purposes of this section distribute funds available for cost sharing among and within the States only after assessing the public benefit incident thereto, and after giving appropriate consideration to the number and acreage of commercial forest lands, number of eligible ownerships in the State, and counties to be served by such cost sharing; the potential productivity of such lands; and the need for reforestation, timber stand improvement, or other forestry investments on such land. No forest incentives contract shall be approved under this section on a tract greater than five hundred acres, unless the Secretary finds that significant public benefit will be incident to such approval.

"(d) The Secretary may, if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the program established by this section, use an advertising and bid procedure in determining the lands in any area to be covered by agreements.

"(e) In implementing the program under this section, the Secretary will cause it to be coordinated with other related programs in such a manner as to encourage the utilization of private agencies, firms, and individuals furnishing services and materials needed in the application of practices included in the forestry incentives improvement program. The Secretary shall periodically report to the appropriate congressional committees of the progress and conduct of the program established under this section.

"SEC. 1010. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. The programs, contracts, and authority authorized under this title shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other programs in such areas authorized by this or any other title or Act, and shall not expire with the termination of any other title or Act: *Provided,* That not more than $25,000,000 annually shall be authorized to be appropriated for the programs authorized under section 1009 of this Act."

ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPEAL

SEC. 2. Section 301 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 79–733), as amended (7 U.S.C. 1628), is hereby repealed.

FOOD STAMPS

SEC. 3. The Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The second sentence of section 3(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2012 (e)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or (3) any narcotics addict or alcoholic who lives under the supervision of a private nonprofit organization or institution for the purpose of regular participation in a drug or alcoholic treatment and rehabilitation program."

(b) Section 3(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the last sentence therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following sentence: "No individual who receives supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act shall be considered to be a member of a household or an elderly person for any purpose of this Act for any month if such person receives for such month, as part of his supplemental security income benefits or payments described in section 1616(a) of the Social Security Act (if any), an amount equal to the bonus value of food stamps (according to the Food Stamp Schedule effective for July 1973) in addition to the amount of assistance such individual would be entitled to receive for such month under the provisions of the plan of the State approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, as appropriate, in effect for December 1973, assuming such plan were in effect for such month and such

individual were aged, blind, or disabled, as the case may be, under the provisions of such State plan or under Public Law 92–603 as amended. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall issue regulations for the implementation of the foregoing sentence after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) Section 3 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) The term 'drug addiction or alcoholic treatment and rehabilitation program' means any drug addiction or alcoholic treatment and rehabilitation program conducted by a private nonprofit organization or institution which is certified by the State agency or agencies designated by the Governor as responsible for the administration of the State's programs for alcoholics and drug addicts pursuant to Public Law 91–616 'Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcohol Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act' and Public Law 92–255 'Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972' as providing treatment that can lead to the rehabilitation of drug addicts or alcoholics."

(d) Section 5 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary shall establish uniform national standards of eligibility for households described in section 3(e)(3) of this Act."

(e) Section 5(c) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2014(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of this section, the term 'able-bodied adult person' shall not include any narcotics addict or alcoholic who regularly participates, as a resident or nonresident, in any drug addiction or alcoholic treatment and rehabilitation program."

(f) Section 10 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) Subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary in the regulations pursuant to this Act, members of an eligible household who are narcotics addicts or alcoholics and regularly participate in a drug addiction or alcoholic treatment and rehabilitation program may use coupons issued to them to purchase food prepared for or served to them during the course of such program by a private nonprofit organization or institution which meets requirements (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (h) above. Meals served pursuant to this subsection shall be deemed 'food' for the purposes of this Act."

(g) Section 5(b) is amended by inserting the following before the period at the end of the second sentence: ": *Provided*, That such standards shall take into account payments in kind received from an employer by members of a household, if such payments are in lieu of or supplemental to household income: *Provided further*, That such payments in kind shall be limited only to housing provided by such employer to such employee and shall be the actual value of such housing but in no event shall such value be considered to be in excess of the sum of $25.00 per month".

(h) The fourth sentence of section 5(b) is amended to read as follows:

The Secretary may also establish temporary emergency standards of eligibility for the duration of the emergency, without regard to income and other financial resources, for households that are the victims of a mechanical disaster which disrupts the distribution of coupons, and for households that are victims of a disaster which disrupted commercial channels of food distribution when he determines that such households are in need of temporary food assistance, and that commercial channels of food distribution have again become available to meet the temporary food needs of such households: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall in the case of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, establish special standards of eligibility and coupon allotment schedules which reflect the average per capita income and cost of obtaining a nutritionally adequate diet in Puerto Rico and the respective territories; except that in no event shall the standards of eligibility or coupon allotment schedules so used exceed those in the fifty States.

(i) Section 10(e) is amended by striking out "and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(6) issuance of coupon allotments no less often than two times per month; (7) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the institution of procedures under which any household participating in the program shall be entitled, if it so elects, to have the charges, if any, for its coupon allotment deducted from any grant or payment such household may be entitled to receive under title IV of the Social Security Act and have its coupon allotment distributed to it with such grant or payment; and (8)"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The State agency is required to submit, prior to January 1, 1974, for approval, a plan of operation specifying the manner in which such State agency intends to conduct the program in every political subdivision in the State, unless such State agency can demonstrate that for any political subdivision it is impossible or impracticable to extend the program to such subdivision. The Secretary shall make a determination of approval or disapproval of a plan of operation submitted by a State agency in sufficient time to permit institution of such plan by no later than June 30, 1974."

(j) Section 16(a) is amended by striking out in the first sentence "June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973" and substituting "June 30, 1972, through June 30, 1977", and by inserting at the end of the first sentence of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "Sums appropriated under the provisions of this Act shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available until expended."

(k) Section 10(h) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, in the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, members of an eligible household who are sixty years of age or over or elderly persons and their spouses may also use coupons issued to them to purchase meals prepared by senior citizens' centers, apartment buildings occupied primarily by elderly persons, any public or nonprofit private school which prepares meals especially for elderly persons, any public or nonprofit private eating establishment which prepares meals especially for elderly persons during special hours, and any other public or nonprofit private establishment approved for such purpose by the Secretary. When an appropriate State or local agency contracts with a private establishment to offer, at concessional prices, meals prepared especially for elderly persons during regular or special hours, the Secretary shall permit eligible households who are sixty years of age or over or elderly persons and their spouses to use coupons issued to them to purchase such meals."

(l) Section 3(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2012(b)) is amended to read as follows: "The term 'food' means any food or food product for home consumption except alcoholic beverages and tobacco and shall also include seeds and plants for use in gardens to produce food for the personal consumption of the eligible household."

(m) Section 7(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2016(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The face value of the coupon allotment which State agencies shall be authorized to issue to any households certified as eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be in such amount as the Secretary determines to be the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet, adjusted semiannually by the nearest dollar increment that is a multiple of two to reflect changes in the prices of food published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor to be implemented commencing with the allotments of January 1, 1974, incorporating the changes in the prices of food through August 31, 1973, but in no event shall such adjustments be made for value of the coupon allotment for such households, as calculated above, is a minimum of $2.00."

(n) The following new section is added at the end of such Act:

"SEC. 17. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, members of eligible households living in the State of Alaska shall be permitted, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to purchase hunting and fishing equipment for the purpose of procuring food for the household except firearms, ammunition, and other explosives, with coupons issued under this Act if the Secretary determines that (1) such households are located in an area of the State which makes it extremely difficult for members of such households to reach retail food stores, and (2) such households depend to a substantial extent on hunting and fishing for subsistence purposes."

(o) Section 3(f) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (7 U.S.C. 2012(f)) is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following new sentence: "It shall also mean a political subdivision or a private nonprofit organization or institution that meets the requirements of sections 10(h) or 10(i) of this Act."

Section 3(e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Residents of federally subsidized housing for the elderly, built under either section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q), or section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–1) shall not be considered residents of an institution or boarding house for purposes of eligibility for food stamps under this Act."

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized until July 1, 1974 (1) to use funds available to carry out the provisions of section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c), and not expended or needed for such purpose to purchase, without regard to the provisions of existing law governing the expenditure of public funds, agricultural commodities and their products of the types customarily purchased under section 32 for donation to maintain the annually programmed level of assistance for schools, domestic relief distribution, and such other domestic food assistance programs as are authorized by law, and (2) if stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not available, to use the funds of the Corporation to purchase agricultural commodities and the products thereof of the types customarily available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to meet such requirements.

(b) The Secretary is prohibited from furnishing commodities to summer camps as authorized under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, section 32 of Public Law 74–320, and section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 if the number of adults participating in the activities of such camp is in excess of one for each five children under 18 years of age participating in such activities.

(c) No individual who receives supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act shall be considered to be a member of a household for

any purpose of the Food Distribution Program for families under section 32 of P.L. 74-320, section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, or other law for any month if such person receives for such month, as part of his supplemental security income benefits or payments described in section 1616(a) of the Social Security Act (if any), an amount equal to the bonus value of food stamps (according to the Food Stamp Schedule effective for July 1973) in addition to the amount of assistance such individual would be entitled to receive for such month under the provisions of the plan of the State approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, as appropriate, in effect for December 1973, assuming such plan were in effect for such month and such individual were aged, blind, or disabled, as the case may be, under the provisions of such State plan or under Public Law 92-603 as amended. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall issue regulations for the implementation of the foregoing sentence after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973".

W. R. POAGE,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,
BERNIE SISK,
JOHN R. RARICK,
ED JONES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
JAMES B. ALLEN,
CARL T. CURTIS,
G. D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DESCRIPTION OF DIFFERENCES RECONCILED

The 111 differences and a description of how the conferees reconciled 110 of them follows:

(1) *Senate* payment limitation excluded resource adjustment payments.

House (i) included diversion and resources adjustment payments, (ii) added a new paragraph (4) which provided for reductions in the payment limitation in cases where lands or allotments are leased, and (iii) amended existing paragraph (4) to provide for rules designed to achieve an "effective and economical" (rather than "fair and reasonable") application of the limitation.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision with an amendment to paragraph (4) to preserve the definition of corporate "persons" originally adopted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture regulations after the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1970.

(2) *Senate* generally provided for a five year bill.

House generally provided for a four year bill, except that the payment limitation provision covered five years.

The Conference substitute generally provides for a four year bill.

(3) *Senate* increased the minimum dairy support price on manufactured milk to eighty percent of parity for balance of current marketing year.

House increased that support price to eighty percent permanently.

The Conference substitute increases the minimum support price to eighty percent of parity for the balance of the current marketing year and for the next marketing year, which ends March 31, 1975.

(4) *Senate* limited dairy imports to two percent of annual consumption subject to exceptions.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(5) *Senate* gave dairy import license priority to domestic producers and processors for "any increase in the quantity to be imported under this section".

House gave such priority for "dairy products not currently being imported", specified that such priority shall be for thirty days, prohibited the transfer of licenses, and excluded casein and caseinates from "dairy products",

The Conference substitute rewrites both provisions to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a comprehensive study of the dairy import situation and to report to the Congress no later than January 1, 1975 his findings and recommendations relative thereto.

(6) *House* preserved the legal status of producer handlers of milk.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(7) *House* increased the minimum wheat price support loan to $1.49 per bushel (from $1.25 in present law).

The Conference substitute increases the minimum wheat price support loan to $1.37 per bushel.

(8) *Senate* wheat "target price" for 1974 was set at $2.28 per bushel.

House "target" was $2.05.

The Conference substitute sets the 1974 and 1975 wheat "target price" at $2.05 per bushel, with adjustments in 1976 and 1977.

(9) *House* provided for adjustment of the prices paid index for wheat, corn, and cotton "to reflect any change in (i) the national average yield per acre . . . for the three calendar years preceding the year for which the determination is made, over (ii) the national average yield per acre . . . for the three calendar years preceding the year previous to the one for which the determination is made.

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision, but the application of the "escalator clause" will not be applicable to the 1974 or 1975 crops of wheat, corn, and cotton. In 1976 any adjustments occurring as the result of changes in farm costs and yields in the previous year would be reflected in the 1976 "target" prices. In 1977 the adjusted 1976 "target price" will be used as a basis for the 1977 "target price", but any adjustments occurring as the result of changes in farm costs and yields in the previous year would be reflected in that 1977 "target price".

(10) *Senate* provided for payment of one-third of "target price" for wheat, feed grains, and cotton *only* where producer is prevented from *planting*.

House provided such payment *also* where producer is prevented from harvesting.

The Conference substitute provides such payment where the producer is prevented from planting or where he harvests less than two-thirds of a normal crop.

(11) *Senate* extended the fifteen million acre limitation on the wheat set-aside.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(12) *House* provided authority for practice payments for measures to protect annual wheat, feed grain, and cotton set-aside from pests and devote it to wildlife habitat.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(13) *House* added cotton, triticale, oats, and rye to crops specifically mentioned which the Secretary may permit to be counted as wheat or feed grains for the purpose of preserving acreage history.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(14) *Senate* suspended wheat certificate collections from processors on enactment.

House suspended it on July 1, 1973.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(15) *House* provided authority to Secretary to exempt wheat and wheat food products in channels of trade on July 1, 1973, from such collections.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(16) *Senate* made inapplicable to wheat the provision that the farm projected yield shall not be less than the proven yield.

House put wheat farm projected yield on a five-year (like county project yield) instead of three-year base, and provided that in computing the actual yield (which would be governing if greater) if one of the five years is abnormally low because of a natural disaster, that year shall be disregarded.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(17) *Senate* permitted marketing without penalty of certain wheat stored to avoid penalty.

House authorized the Secretary to permit such marketing with authority to require a refund or part of the certificate payment made in the year the excess wheat was produced.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(18) *House* provided for a minimum corn price support loan at $1.19 per bushel (instead of $1.00 in present law).

The Conference substitute sets the minimum corn price support loan at $1.10 per bushel.

(19) *Senate* set the corn "target price" for 1974 at $1.53 per bushel.

House "target" was $1.38.

The Conference substitute sets the 1974 and 1975 corn "target prices" at $1.38 per bushel with adjustments in 1976 and 1977.

(20) *House* provided that acres cut from farm allotments because of failure to plant would be assigned to a national pool for adjustment of feed grain allotments as provided by section 105(e)(2) of 1949 Act.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(21) *House* gave the Secretary discretionary authority to waive requirement that wheat and feed grain producers devote their conserving bases to approved conservation uses.

The Conference substitute includes this provision and extends it to cotton.

(22) *Senate* struck out all after first sentence of section 105(e)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (which dealt with adjustments of feed grain base acreages, which are replaced in the bill by acreage allotments).

The Conference substitute includes this provision with a technical revision to conform it to Item 20 above by substituting the word "allotments" for the word "bases."

(23) *House* permitted sale or lease of cotton from base acreage to farms which have no base acreage.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(24) *Senate* provided a minimum national base acreage for cotton of ten million acres.

House provided minimum of eleven million acres.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(25) *House* permitted cotton base acreage in case of disaster to be planted in a "nearby" rather than "adjoining" county.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(26) *House* struck the provision requiring compliance with set-aside as condition of receiving base acreage through release and reapportionment, or sale, lease or other transfer.

The Conference substitute deletes this House provision.

(27) *House* based cotton price support loan level on the average "price of American cotton in world markets" rather than the average "world price".

The Conference substitute includes this provision. The Conferees intend that the Secretary shall obtain quotations in world markets for American cotton, supplemented by any other relevant price information avail-

able, for use in the determination of average price and in the establishment of the loan level at ninety percent of the three-year average.

(28) *Senate* based cotton price support loan level on price of strict low middling one and one-sixteenth inches, instead of middling one inch.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(29) *Senate* provided for adjustments in loan level to keep United States cotton in line with world prices and retain adequate share of world market.

House provided for adjustment down to ninety percent of current world price.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(30) *Senate* based cotton payments on the five-month average price of strict low middling one and one-sixteenths in the designated spot markets.

House based cotton payments on the average price received by farmers during the calendar year in which the marketing year begins.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(31) *Senate* set the cotton "target prices" for 1974 at 43 cents per pound.

House "target" was 38 cents.

The Conference substitute sets the cotton "target price" at 38 cents per pound in 1974 and 1975, with adjustments in 1976 and 1977.

(32) *House* provided for payment of one-third of the "target price" to a producer prevented from planting or harvesting cotton, even though he could have planted or harvested another non-conserving crop.

The Conference substitute provides such payment where the producer is prevented from planting or harvests less than two-thirds of a normal crop.

(33) *Senate* authorized Secretary to limit cotton planted in excess of base acreage.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(34) *House* did not require cotton to be planted to qualify for payments.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(35) *House* struck out prohibition against grazing cotton set-aside during the five principal months of the growing season, and specifically authorized the Secretary to permit hay, triticale, oats, or rye to be planted on cotton set-aside.

The Conference substitute adopts this provision and extends it to wheat and feed grains.

(36) *Senate* based CCC cotton sales price restrictions on strict low middling one and one-sixteenth.

House set CCC domestic release price at 115 percent of the loan.

The Conference substitute deletes both these provisions.

(37) *Senate* extended section 608 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, thereby making inapplicable section 203 of the 1949 Act, which requires competitive support levels for cottonseed and soybeans.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(38) House amended section 610 of the Agricultural Act of 1970 to provide that the first grant by CCC provided for thereunder for cotton market promotion shall be $10 million annually (instead of the amount not exceeding $10 million withheld from producers because of the payment limitation).

The Conference substitute includes the House provision. It is the intent of the Conferees that the Secretary shall not approve agreements with the contracting organizations for sales promotion programs.

(39) *House* provided for a civil penalty of up to $5,000 for violation of cotton pest eradication program regulations.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(40) *House* authorized appropriations to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cotton pest eradication program.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(41) *House* extended to the 1974 through 1977 crops of cotton the same skip row rules that applied to the 1971 through 1973 crops.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(42) *Senate* permitted sales under title I of P.L. 480 for dollars to any country if assistance could be made available to that country under title II.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(43) *Senate* required the President to take steps to assure that commercial supplies are available to meet demands developed through programs carried out under P.L. 480. The Senate also required that applications for participation in programs under P.L. 480 include considerations of supplementary cash dollar sales at that time or in the future.

The Conference substitute includes only the requirement that the President take steps to assure that commercial supplies are available to meet demands developed through programs carried out under P.L. 480.

While the *Conference substitute* does not accept the remainder of the Senate statutory provision, the Conferees wish to emphasize the direction in the Senate Committee report on S. 1888 for action consistent with U.S. obligations under international agreements and the capabilities of the recipient country.

(44) *Senate* prohibited the use of foreign currencies under P.L. 480 for military, defense, or internal security purposes.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(45) *House* prohibited P.L. 480 sales or donations to North Vietnam unless assistance is specifically authorized by act of Congress enacted after July 1, 1973.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(46) *Senate* required applications for export subsidies to specify the kind, class, and quantity of the agricultural commodity, and the regional geographic destination. Required publication of such information within seventy-two hours after the application is filed.

The Conference substitute includes a revised version of this provision (see also Item 80).

(47) *Senate* made title XVI Social Security supplemental assistance participants eligible for food stamp and food distribution programs if they meet income and resource criteria.

The *Conference substitute* includes a revised version of this provision.

Nothing in this amendment would affect the provisions of section 401 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972, which provides a limitation on fiscal liability of States for optional state supplementation, including the cashing out of food stamps, under the supplemental security income program. Neither would the amendment affect the eligibility of supplemental security income beneficiaries for food stamps under temporary emergency standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture for victims of a disaster.

(48) *House* extended food stamp program to certain participants in drug addiction and alcoholic treatment programs.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(49) *House* required payments in kind to be taken into account in food stamp eligibility standards.

The *Conference substitute* includes this provision, but modifies it to apply only to the actual value of housing provided by an employer not in excess of $25.00 per month.

(50) *Senate* provided for application of the same eligibility standards for participation in the commodity distribution program under section 32 of P.L. 74–320 or section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as for participation in the food stamp program.

The *Conference substitute* includes a revised version of this provision (see also Item 97).

The revised language provides that each State agency is required to submit to the Department of Agriculture for approval, prior to January 1, 1974, a plan of operation for conduct of the food stamp program in their State and particularly specifying any areas of the State where it is impossible or impracticable to extend the program. The Secretary is required to make a determination or all State plans in sufficient time to permit implementation of the food stamp program by no later than June 30, 1974.

(51) *Senate* prohibited the establishment of resource eligibility criteria of less than $3,000 for each individual sixty years of age or over.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(52) *Senate* permitted establishment of temporary emergency eligibility standards for households that are the victims of a mechanical disaster which disrupts the distribution of coupons.

The Conference substitute includes this provision, but limits its application to the duration of the mechanical disaster.

(53) *Senate* raised the face value of coupon allotments for households that include persons medically certified as requiring a special diet due to disease or organic difficulty by the amount needed to assure a nutritionally adequate diet.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(54) *Senate* provided for certification of eligibility upon request in the case of households receiving public assistance from any State under a program approved pursuant to title IV of the Social Security Act, and for action within thirty days after initial request in the case of other households upon the basis of a simplified application and reasonably available documentation verifying income.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(55) *Senate* required income of migrant (as defined in 42 U.S.C. 242h) households earned on a seasonal basis to be averaged over three, six, or twelve months, as elected by the applicant, with certification of eligibility to be made for a like period of time.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(56) *Senate* required participating households to report within thirty days after the close of each quarter any increase in income or resources or decrease or change in household composition which would lower its coupon entitlement and which occurred in that quarter.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(57) *Senate* repealed the provision of section 10(c) prohibiting discrimination by reason of race, creed, origin, or political belief.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(58) *Senate* made all political subdivisions, upon approval of a State plan, eligible for institution of the program within ninety days after request therefor, and repeals the existing final provision of section 10(e) for orderly expansion among the several States.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision. (See also Items 50 and 97.)

(59) *Senate* required employment by the State agency of one certification worker for each thousand participating households and one out-reach worker for each five hundred nonparticipating households with incomes below the poverty guidelines.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(60) *Senate* repealed the present provisions of section 10(e)(5) for the use of other federally funded agencies for out-reach purposes.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(61) *Senate* provided for federal reimbursable retroactive relief wherever appropriate by reducing the amount to be charged the aggrieved household for coupon allotments.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(62) *Senate* required issuance of coupons at least twice a month.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(63) *Senate* required that at election of recipient, charges for coupons be deducted from payments to recipient under title IV of the Social Security Act and coupons be distributed with such payments.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(64) *Senate* required the federal government to pay eighty percent of all costs of the administrative responsibility assigned to the States under the Act (instead of, as at present, sixty-two and one-half percent of the direct salary, travel, and travel-related cost (including normal fringe benefits) involved in out-reach under section 10(e)(5), certification for non-welfare households, and hearings).

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(65) *Senate* provided that funds appropriated to carry out the Food Stamp Act shall remain available until expended.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(66) *Senate* repealed section 16(b) (which requires the bonus value of coupon allotments to be kept within available appropriations).

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(67) *Senate* permitted food stamps to be used by persons over sixty and their spouses to purchase meals prepared by nonprofit private establishments and private establishments contracting with State or local agencies preparing meals for elderly persons.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(68) *House* changed the definition of "food" to make imported foods eligible for purchase with food stamps.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(69) *Senate* provided that the semi-annual (instead of annual) adjustment of coupon allotments to reflect changes in food prices shall begin with an adjustment August 1, 1973, to reflect changes through April 30, 1973.

House made semi-annual adjustment provision effective January 1, 1974, to reflect changes through August 31, 1973, and provides for adjustments in $2.00 increments.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(70) *Senate* permitted food stamps to be used in certain areas and cases in Alaska for the purchase of hunting and fishing equipment, except firearms, ammunition, and other explosives.

The Conference substitute includes this provision, but limits the use of food stamps to the purchase of such equipment used directly for the procurement of food.

(71) *House* prohibited issuance of food stamps to strikers.

The Conferees were unable to agree on this item, but did agree on the fact that they deplore the lack of enforcement of existing food stamp regulations which require that an able-bodied person in the household register for employment "including a person who is not working because of a strike or lockout at his usual place of employment." It is the specific intent of the Conferees that this provision of the regulations be rigidly and uniformly enforced by the Department of Agriculture and those agencies administering the program at the local level under the auspices of the Department. Eligibility of strikers for food stamps should be carefully scrutinized prior to certification and certification made only in those cases where the household of the individual striker applicant meets all of the requirements of eligibility as in the case of other applicants.

(72) *House* provided that residents of federally subsidized housing for the elderly under certain acts shall not be excluded from the food stamp program as residents of an institution or boarding house.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(73) *Senate* permitted loans under sections 302, 303, and 304 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act even if the indebtedness against the security exceeds $100,000, so long as the indebtedness under those sections does not exceed that amount.

The Conference substitute includes this provision, but modifies it to permit such loans up to $100,000 if the total indebtedness against the security does not exceed $225,000.

(74) *Senate* required production cost studies for wheat, feed grains, cotton, and dairy.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(75) *Senate* required a study of the reasons for and means of preventing, loss of livestock in transit through injury and disease.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(76) *Senate* recommended an international grains agreement conference.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(77) *Senate* created a National Agricultural Transportation Committee.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(78) *Senate* authorized appropriation of $500,000 per year for a wheat and feed grain research program and provided for a Wheat and Feed Grain Research Committee.

House authorized a similar effort by the Secretary of Agriculture with an authorized appropriation of $1,000,000.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(79) *Senate* provided for technical assistance to exporters and importers of U.S. agricultural products.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(80)(a) *Senate* required reporting within seventy-two hours of export contracts of wheat, feed grains, oilseeds, and their products.

House required reporting on a weekly basis and included cotton.

(b) *Senate* required that such reports be promptly made public.

House required that such reports be kept confidential but that compilations be published.

(c) *House* required reporting of marketing year of shipment, destination only if known, and any information with respect to export sales of agricultural commodities requested by the Secretary.

(d) *House* permitted Secretary to suspend requirement for publishing data under certain circumstances.

(e) *Senate* provided for an agricultural export market development unit within the Foreign Agricultural Service.

The Conference substitute revises the reporting requirement provisions of both bills. (See also Item 46.)

In place of the authority for complete suspension of publication of the information obtained from reports required of exporters under the section, provision is made for continuous reporting and publication on a monthly basis, under the same limitations as provided in the House amendment.

The managers also intend that the authority given the Secretary to suspend weekly publications and weekly reporting and substitute, instead, reporting and publication on a monthly basis be interpreted as a limitation of the Secretary's authority to make such suspension, or if made, his authority to proclaim an extension of such suspension.

Prior to issuing such suspension of the requirement of weekly reports, and of weekly publication of a compilation of data from such reports, the Secretary must find that all the conditions for such suspension exist simultaneously. An extension of a suspension, or additional extension after the first extension has been made, shall require a new determination by the Secretary that the extension should again be promulgated.

The reports required to be made by exporters to the Department are not affected by the existence or non-existence of funds made available for subsidy of export sales of commodities.

(81) *House* required the Secretary of Agriculture to report on steps to implement GAO recommendations in Russian wheat sales report.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(82) *Senate* required the Council of Economic Advisers to monitor developments affecting food and fiber costs.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(83) *House* provided for an emergency reserve of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans.

The Conference substitute includes this provision, but limits the total quantity of commodities to a total amount not to exceed 75 million bushels.

(84) *House* required the Secretary to permit planting on set-aside without loss of payment of any crop of which U.S. is a net importer and which is not price supported.

The Conference substitute includes this provision. The Conferees intend that the term "price supported" include crops for which payments are made as well as those for which CCC loans and purchases are made available. Thus, sugar cane and beets, for example, would not be considered as suitable crops to be planted under this provision.

(85) *House* required adjustment of ceiling prices of any agricultural product if the Secretary determines that the supply will be reduced to unacceptable levels.

The Conference substitute includes this provision with changes designed to clarify its application.

(86) *Senate* extended for two years the time within which the Secretary is to submit a report detailing the contribution of the rural fire protection program to achieving the purposes of title IV of the Rural Development Act of 1972.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(87) *House* prohibited any *grant* under section 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act from being subjected to prior State approval.

(Both the Senate bill and the House amendment prohibited any loan under that section from being so subjected.)

The Conference substitute includes this provision and applies it to all loans or grants under the Act.

(88) *Senate* prohibited requiring more than ten percent equity for loans under section 304, 310B, or 312 of Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(89) *House* exempted participations in notes insured or guaranteed under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act from Securities and Exchange Commission laws with technical changes.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(90) *Senate* affirmed the national policy of strengthening family farms and required annual reports thereon.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(91) *Senate* restricted multi-year set-aside contracts to wheat, feed grain, and cotton programs.

The Conference substitute includes this amendment.

(92) *House* prohibited grazing on multi-year set-aside and required compliance with State noxious weed laws.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(93) *House* limited retirement of acreage under title X of 1970 Act in any county or local community to a percentage which will not adversely affect its economy.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(94)(a) *Senate* required State advisory board to meet at least once a year.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(b) *House* required such board to include the State Soil conservationist, the State forester, the State administrator of the quality programs and the State wildlife administrator or their designees.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(c) *Senate* limited the national advisory board to advising on wildlife phases of the multi-year set-aside program.

House limited the advice of the State and national advisory boards to water bank conservation measures, perpetual easement purchases, long-term upland game cover, and multi-year set-aside practices.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(95) *Senate* made the State Director of Wildlife Resources an ex-officio member of the State ASC Committee.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(96) *Senate* reduced the grant authority for water and waste disposal facilities in section 306(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act from $300 million to $50 million per year, but directed the Secretary to make such grants in the case of water facilities. It also reduced the planning grant authority under section 306(a)(6) of such Act from $30 million to $5 million per year, but directed the Secretary to make such grants in the case of water systems.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(97) *Senate* required the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, and other available funds to purchase commodities of the types customarily purchased under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 needed to provide recipient households under section 416 with 125 percent of their daily nutritional requirements.

The Conference substitute includes a revised version of this provision (see Item 50).

The revised language (subsection (a)) gives the Secretary authority, until June 30, 1974, to use funds appropriated under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 to purchase commodities of the types customarily purchased under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. This action was necessary to continue the Federal food distribution program during any period when there are no surplus commodities up until June 30, 1974. At that time, it is the expectation of the conferees that the food stamp program will have been implemented nationwide (under Item 50) and that those areas of the country which had previously relied upon the Federal food distribution program will be receiving food stamp assistance.

The conferees also included language in subsection (b) to clarify the definition of "summer camp" in section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, section 32 of P. L. 74-320, and section 709 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 to provide that the number of adults participating in the activities of such camp not exceed more than one for each five children.

(98) *Senate* required the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a census of agriculture in 1974 as required by section 142 of title 13 of the U.S. Code; and within thirty days of enactment of the bill to submit an estimate of the funds needed to conduct such census.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(99) *Senate* contained a short title and policy statement for forestry incentives provisions.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(100) *Senate* restricted forestry incentives to owners of 500 acres or less.

House restricted eligibility to tracts of 500 acres or less unless significant public benefit will result.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(101) *Senate* excluded manufacturing and utility *corporations* (not individuals).

House excluded forest manufacturing and utility *entities*.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(102) *House* restricted forestry incentive program to a "pilot" program, excluded non-federal public lands, and did not specifically provide for recreation, scenic, environmental, watershed, forage, and fish and wildlife benefits.

The Conference substitute includes this provision, but deletes the reference to a "pilot" program.

(103) *Senate* provided specifically for forestry incentive payments and limited any person to not more than $2,500 annually.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(104) *Senate* provided for distribution of funds for cost-sharing after consideration of enumerated factors.

House required distribution of funds among and within the States after consideration of somewhat different factors.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(105) *Senate* authorized Secretary to designate ex-officio members of State and local committees for forestry incentive program to be selected from (1) small owners, (2) private forest manager or consulting foresters, and (3) wildlife and other private or public resource interests.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(106) *Senate* required ten-year forest management contracts from forestry incentive program participants.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision.

(107) *Senate* limited REAP practices to permanent measures, and limited federal cost-sharing for such measures to not to exceed fifty percent.

House permanently required three, five, ten, and twenty-five year contracts, and perpetual easements to carry out the purposes of the REAP, Great Plains, and water bank programs.

The Conference substitute includes the House provision.

(108) *House* authorized the use of CCC in carrying out program described in Item 107 and multi-year set-aside.

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(109) *Senate* postponed the effective date of regulations under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, fixing minimum field re-entry periods after the application of certain pesticides (Federal Register, Vol. 38, No. 83, pp. 10715-10717) from June 18, 1973, to a date at least thirty days following submission of findings to Congress made after hearings held as soon as possible after enactment of the bill.

The Conference substitute deletes this provision. The Conferees, however, are fully mindful of the action of the Department of Labor in recent months in promulgating and attempting to enforce what has proven to be arbitrary and capricious regulations affecting farm workers and their employers. The Conferees strongly recommend that in the promulgation of future regulations the Secretary of Labor take into account both the expertise and the vital interests of both farmers and consumers, as well as providing an adequate public hearing process where all affected parties will have an opportunity to be heard.

(110) *House* repealed section 301 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (which provides for a national research advisory committee).

The Conference substitute includes this provision.

(111) *Senate* provided short title "Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973".

House provided a short title "Agriculture Act of 1978".

The Conference substitute includes the Senate provision.

The Conferees also wish to express their intent in regard to the following:

DAIRY INDEMNITIES

The Conferees have taken note of the fact that the authority for dairy indemnity payments on milk has expired on June 30, 1973. In approving the four-year extension and amendment of this program the Conferees are also mindful that some claims for milk may arise during the period from June 30, 1973 to the date of enactment of this bill.

It is the intent of the Conferees that such claims occurring during this period be entertained by the Secretary and if the claimants otherwise qualify, the fact that these losses occurred during this period should not disqualify their claims.

W. R. POAGE,
THOMAS S. FOLEY,
B. F. SISK,
JOHN R. RARICK,
ED JONES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
GEORGE MCGOVERN,
JAMES B. ALLEN,
CARL T. CURTIS,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMISSION ON REVISION OF FEDERAL COURT APPELLATE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Commission on the Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 11, 1973.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with deep regret that I tender my resignation as a member of the Commission on the Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System.

The mandate of the Commission is of vital importance to the administration of justice in the courts of the United States. However, other responsibilities—including the Chairmanship of a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering proposed

Rules of Evidence for use in the Federal Courts and soon to consider a massive proposed reform of the Federal Criminal Code—make it impossible for me to give the work of the Commission the attention and time it deserves and requires.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. HUNGATE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE FEDERAL COURT APPELLATE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a); Public Law 92–489 the Chair appoints as a member of the Commission on Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. FLOWERS), to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

FREE MARKET FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS BEST WAY TO LOWER FOOD COSTS

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's July 18 decision on phase IV economic policy, as it affects agriculture, was a victory for the wisdom of the private enterprise economy. In short—it was public recognition that tight economic controls do not work, that they create more problems than they solve, and that the only way to achieve an abundant and reasonably priced food supply in the long run is to let the market operate—and let our farmers produce in response to it.

During the past 20 years, we as a people regrettably took the farmer for granted. Agriculture's remarkably high productivity was greatly responsible for keeping the lid on food prices.

During the 1950's and the 1960's, farmers put their shoulders to the wheel in a constantly expanding production effort. They adapted to new technology as it developed. They invested in new equipment as it came on the market. They constantly improved their productivity—both in quantity and quality. Then, they kept learning, kept investing, kept improving, and kept producing. Their efficiency and their productivity climbed. Because farmers kept pace with or exceeded demand—farm and food price levels remained low and fairly constant.

Unfortunately farmers realized little real improvement in their relatively low level of income. Certainly their income level did not increase with their remarkable productivity. On the other hand, during that same period of time, other prices were climbing steadily while nonfarm wages were rising even faster.

In the past year or so, an exploding domestic and foreign demand has created upward pressure on food prices. Prices have risen to signal farmers to produce more. Adverse weather, worldwide food shortages, transportation problems, and fuel and fertilizer scarcity have complicated farmers' efforts to produce more.

As a result, demand has outstepped supply. Thus, prices continued to climb accordingly. Consumers grew unhappy, and that was understandable. Congress reacted, and that was equally understandable. As a result, food price controls were implemented, followed by export restrictions. These measures, alone and together, created such havoc in agriculture that some producers began to take drastic measures which could eventually reduce our food supply.

Now those controls are being terminated. As a result of phase IV, agriculture should have a chance to return to a situation where farmers can produce for a market.

Perhaps food will cost more. If so, it will because the market mechanism of the private enterprise economy is working to indicate that food is worth more. What those prices really mean—or, more correctly, what they make possible—is that, in 1974 and 1975 and 1976 and 1977, we will have plenty of farm production and an adequate supply of the kind of food we want.

At the same time, agriculture again will be making a great contribution to this economy. Our farmers, with their great productivity and efficiency, can then continue to play their part in providing a much needed measure of stabilization for the domestic economy.

CAR BUZZERS NOT NECESSARY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, do you have the feeling that the folks back home are getting more free advice than they want on how to mind their own business? The latest move by the bureaucrats is to control the passenger's safety while he is in the car.

I have just introduced a bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. This will restrain the Secretary of Transportation from requiring motor vehicles to be equipped with upper torso restraint, and with flasher or buzzer devices or a starter interlock system associated with belts or torso restraints.

We have had a strong public approval of seat belts. But there is a lack of enthusiasm for shoulder harnesses. I am tired of having those straps flapping around in my car.

But next year the new model cars are worked out on the principle of Pavlov and his dog. They are going to buzz when you sit down or turn on your ignition unless you are completely tied into your straitjacket.

Shoulder harnesses and the starter interlock system should be optional equipment. For instance, this new starter interlock system will increase the price of a new car by $37. This makes a total increase of $106 per car when you add in the basic belt system warnings, buzzers, and interlocks. I believe America would be safer to spend $106 a year to buy new tires, new brake systems, and keep their cars in better running condition.

Frankly, I am fed right up to my ears with all of these departmental bureaucrats regimenting my life. I do not smoke, but I see no value to putting this big sign about smoking on all the packages.

Soon the bureaucrats will learn that one of the major causes of accidents is in the bathtub at home. When they do, you can soon anticipate rules like putting a sandpaper cover in every bathtub.

Let me tell you more about this buzzer system. According to statistics, it is anticipated that the malfunction of the system would anticipate a 3 percent ignition failure rate. The logic of the starter interlock system is a three-step sequence to be followed in order to start the car: Sit down, fasten the seat belt, and start the car. With 10 million cars of expected production next year, that means 300,000 people will suffer a buzzer nightmare in 1974.

Let me tell you about a buzzer nightmare. Last year on a Sunday I was driving a rented car in Miami. We were 40 miles from the rental station when this buzzer system malfunctioned. We had commitments to go other places, so we spent the afternoon listening to that buzzer system with its psychopathic drill pounding in on us.

Remember that in the second year and as the car grows older, there is a greater chance for electrical shorts. With the elaborate electrical systems in cars today, it can lead into a secondary short controlling lights or window controls when they start in to fix the buzzer.

Several driver nuisances have been attributed to the system. If the driver fastens the seat belt around a young child before being seated behind the steering wheel, it would be necessary for the driver to release and rebuckle the belt around the child after he enters the vehicle in order to start the engine. This would occur because the belt was buckled around the child out of sequence; that is, before the seat sensor recognized his presence. Likewise, it would be necessary to release and rebuckle the child's belt if the driver momentarily exited the vehicle, such as in a gasoline station.

Also, under current requirements of the standard it will be necessary for the driver and any front seat passenger to buckle their lap and shoulder belt to merely back out of a garage or to start the engine for a predriving warmup.

Furthermore, normal child squirm on the seat, and the loading and unloading of the sensor due to road undulations, bumps, et cetera, could alternately activate and deactivate the sensor. If the sensor is deactivated for longer than 10 seconds and reactivated, the seat belt must be unbuckled and rebuckled in order to shut off the warning light and buzzer.

Statistics show that only one person out of 20 today is using that shoulder harness. Of course, if the barbarian torture system of the buzzer is started, this will make it mandatory. But I recall one man in a Volkswagen who had his car collapsed by a major truck but he was thrown clear. I recall another man whose car bounced off the side of a mountain but he was thrown clear. I would like to

take my chances with going through life without a shoulder harness or a buzzer.

I definitely would like to have the freedom of choice to decide whether I want a buzzer system in my automobile. I would prefer to save money. I do not want to go through life on a buzzer system. I ask that my other colleagues join me in putting America back on an independent individual decision basis.

HOWARD K. SMITH'S COMMENTARY

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, as they continue on the other side of the Capitol with the so-called Watergate hearings, much of the media has assumed the posture of a lynch mob, and I wanted to point out a commentary of Howard K. Smith of ABC last Wednesday at which time he had made a rather refreshing commentary putting much of these hearings into their proper perspective.

I ask unanimous consent to include his remarks on July 25.

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

There was no objection.

The commentary is as follows:

HOWARD K. SMITH'S COMMENTARY FOR ABC EVENING NEWS, JULY 25, 1973

Nixon and company have been roundly criticized for Watergate in this space. In fairness, something ought to be done about that halo around the kindly locks of Senator Ervin.

I have noted before his peculiar lilywhite view of the Constitution, and his opposition to moves to extend its rights to black Americans.

I beg to call attention now to his conduct in the hearings, such things as the petty flim-flammery of his big applause grabber—that repeated reference to himself as nothin' but an ole country lawyer. Lyndon Johnson once properly said whenever he heard somebody say that, he reached for his wallet to make sure it was still there.

And Ervin's much more serious failure through yesterday and too much of today to do anything about outright political demonstrations by a small biased audience, magnified by television—its wild applause for him, its loud groans of dislike for the witness. It was not till it was turning, in one Senator's word, into a circus, that Ervin finally called the claque to order.

Lastly, I wonder about Ervin's totuted reputation as a lawyer. He not only opposed the best law of the decade, the Voting Act of '65 . . . he also, he says, helped frame the sloppiest: The Crime Law of 68 that seemed to give a President unlimited power of espionage, which Lyndon Johson called unconstitutional and Justice Powell called nebulous . . . and which the Nixon Administration is justifying its actions by.

A man who admits to writing that legal atrocity should display modesty. And if he stopped grand-standing and applied fairness, maybe I could see that Halo others see and I don't.

QUO VADIS—FEDERAL RESERVE

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, high employment, rising output of goods and services, and relatively stable prices are three widely accepted national economic goals. Responsibility for economic stabilization acts to meet these goals has been assigned to monetary and fiscal authorities. The Federal Reserve System has the major responsibility for monetary management.

As the Wall Street Journal in its editorial of July 20, 1973, has correctly noted—

The fundamental role of fiscal and monetary policy in keeping prices under control has been proven in so many nations over so many centuries.

Anyone who bothers to glance at the facts of fiscal and monetary policies would have little doubt as to the cause of our recent inflation. Since 1967, the Federal Government has run a cumulative budget deficit of some $97 billion. The necessity to finance these borrowings exercises to some extent pressure on the Federal Reserve to speed money growth and since 1967 the money supply has grown at more than 6 percent annually, more than twice the rate of the 1957–67 decade. When money grows faster than production, you have inflation. Or in a more picturesque term, we reach a stage where "too many dollars are chasing too few goods."

The key to stopping the inflation is not wage-price controls, leaking dams at best, but holding down the deficit and more important of all, the remedy is to be found in the steady and moderate rate of growth of the quantity of money—and that is the responsibility of the Federal Reserve System. A responsibility which up to date has been exercised with a great degree of irresponsibility. Because the rate of increase in money stock practiced by the Federal Reserve is definitely one of the major, if not the major cause of the inflationary problems which we now face.

IRRESPONSIBLE MONETARY POLICIES

Inflation is one of those persistent human problems which take place—not like bad harvests and earthquakes due to no human action—but on the contrary, inflations are manmade problems. As a matter of fact the inflation is not a responsibility of private individuals or single groups, but they are in the domain of responsibility of precisely definable individuals who are in charge of monetary policy.

Monetary growth was more erratic in 1972 than in any year for the past two decades and more. Consequently, we must ask, is the Federal Reserve going to take real responsibility for dealing with inflation? For all the current talk of restraint, the money supply at the present stands 7.3 percent above the year earlier, compared with an average annual growth of 6.3 percent in the inflation raked years of 1967 to 1972 and 2.9 percent from 1957 to 1967. In 1972, a broader measure of money—M2—defined as currency, checking account deposits and savings deposits—has risen at an 11-percent rate; since that time, we have heard promises that the situation will be brought under control.

But we have little basis as yet for much optimism along these lines. In the last 2 months, M1—defined as currency plus checking account deposits—has again grown at a 9-percent annual rate, and some of the basic Federal Reserve magnitudes have been increasing with unusual rapidity this year. Federal Reserve credit has grown at an 18-percent annual rate compared with 8 percent during 1972. The monetary base "considered by both the portfolio and the modern quantity theory school to be a strategic monetary value which is under direct control of the monetary authorities" has risen at a 9-percent annual rate so far this year, the same as during 1972. Thus, the fundamentals of Federal Reserve expansion did not decelerate at all.

CAN THE FED CONTROL THE QUANTITY OF MONEY?

Is the Fed to blame for the accelerating monetary growth? Or has the rise in the quantity of money being produced by sources outside its control—such as the need to finance Government deficits—so that the Fed is the victim rather than the villain of the inflationary surge? The answer is clear. The Fed has ample power to control the quantity of money whatever the state of the Federal budget, by buying and selling Government securities. When it buys securities, it pays for them by creating money that adds to bank reserves. When it sells securities, the proceeds are subtracted from bank reserves. It was able to bring the rate of monetary growth down sharply in 1966 despite a large and growing Government deficit. It has been able to step up sharply the rate of monetary growth in 1968 despite the tax surcharge that has been restraining the Government deficit.

The plain fact is that inflation is made in Washington, in that stately and impressive Grecian temple on Constitution Avenue that houses the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Prices have been rising at faster and faster rates because Chairman Burns, and the other distinguished men who govern the System, have decreed that they shall.

TECHNICAL DISCUSSION

Why have they so decreed? Do these gentlemen want inflation? It is difficult to believe so. Why then do they produce inflation? Because they are and have been misguided—and, like the rest of us, find it incredibly difficult to admit that they have been wrong. They have taken the behavior of interest rates rather than the quantity of money supplied as their guide—and this mistake has led them far astray from their intended path. However, at the present crucial juncture of our economic affairs when the inflation threatens to destroy our savings, it takes the security out of old-age security, it gnaws away at earning power, and eventually reduces jobs. Their unwillingness to recognize their error is inexcusable.

For example, the recent rise in the discount rate was trumpeted as a major step against inflation. It was nothing of the sort. It was simply a bland and timid response by the Fed to the Fed's own inflationary policy—which has been pushing up market interest rates, leav-

ing the pegged—and unimportant—discount rate behind.

What lies in wait at the end of the inflation line created by irresponsible monetary policy? Historically, social disorder, even total economic collapse, have been the progeny of continuing inflation. It has happened over and over again. When a people's medium of exchange, stock of value, basic unit of account, becomes worthless, then the whole economic system comes unhinged and makes way for highly unstable political and social conditions. The most flagrant example is Germany in the 1930's whose great upheavals of that period, as everybody today should know, were to a great extent caused by galloping inflation and economic crisis which were the result of irresponsible monetary policy of the German Central Bank. It is a historical fact that German developments had subsequent disastrous international consequences. I believe that this, or any similar "remedy" is far from the hearts of the American people.

The inflation produced by the Fed cannot be stopped overnight. Monetary growth today has little effect on today's income and prices. Its major effects are on income and prices 3 to 6 or more months from now. The rapid monetary expansion of the past 18-months assures continued inflation for some months to come. The farmer, merchant, and industrialists are then made the scapegoats for policies over which they have no control.

PRESCRIPTION

The Fed can and should start at once to slow down the monetary growth. That is the only way to slow down inflation 6 months from now. That is a good way to help the ailing dollar and our balance of payments problem.

I would hope that the Fed will move quickly to a rate of monetary growth of about 5 percent a year, and maintain it there. That would mean stable prices over the long pull. The Fed has departed so widely from the desirable rate of growth that reversing it too quickly or abruptly in one step may involve too large a wrench for the economy. At the very least, I would hope that the Fed will begin a reduction in the rate of monetary growth in two steps: First, to about 7-percent-a-year increase in the money supply; then to a more reasonable 4 percent or 5 percent a year.

If the Fed does not change its policy, it will undoubtedly be responsible for the magnitude of the economic, social, and political problems we will experience in the foreseeable future.

THE LATE HONORABLE NICK BEGICH

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, today we have set aside a time in our deliberations to honor a former Member of this body, the late Nick Begich of Alaska.

His stay with us was all too brief, and yet it is particularly appropriate that on an evening such as this, at this late hour, so many of his devoted friends are present. They are present to pay tribute to this remarkable colleague of ours, with whom many of us have served beginning in the 92d Congress.

Nick was a refreshingly welcome freshman when he joined us in January of 1971. He was, indeed, as outgoing and as expansive as the 49th State, which he represented with such unbelievable vigor.

Nick was 40 years old at the time of his disappearance and yet, characteristically, he had spent his 40th birthday in Seoul, Korea, with his lovely wife Pegge, cementing good relations with first the Japanese and then the Koreans on behalf of Alaska.

In those 40 years he contributed more, in a way, toward public service than most of us will manage with much longer careers in public life.

Here in the House we came to know Nick for his prodigious efforts on behalf of his native State. When he first came to the Congress, he indicated he wanted to be a member of two principal committees which would most directly affect Alaska, and he set out with his usual zeal to win membership on those two committees, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works.

He did not just want to be a member of those committees for some transitory political benefit or value, or merely for the sake of the record, and he quickly proved he was much more interested than that. He was a very dedicated and working member of all of his committee assignments. He maintained an impressive record of above 90 percent attendance for all meetings held by these committees in two years.

His voting percentage on the floor of the House was better than 96 percent in his two sessions.

Nick always felt that if he wanted to win support for programs benefiting Alaska he must be in committee and on the floor to support those programs of importance to areas represented by other Members. It was a practice which reaped rich rewards in Nick's efforts to have the Alaska Native land claims legislation considered by this body.

Nick was the consummate legislator. He left no stone unturned in his efforts to represent Alaska, and it was that remarkable ground work that he so carefully laid which contributed to Alaska's interest when the Native claims legislation came before this body for a vote. That legislation passed this House by a vote of 344 to 63 on October 20, 1971, exactly 9 months after Nick came to Congress.

Rarely in the long and distinguished history of this House has a freshman Member in the first session of his first term been selected as a conferee for such major legislation, but Nick was so selected. And, again, on December 14, 1971, the House was called upon to approve the conference report on H.R. 10367, the Alaska Native land claims bill, which it did by a vote on that occasion of 307 to 60.

This legislation, the largest Native settlement ever passed by the Congress of the United States, almost certainly could not have passed without the legislative skill, during this period of demanding work on legislation which had never before emerged from a subcommittee, of Nick Begich. And yet Nick also found time to become involved in other projects here, many of them.

He was the first freshman Representative who was elected to the executive committee of the Democratic study group in what I recall as a spirited contest in 1971, and he was also selected by his fellow freshmen to be treasurer of the 92d Congress Club that year.

Those of us who saw him in action can testify to the enormous dedication he brought to these responsibilities. He was always a forceful participant in the work of the Democratic study group and, in addition, to his executive committee assignment. He was vice chairman of the Indian Education Task Force as well of the DSG.

In 4 years Nick brought many people from this Congress to Alaska. He always felt that the more people who became familiar at first hand with the unique problems of Alaska, the better that State would be understood here in Washington. Alaska was Nick's consuming interest and great love, and he wanted to share all aspects of his experience in this Last Frontier with everyone he met. Certainly, seldom has any area of this Nation had a more eloquent, a more dedicated, a more inexhaustible spokesman for its interests than Nick Begich.

Mr. Speaker, I recall how proud he was to say that he represented the largest legislative district in the world, some 586,000 square miles. All of his colleagues knew that he represented Alaska with skill, with understanding, with courage and compassion, and Nick Begich has left an indelible impression on those of us who were privileged to serve with him and to know him and to value him so much as a friend.

He was indeed a politician in the finest and the most noble sense of that word, a man who devoted his life to public service with the highest distinction.

We all have suffered an irreparable loss, but we all must be eternally grateful to Nick Begich who was able to share a portion of his vital life with us in this place.

I am confident that as long as any of us are honored to continue to serve here, the memory of Nick Begich will remain with us as a most inspiring legacy of a true and gifted public servant.

To his lovely and gracious wife, Pegge, and his devoted family go our heartfelt sympathies and most profound respects.

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

Mr. CULVER. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly appropriate that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa should take this time for this purpose, and it is most appropriate that, despite the lateness of the hour, we should continue with the program which had been planned for this occasion.

In all my years of service in the House of Representatives, I can say without equivocation that I have never known a person who gave more to his job, who accomplished as much for his State in

such a short period of time as Nick Begich.

Nick started to work the day he took his oath in the House of Representatives, and he never quit until he took that ill-fated trip with our colleague, the former majority leader, Hale Boggs, which ended in one of the greatest tragedies that has occurred in this House in my time.

Nick did so many things so well. It was my pleasure to go to Alaska in 1970 during his campaign and to campaign with him for a little while. He put the same enormous energy and enthusiasm and optimism in that campaign that he put into every single piece of legislation in which he became interested in this House.

Without funds, with an enormous territory to cover, Nick was one of those never-say-die individuals. It was obvious to everyone who knew him and to everyone whom I met when I was with him in Alaska and to me that here was a winner, here was a man who was going places.

The pace of his life in the House seemed so fast and so determined that he almost, it seems, had a foreboding that he had only a little time in which to do the things he wanted to do.

Of course, he did pass the most memorable Indian bill in the history of the House of Representatives. He led the fight here in the House and followed it to the other body and to the White House.

He worked in everything he started with that same enthusiasm and determination which carried through to the end.

We are almost on the eve of the Alaska pipeline bill. While that is a controversial measure, I will say if it becomes law—and I think it will in some form—Nick Begich contributed more to it and to its final success than any other human being. He talked to me about it every time he saw me just as he did the Indian Claims Act. He did it with that friendliness and enthusiasm which was contagious and which made you want to help him.

Had Nick lived, there is no telling what he could have done. The world was before him for conquest. He did so much in such a little time.

He left his lovely wife Pegge and their lovely children. All our hearts go out to them as they did when we lost Nick nearly a year ago. Mrs. Albert joins me in extending to them our deepest sympathy and our hope that we may in some measure reflect in what we do for Alaska the love and respect and honor that we have for their loved one, Nick Begich.

Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I rise to pay heartfelt tribute to our former colleague, Nick Begich. This brief period can hardly suffice for us to adequately honor Nick. For his unlimited energy and spirit made a lasting impression on this House, and on all those who had the good fortune to serve with him.

Nick was a young man, from a young State, who was taken from us at all too young an age. Yet, even during his few years in the House. Nick had quite an impact. It was in large measure, thanks to Nick, that this House adopted the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement. It was largely at Nick's insistence that we attached strong guarantees against environmental damage to pipeline legislation.

Had he lived, Nick would doubtless have contributed even more. So his untimely death was more than just a personal blow to each and every one of us—it was a serious loss to this House.

Let the memory of Nick's youthful dynamism, concern for the young, and of his contribution both to the State of Alaska and to this Nation now serve as an inspiration to us all. They will never be forgotten.

My wife Mildred joins me in offering our deepest sympathy to Nick's wife Pegge and their six wonderful children.

I include remarks made on my behalf at a memorial service for Nick held in January in Anchorage:

When men die, their lives are usually summed up by the deeds which they have performed in life; yet, in death, the mere deeds of a beloved friend, a devoted colleague, and a respected Congressman pale in significance next to the character and spirit of the man himself. The loss of Nick Begich is a tragedy in the dual sense, for we have lost not only a man whose future promised to be extraordinary, but an extraordinary man who promised us all hope for the future.

Through his youthful and spirited approach, Nick Begich symbolized the dynamism and excitement of the Alaskan wilderness which he represented. In the same vein, he displayed a cautious engery that earned favor, admiration, and respect from the rest of his colleagues.

In a symbolic sense as well as a political sense Nick was Alaska's favorite son, going forth to help realize the dreams of a State the size of a continent. Exuding confidence but never dogmatic, displaying expertise, but not self-righteousness, totally candid, but never flippant, Nick Begich put every ounce of his body and spirit into fulfilling his responsibilities as a Member of Congress. His commitment to Alaska and its people was as varied and wide ranging as the geography itself, and his belief in its potential was unwavering. This conviction he transmitted to his colleagues, who in turn learned the ways of a State and its people through its Representative in the U.S. Congress.

For almost two centuries this Congress has symbolied the continuous American quest for liberty and justice. These past 185 years have seen 10,000 men and women representing all of the 50 States Madison, John Quincy Adams, Sam Rayburn, and Harry Truman in the making of congressional history. Nick Begich was only the third Representative from Alaska out of these 10,000, and in the brief time that he was in Congress he made memorable legislative history with the outstanding role he played in the passage of the Alaskan Native Land Claims bill, in his attainment of a waiver on the Jones Act for the Alaskan ferry, the *Wickersham*, and for his insistence that Alaskan pipeline legislation include strong guarantees against environmental damage.

Nick Begich was remarkably hard-working in a political club which demands hard work as its ordinary membership fee. His exceptional accomplishments and his vigorous methods of attaining legislative goals serve as an eloquent testament and a provocative challenge for those of us who see the Congress as a positive force for change and progress.

Nick's untimely disappearance, as he mounted the elusive pinnacle of achievement, caushes us all to reflect on the purpose of death at such an early age. Young death is especially poignant and bewildering, for we in this Nation have lived through this experience so many times before and still seek an answer to the imponderable question—Why are not young men allowed to finish the work which they have begun? We have no satisfactory answer to that question. But we can be confident that the determination and vigor exhibited by Nick Begich in beginning his work, will serve as inspiration for others; that the youth, charm, and confidence which emanated from Nick will be recalled and recalled again by others, and that the example of his life will illuminate and enrich the lives of others, who will pick up where he was forced to leave off.

To you Pegge, to your six wonderful children, and to all Nick's family and friends who are gathered here today I extend my deepest sympathy. I pray that God will comfort you in your loss.

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

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the distinguished deputy whip, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of our late friend and colleague, the Honorable Nick Begich of Alaska. Although he was with us in the House of Representatives but a short time, he won both the affection and respect of those who became acquainted with him.

Nick Begich clearly found immense satisfaction in serving the people of Alaska in Congress. He was a hard worker, marked with a keen mind and a lively sense of humor.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I had known Nick even before he came to Congress because of his reputation as a strong supporter of education. Indeed, he had been a school teacher and principal and, as a member of the Alaska State Senate, proved a vigorous voice for the schools of his State.

Mr. Speaker, evidence of the high regard in which Nick Begich was held in his home State is the following article by Bill Tobin, of the Anchorage Times, which was republished in the journal, Alaska Teacher.

THERE WAS NEVER DOUBT WHEN NICK BEGICH WALKED INTO A ROOM—EVERY PLACE HE WENT HE MOVED WITH GUSTO

(By Bill Tobin)

Without question, his career and his life had reached a high point just before whatever tragedy befell him 12 days ago, within

hours—or minutes—after taking off from Anchorage International Airport in a small, twin-engined plane bound for Juneau. His companions were another congressman, an aide, the pilot, and some terrible, dreadful weather conditions.

That little plane went down, ironically, at a time when everything else around Nick seemed to be going up. Life was zooming for the handsome and vigorous 40-year-old politician.

Just the night before he had laughed until tears filled his eyes at the great wit of one of the nations leading political figures, Rep. Hale Boggs of Louisiana, the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives—a body in which Nick Begich had served just one year, 10 months and 13 days.

It says a lot about Nick Begich that this senior congressman would come to Alaska to campaign for so junior a colleague. They appeared together on the platform here that Sunday night two weeks ago. In a fund-raising event for the Begich campaign. And together they took off from Anchorage at 9 o'clock the next day in an orange and white Cessna 310—along with Begich's aide and friend, Russ Brown, and pilot Don Conz.

They were bound for Juneau, but nobody knows how far they flew before tragedy struck, Maybe it was in the pass before reaching Whittier, maybe it was out over the raging waters of Prince William Sound, maybe it was near Yakutat, perhaps it was as far as Cape Fairweather, where gale winds whipped the Alaska coast that stormy Monday. Maybe it was as far as the timbered and snowcovered mountains which cast up a formidable barrier around Juneau, as though protecting the castle capitol from the invader.

With each passing day the grim reality of what must have happened grows ever larger. The hopes that all may be well, in like measure, grow ever smaller.

In the days of anxiety that have passed since the word first flashed that Nick was missing, there has been time for reflection about this talented and dedicated man who loved politics in a lusty, joyous way—and who pursued public service with an intensity and drive matched by only a few.

Don't think for a minute that very many freshmen congressmen could have asked for and received campaign support from Majority Leader Boggs. But the fact that the distinguished veteran from Louisiana would come to Alaska for Nick—and here proclaim the House of Representatives as the greatest political body in the world—only proves again what was evident before: Nick Begich's tireless energy, his willingness to work within the staid and venerated congressional traditions, his quick mind and his love of politics and public service (each in the highest sense of the word) had commanded again the attention of respected and powerful leaders throughout the land.

Hale Boggs was one in a growing line of national figures so impressed by Begich that they would come here to campaign in his behalf. These included Rep. John A. Blatnik of Minnesota; former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, again a senator from Nick's home state of Minnesota; Sargent Shriver, the Kennedy family-in-law who is now the Democratic vice presidential nominee, and Rep. Carl Albert of Oklahoma, now speaker of the U.S. House and a man who was majority leader—like Boggs—when he campaigned for Nick here two years ago.

Nobody would ever accuse Nick Begich of being unwilling to speak. He loved to talk—at two speeds, fast and faster. And he enjoyed telling—as anyone would—about his success in his freshman year in Congress . . . of the native land claims settlement, of the waiver of the Jones Act for the Alaska ferry Wickersham, of his midnight calls to constituents, of his 99-plus per cent record on attendance, of his frequent trips home.

He moved like a whirlwind, dropping papers and documents, his arms loaded like a schoolboy's with books and files. What he couldn't carry, Russ Brown packed along. Let other speakers appear on a panel with some typed remarks or a page full of scribbled notes . . . but not Nick. He would swirl in like the custodian of the Library of Congress, ready to quote chapter and verse, page and paragraph, should the occasion arise.

He gave up teaching to stay in politics and he owned apartment buildings as an investment for his family. Anchorage was his home, but Washington became his natural environment. He took to Congress like a hummingbird to a flowerbed. Politics was his life—with gusto.

And, Mr. Speaker, further indication of the feeling his fellow educators had for Nick Begich is the following poem in tribute to Nick, "For Whom the Bell Tolls," written by Robert Von Houte, executive secretary of the Alaska Education Association and published in the 50th Anniversary Issue, Winter 1972–73, of the Alaska Teacher. The entire issue was dedicated to Nick's memory.

FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

By Robert Von Houte

A man for education is gone
A man for Alaska is lost
A man for the nation is departed
A friend's going leaves us stone-hearted
Everyman's death diminishes me
So the bell tolls for me and thee.

Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing warm appreciation for the life of Nick Begich and deep sympathy to Nick's lovely wife and children.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK).

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying highest tribute to Nick Begich, Congressman from Alaska, whose brilliant future in the House was tragically ended when his airplane disappeared in Alaska last fall.

Nick was my friend, respected colleague, and more—he was like my younger brother. He grew up in Eveleth, a town close to my own hometown of Chisholm, on Minnesota's Mesabi Iron Range. I watched him grow to manhood—saw boyish idealism become the steely determination to serve his fellow man with his full talents and abilities.

Like everyone who knew him, I was early impressed by Nick's sincerity, his alertness and awareness of what ought to be done—and to his dedication, determination and sense of duty—and his incredible energy.

Nick Begich and I were a generation apart in time, but we were friends from the first day we met, and our lives ran a strangely parallel course—but about 20 some years apart.

We were both sons of immigrant parents; our fathers worked in the iron ore mines of the Mesabi Range. Nick and I both worked our way through Minnesota State teachers colleges—I at Winona State and he at St. Cloud State. But it took me 4 years and Nick only 2½ to get a teacher's degree and certificate.

We, then, both taught school for several years—20 some years apart—I, in the thirties, he in the fifties. Likewise, we then started our political careers in our respective States senates again, 22 years apart.

Nick was only 24 when he pulled up stakes and moved to Alaska in 1956, but he was already a veteran of 4 years of high school teaching in Minnesota, and he brought his zeal for education along with him.

He devoted the remaining years of his life to promoting the education of Alaska's youth, both in the school system in Anchorage, and in the State senate.

I hope I may be permitted a few moments of indulging in sentimental reminiscing, for it brings back many memories of close friendships that were brought togther a quarter of a century later in time. I was still a schoolteacher in 1940 when I was first elected to the Minnesota State Senate, as Minnesota's youngest State senator. I mention it only because in that same year, Hale Boggs, at the age of 26, was elected to the 77th Congress as the youngest Democrat. Nick Begich, at that time, was an 8-year-old elementary school student in Eveleth. Little did any of the three of us realize that while starting at the same time, but widely separated geographically, our lifelines would converge in the Halls of Congress in Washington, D.C., and later end tragically for two of them in our northernmost State of Alaska. Hale Boggs and I then served in World War II, and strangely enough in 1946 he was reelected to Congress by his second district in the city of New Orleans, and I was elected to the 80th Congress for my first term from northeastern Minnesota.

It was 10 years later, in 1956, that Nick Begich moved to Alaska where, as I mentioned earlier, he gave such splendid leadership in the field of education both as a teacher, school administrator and later State senator.

Nick was elected to the Alaska State Senate in 1962—22 years after Hale Boggs was elected to Congress and I was elected to the Minnesota State Senate in 1940.

Nick's active mind and his sense of duty and awareness of the great needs to be met attracted him to the political arena—and I encouraged him to enter politics. He made his first run in 1968 and made a creditable showing, but fell short. We encouraged him to continue, somehow feeling how great was his potential for public duty and service to the people.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY went up to speak in behalf of Nick. I made two trips to Alaska and finally Speaker CARL ALBERT gave the final push that helped Nick be elected to the 92d Congress in November 1970—30 years, almost to the day, that JOHN A. BLATNIK was elected to the Minnesota State senate in 1940 and Hale Boggs was elected to the U.S. Congress.

Nick was deeply and effectively involved in everything that touched the lives of so many people—and above all, he was always loyal to his friends, and deeply loved his family—Pegge Jendro and their six lovely, bright children, and his dear parents, and two brothers and one sister—all dear friends of mine.

He will be long remembered for his remarkable accomplishments in Wash-

ington where, in his first year in Congress, he won passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Act.

He served on the Public Works Committee, which I have the honor to chair; and I have never seen a Congressman more dedicated to his work, both in committee and on the floor; or more determined to represent the people of Alaska, and to make the full Government serve them as he did.

Much, much more could be said of Nick Begich's public service, not only to his State but to the Nation, in environmental legislation, consumer protection, civil rights, labor, and a long list of other issues.

Brief as was his term with us here, it was crowded with achievements many of us do not attain in a lifetime.

He is the only freshman ever to serve on the Democratic Study Group Executive Committee, where he added his leadership and commitment to liberal reform.

We here today confidently tell each other that the past is prologue; and for us, at this moment, that statement is true.

For Nick, prolog was everything, but he seized the lead from the first parting of the curtain, and played it better than many.

A portion of this stage, the House of Representatives, will remain dark now, as will a part of all of us who were privileged to know him.

Nick Begich was an uncommon man, and one of the most promising Congressmen I have ever met. He left us with much of his promise still unrealized.

We take this opportunity to officially commemorate, once again a great man, and through him, the people of Alaska and our many Minnesotans living there, whom he served so well.

We, as well as the people of Alaska who chose him to represent them, have known true greatness; and, having known it, the memory remains vivid.

We will not forget Nick, or his achievements.

The people of Alaska, whose lives he changed materially, will not forget him.

Nick has left us all with a higher standard of expectation, and of performance.

Nick was a splendid man, who truly served his fellowman in every sense of the word—but, above all, he was my friend, as was Hale Boggs and I shall always miss them more deeply than I can ever adequately say.

I shall remember them both always in the words of a long ago poet, as one of those shining young men—"who died in their glory and never will be old."

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

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

Mr. BURTON. I would like the gentleman from Minnesota to know that the Congressman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), as Nick told me personally time without number, was the one person and Member of this House that he held dearest in his heart, and his advice and judgment and leadership Nick relied upon the most. I am sure if Nick were with us this evening he would like that to be unalterably written in the history of the RECORD of this evening.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California who joined me in requesting this special order.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, what can we say to the wife of Nick Begich? How can those of us who live by the spoken word possibly speak the depths of our desolation and what she must feel and what we certainly share with her as a result of Nick's not being with us in this Congress this evening?

He was an energetic, bright, concerned, committed and intellectually curious man determined as best he could to right the injustices confronting humanity and proclaiming his responsibility as the sole Member in the House of Representatives representing the State of Alaska but also insisting that he was among other things the ninth Member from the State of Minnesota serving in the House.

As Mrs. Begich knows and as my wife and I solemnly know we loved Nick and we approved of his courage and diligence.

We could never adequately know his contributions to the well-being of his fellow men and women. I must state that, despite the late hour, I think it a remarkable tribute that so many of his colleagues—and they would be here fivefold but for the inordinately late hour—are here tonight to try to, in some measure, express as inadequately as it may be the kinship we feel with you and your children in the loss of this marvelous human being.

Two hundred and eighty-eight days have passed since the tragic news reached us here in Washington of the disappearance of Nick Begich and our majority leader, Hale Boggs, on a flight from Anchorage to Juneau, Alaska. There have been days in which all of us, who knew both so well, have had time to measure the full loss this House has sustained by their untimely departure.

The majority leader had flown to Alaska after many long sessions leading to the adjournment of the 92d Congress last year. Nick had invited him to attend two dinners in Anchorage and Juneau and both of them joined in this trip with great fervor and enthusiasm. From reports we have heard of that tremendously successful first dinner at the Anchorage Westward Hotel on Sunday night, October 15, it was an evening long to be remembered. The friendship and camaraderie between these two men spread to the audience and created a radiant effect among the Nick Begich supporters gathered to pay respects to Hale and Nick.

Both of them were in their usual good humor and both were engaged in, what was for them, a consuming love—politics. The next morning, October 16, 1972 there was more of this good humor as they departed on a private plane with Nick's special assistant, Russ Brown, for the 700-mile flight to Juneau.

It was typical of Nick's thoughtfulness that he had arranged this flight so that his guest would have a longer time to rest for Nick knew that it had been a long session prior to their departure and an even more tedious trip to Alaska. Nick was used to these weekend sorties to Alaska, 10,000 miles round trip, but for Hale it was a tremendously tiring experience. He was, however, as good as his word and knew Nick was counting on him to be there for the occasion. The commercial flight had departed at 6 a.m. that Monday morning for Juneau and Nick felt that a couple of more hours of sleep would help Hale adjust to the time differences and the trip. It was this kind of thoughtfulness and concern which impressed many of us with Nick as a new Member of the 92d Congress in January 1971.

Born in Eveleth, Minn., of immigrant parents, Nick early in life gained a tremendous respect for government from his parents. Mr. and Mrs. John Begich, still living in Eveleth, came to see their youngest son sworn in to the Congress on January 21, 1971. It was a day of unbelievable pride for the Begiches and a day of real achievement for Nick—for this had been a goal Nick had worked for all of his life. In fact, every step Nick had made in his life seems, in retrospect, to have been a step which brought him closer to that goal as a Member of the Congress. His parents, so proud of their son, knew the work and sacrifice which had gone into Nick's plans. It was a magnificent day for them and for Nick's beautiful wife, Pegge, and their six children. All were there to share the success which they had helped Nick achieve.

Nick was torn between two loves early in life—the love of government and the love of teaching. It was, therefore, a happy combination when he became a student at St. Cloud State College majoring in history, government and education. Typical of Nick's desire to do everything in a hurry and to excel at the same time, he completed a 4-year course at St. Cloud State in 2½ years and when he graduated cum laude in 1952, just having turned 20 years of age, he was selected to Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities and had been invited to join two honor societies.

For the next 4 years he taught at St. Cloud High School and it was here that he became more and more active in the Democratic Party. He was selected as the 2nd vice president of the Minnesota Young Democrats when, now U.S. Senator WALTER MONDALE, was elected as the 1st vice president, and he was very active throughout Minnesota on behalf of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in his first campaign for reelection in 1954.

Although St. Cloud High School was notable for his first encounter in teaching and politics, it is even more notable as the setting of Nick and Pegge Begich's meeting. Pegge was Nick's student at the high school and it was here the paths of these two remarkable people joined. Pegge graduated in 1956 and Nick headed for Alaska to work for the U.S. Department of Labor that summer and, in the fall, he became Boys' Counselor at Anchorage West High School in Anchorage. Alaska beckoned to Nick as a new frontier where he could really be-

come involved in the political and educational arena as a real pioneer. At Christmas time of that year he went back to Minnesota, married Pegge, and they honeymooned along the Alaska Highway in that late December of 1956. Thus, the Nick and Pegge Begich team began and Alaska gained two of its most ardent and energetic adopted citizens.

From that point on education and politics was the consuming interest of both of them. While Nick's educational career blossomed from counselor to director of student personnel to principal and then to superintendent of schools in the next 2 years, his political career also made steady progress, culminating with his election to the Alaska State Senate in the same period. His indefatigable industry was as broad as his senatorial district which extended from the Canadian border to the Pribilof Islands, some 1,500 miles east to west, and from the tip of the Aleutian chain to Mount McKinley, another 1,500 miles south to north.

Nick soon became known as "Mr. Education" and it was a title he held throughout his political career, particularly in the rural areas of Alaska. His work in the Alaska State Senate on behalf of educators and education marked him early as a leader. Much of his landmark legislation, passed years ago in Alaska, is just now being introduced in the "lower 48" States. Selected as chairman of the Senate Health, Education and Welfare Committee when he first assumed office in 1963, he remained a member of this important committee for his 8 years in the Alaska Senate. Reapportioned into a smaller area, the city of Anchorage, after his first 4-year term, Nick was reelected resoundingly in 1966 and became minority whip of the Alaska Senate for the next 4 years.

Nick's pride in his wife and six children was well known. It can truly be said that he had no hobbies or other interests except politics and his family. They took every minute of his time and his total dedication was to both of them.

Pegge and Nick soon became favorites here in Washington and they were often in attendance at two or three different evening or weekend events, always representing Alaska in their open and unpretentious way. On those weekends when Nick was flying 5,000 miles off to Alaska and 5,000 miles back on a Sunday night to be here for Monday sessions, Pegge would fill in for him when Alaska needed to be represented. It was a real partnership in every sense of the word and their six remarkable children, ranging in age from 15 years down to 5 years of age, were also participating members in that close-knit family group.

There were many things that could be said about Nick Begich. We all knew him for his inexhaustible energy; his outgoing personality; his skill as a legislator; his devotion to the House of Representatives which he loved so much. He soon became legendary and the halls of the Longworth Building were often danger zones when Nick came running down the corridor from room 1210 to the subway or up to the stairs to the Interior Committee, or to the Public Works Committee rooms. Indeed, he became known as the Congressman who was everywhere at once, a habit he first developed at St. Cloud State when he oftentimes took more than one class at the same time so he could graduate sooner. This ability to move quickly was a prerequisite for a Congressman from Alaska which is one-fifth the size of the United States for he had to be everywhere and at once there, too.

As chairman of the Democratic Study Group during the 92d Congress, I worked closely with Nick. In addition to all his other duties, he served as vice chairman of the DSG's Indian Education Task Force. Nick was recognized as an effective legislator among his colleagues in the 92d Congress. He was elected as the first freshman Representative to serve on the DSG Executive Committee.

To Pegge Begich and those six children; to Mr. and Mrs. Begich and Nick's family in Minnesota; to the staff who worked so closely with him in Washington and in Alaska, and to his many friends in Alaska and Washington—we know that your loss has been a terribly tragic one. For we knew Nick as a man of integrity. We knew him as a man of compassion. We knew him as a man with a deep and inquiring intellect. He was a genuine, though gentle, human being. To have known him was to have touched greatness; and we are the better for it. Unfortunately, we were able to have walked along his pathway for too short a time.

Although Minnesota was his birthplace and Alaska was his home, it was here in Washington as a Member of the 92d Congress, that Nick really found that niche which really fitted his abilities—that of the all-encompassing, all-consuming, and totally dedicated Congressman representing Alaska, which he was for so brief a time.

We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. CULVER. I recognize the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sorrow about the tragedy to Alaska, to the Congress, and to this great Nation arising from the loss of our beloved colleague, Nick Begich.

At a time when certain people are saying that young people should not enter public service, I hope that these magnificent contributions of Nick Begich are an inspiring record of idealism, and his outstanding record of contributions to his beloved State of Alaska will inspire young people to help us to serve our country.

To his courageous wife, Pegge, with whom I spoke very shortly after the report of the loss of the airplane, and to his family, I extend my deepest sympathy. I can only say, may the memory of his inspired life of public service be of some comfort to them.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker:

Somehow life is not what I thought it
and somehow the gold isn't all.
No! There's the land—(Have you seen it?)
It's the cussedest land that I know.
From the big, dizzy mountains that screen it
To the deep, death-like valleys below
Some say God was tired when he made it;
Some say it's a fine land to shun;
Maybe; but there's some as would trade it
For no land on earth—and I'm one.

Today we pay our respects to our late colleague, Nick Begich, Alaska's third Congressman since statehood. This House sustained a great loss with his disappearance on that flight of October 16, 1972. For Nick loved this House and "he took to Congress like a hummingbird to a flowerbed." He was, indeed, a young man who seemed to be on top of everything whether it pertained to Alaska or concerned other issues of national or parochial interest. Not only that, but he seemed to be everywhere.

Nick spent long hours on the floor of this House listening to the debate, meeting other Members and learning every legislative procedure. He spent hundreds of hours in committee sessions and was so skilled in understanding issues and concepts, he was able to get to the core of an issue with ease. Nick believed in talking to other Members to determine their problems, for he knew he would need their equal compassion when it came time for the biggest battle of all, the passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims. His understanding of this House showed his remarkable preception. How well he was able to work within the, sometimes difficult, rules of this House was obvious when, in his first year, he was able to bring about the passage of the Alaska native land claims legislation almost singlehandedly.

Majority Leader Hale Boggs, on the night of October 15 in Anchorage, told those assembled at the Anchorage Westward Hotel to honor him and Nick, of his first meeting with Nick Begich on the floor of the House. Nick had played his role, up to that time, with strategic precision but it was appropriate to approach the leadership about the native land claims bill and so he introduced himself to Hale again. As the majority leader told the story that night, he said that Nick, after appropriate preliminaries, told him that he had "a little bill" he was interested in. After some discussion, Hale asked him what this little bill would cost. Nick became more interested in discussing the merits of the bill and the needs of Alaska and the Alaskan natives. Again, he was asked the cost of the bill and again Nick continued to extoll the merits of the bill. Finally, when pressed with some exasperation about the cost of the bill, Nick casually indicated that it was "only a billion dollars." Hale was so shocked at this price tab of the bill he indicated that from then on he was always a little leery when "this new Congressman from Alaska" approached him.

And Nick did approach him again many times—for assistance in moving the bill through the subcommittee and the full committee, for help in having a rule granted in the House Rules Committee, for placement on the calendar, for assistance in preventing crippling amendments, for debate on the floor and

for final passage of the bill. He said on that night in Alaska that "the persistent Member from Alaska would not give up his tenacious hold" and Hale said he was much relieved when the bill passed the House and, later, when the conference committee report won passage in the House.

It was a great tribute to Nick that Hale, one of the most active majority leaders this House has ever had, accepted Nick's invitation to Alaska despite the tremendous workload he had as the Congress proceeded to adjournment. From all reports, Nick stood in good stead with his voters in Alaska, voters he cultivated just as he did the Members of this House, and yet, Hale flew 5,000 miles to be there for that dinner with Nick in Anchorage.

Nick Begich is known best for the standards of excellence he set for himself. As a student, teacher, school administrator, State senator and Congressman he was constantly in pursuit of excellence. Nick was a teacher and his life was a lesson and an example that will inspire young people in this country for ages to come. He was a member of the national compact on education in 1967. When he was a superintendent of schools, his school system won the Encyclopedia Americana School Library award in competition in the entire Nation 2 years ago in 1965 and 1966. The night before he met Congressman Boggs in Alaska he received, with 17 members of his family present, the distinguished alumnus award from his alma mater in St. Cloud, before flying off to Alaska early the next morning.

We shall remember Nick Begich for his tenacity, yes; we shall remember him for his great achievements, definitely; we shall remember him for his unbelievable ability, most certainly; but, of them all, we will probably remember Nick for his love of family, a love which transcended all others in his life. It was his love for his wife, Pegge, his six marvelous children, Nichelle, Nick, Tom, Mark, Stephanie and Paul, and his parents, a love which towered above all else in his short but incredibly successful life.

We will miss him; Alaska will miss him; but his family will miss him most. We share their grief at his loss.

There's a land where the mountains are nameless,
And the rivers all run God knows where;
There are lives that are erring and aimless
And deaths that just hang by a hair.

I'll pike to the Yukon again.

I'll fight—and you bet it's no sham-fight:
It's hell!—But I've been there before:
And it's better than this by a dam-sight.
So me for the Yukon once more.
It's the great, big, broad land 'way up yonder,
It's the forests where silence has lease:
It's the beauty that thrills me with wonder,
It's the stillness that fills me with peace.

Nick Begich was indeed a man to match Alaska's towering mountains, may his soul know eternal peace.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, "They said it couldn't be done," but Nick Begich undertook the impossible and almost singlehandedly obtained passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Act, an act which today stands as a monumental living memorial to Nick Begich.

That legislative episode was typical of Nick Begich. He set his goals and through hard work and untiring diligence he pursued them. He readily won supporters to his cause by his disarmingly charming ways.

In my home State of Hawaii we would have recognized Nick as one truly and richly endowed with the spirit of Aloha.

By his tragic departure from our midst he left behind him many saddened hearts. Among them I count myself. As a friend, I shed a tear over his loss and wish now to pay tribute to his memory and to extend my heartfelt condolences to his beloved widow, Pegge, and to his children and family. May they find the hope and the courage in his memory to face the future.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, those Members who have spoken before I rise to speak have spoken much more eloquently than I ever could in summing up those thoughts that come to my mind in thinking of the loss of Nick, but I would like to look at it in just a little different vein for just a few moments.

I concur in all the thoughts that have been expressed by those who spoke before me, and I would like to suggest that there ought to be a feeling among all of us of happiness in realizing that we have been close to a very great man, a very fine man.

We have been touched by his life, and I do not think that touching can ever be taken from us. I believe his family feels the same way, and rightly they could and should, and proudly so.

Mr. Speaker, I say this because of a happiness I feel for Nick for the full and joyous way in which he lived. He spent his life; he did not save it. He gave it for those things he felt were the best for his State and his Nation.

I am happy for having known Nick as a gentleman, a true gentleman and a gentle man. I am happy for my memories of Nick because of the extent to which I was favored with his respect, which he gave sincerely, and because of the extent to which I saw respects given so quickly and earnestly and the heartfelt affection for Nick.

So although I join the others in the comments they have made, I also feel happy for this richness that has come to me in knowing this fine man. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my fellow Members in paying respect to the memory of our late friend and colleague, Nick Begich of Alaska. There are few places in our Nation that are farther from Alaska than my native Florida, but distance is no impediment to my sense of deep personal loss at the death of an exceptionally able member of this House and a valued friend.

Although tragedy has cut short what would undoubtedly have been a long and illustrious career, Nick Begich left a record of accomplishment remarkable for the short time he labored among us. His stance in Congress was consistently progressive and human. A former educational administrator, he felt a deep personal interest in this area and worked hard in the cause of increased Federal assistance, while at the same time establishing an enviable record by his strong support for legislation in the areas of civil liberties, women's rights and consumer protection. Nick voted his conscience in regard to Vietnam, being consistently opposed to continued American involvement in that tragic conflict, while at the same time voting to insure that the Nation's defenses were maintained at a high level of efficiency.

Not withstanding his outstanding record on national issues, Nick Begich will be remembered as the Representative from Alaska. This is the way he would have wanted it; as our 49th State's only member in the House of Representatives, Nick strongly felt that his best efforts should be directed towards serving his constituents. How well he succeeded in this.

The Alaska Native land claims bill had languished in Congress 6 years without concrete action before he arrived; Nick went to work on it as soon as he assumed his seat, and, due in large part to his determined action, this historic measure became part of the law of this land. He was an early opponent of the trans-Alaska pipeline, but worked hard to have changes incorporated in the plan which would safeguard the Alaskan environment while at the same time providing the petroleum America so desperately needs and the economic boost his home State required.

Nick Begich was a personal friend of mine. When he first came to Congress I worked with him in obtaining his committee assignments and followed his career very closely. He was an outstanding Member and accomplished a tremendous amount of good for his State and Nation during his service in the Congress. I talked with him upon numerous occasions about the many trips he made back to his distant constituency. I know how conscientiously he performed his duties to represent his people—often at a great sacrifice of his own health and his personal comfort.

Last month I flew over a part of Alaska and looked upon its rugged terrain and thought about Nick Begich.

His untimely death is a source of deep sorrow to all of us. Both Mrs. Gibbons and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife Pegge and to their fine children.

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

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to say what it was that most impressed you about Nick Begich. He was simply irrepressible.

With all due respect to many of my colleagues, there was never much doubt in my mind that Nick Begich was the most effective member of his congressional class. The examples of his exuberance are easy to remember. He came to the House and knew exactly which committees he wanted to get, and he got them. He worked tirelessly to pass the Native Claims Act which had been hanging around for years before he got here and he got it. I think the reason he was so effective was because he was so well liked. I do not know of a congressional couple in Washington that was more liked than Nick and Peggy Begich.

Even when you were opposing him on an issue, you liked him. I remember sitting on this floor a few nights before Nick and our fondly remembered colleague Hale Boggs left for Alaska. It was a late night session and a number of us were needling Nick about the Alaskan pipeline. We were having so much fun and Nick was making such a strong defense of his case that I finally interrupted him and told him that he could have probably made a million dollars as a lawyer because he did the best job of defending a bad case of any man I had ever seen.

That is what I will always remember about Nick—simply the fact that you could not get mad at him in an argument and 9 times out of 10 when he was involved in something, you hoped he would win.

He was fair. He was quick. He loved a contest and he loved life. And he so enjoyed himself that he made the jobs and the lives of all of those around him more enjoyable as well. We miss him as much as we were proud to serve with him.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. ABZUG. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, he came to Congress when I did. I think myself that Nick Begich represents that group of people who come to the Congress with a great deal more independence and interest in change and reflection of the reality of our times.

I think everything that has been said here tonight about his career or his careers reflects that.

I think those who think of him tonight and his family, who always have him in their presence, will probably get the greatest comfort out of their knowing of his commitment to change for his State and for his country.

I think his wife Pegge and Hale's wife LINDY, who is with us, will be able in their memories and in the image of the loss of these two men to be able to continue the kind of commitments that these people had.

It is very hard to speak about somebody under such tragic circumstances; it is very hard to make it meaningful. I think the family of Nick Begich know themselves how meaningful his life has been. I believe they will continue that meaning in their own lives, and I wish them the very best.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, it seems, Nick Begich become a member of the House Committee on Public Works, and it was no time at all before the rest of us realized there was a unique and valued colleague in our midst, because, as has been mentioned before, he had tremendous enthusiasm and dedication to his work and State.

Nick Begich brought this with him from Alaska to the Congress. He was someone who never stopped working for his State.

It was not long thereafter when Mrs. Howard and two of our daughters and I were traveling prior to one of our recesses to Tokyo, Japan, to participate in an interparliamentary conference. We were fortunate to be on the plane for that long flight with Nick and Pegge Begich. That long flight really seemed short after my wife and daughters and I had the benefit of the engaging personality of Nick Begich.

After my wife and daughter and I had the benefit of the engaging personality of Nick Begich we dropped Nick Begich and Pegge off at Anchorage and we went on to Japan. And then the very next day to my surprise—perhaps I should not have been surprised—there in Tokyo was the Representative from Alaska, Nick Begich, who had come on his own during a recess to meet and discuss with businessmen efforts that he was making to improve the business situation for his State of Alaska. In that situation, as in many others, he was successful.

During last August our colleague and friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, had assigned me to head a special hearing concerning the energy crisis.

And during the several weeks of those hearings it was Nick Begich who attended every single committee meeting, who spoke with every witness, and who engaged in conversation with all who were present concerning the values of the resources of his State of Alaska, and how they could not only benefit his State but the needs of all of the people in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, when we in this Chamber consider a way to pay tribute to a colleague very often all we can think of are words. If there is one thing that there is so many, many of in the House of Representatives, it is words, and conversation. And we are now at a time of having heard 12 solid hours of words, so perhaps the greatest tribute that we can pay to a colleague is that when he or she speaks the rest of us listen. Whether it be casual conversation in committee or here in this great Chamber, Mr. Speaker, when Nick Begich spoke the rest of the House listened, and that listening was to the benefit of all of us because when Nick did speak he spoke with facts, with determination, with logic, and with enthusiasm. And the result of listening to Nick speak caused things to happen in the Congress and throughout the country which will benefit us in our Nation for years to come.

So, although Nick is gone, we in this Congress and in the country will continue to benefit from the work he did while he was with us, and down through the years this Congress, the State of Alaska, and his people will be better off because everyone had faith in Nick Begich as he had faith in his people.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I now recognize the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join in tribute to our distinguished colleague, Nick Begich, who was so much like the place from which he came, with so much heritage and hope bound together in this fine blend of a human being.

Nick Begich in his short time endeared himself in the House as he did in his State. His services were cut short, but his mark is bold and clear, clearly chiseled in the granite of legislative achievement.

Nick's spirit was of hope for Alaska and hope for America. His spirit continues with his good wife, Pegge, and with his devoted family. He is at our side, and we are at his.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI).

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, one always has a closer feeling for a classmate than perhaps for other Members of the Chamber with whom one comes in contact, and Nick was in our freshman class in the 92d Congress.

I met Nick early on the very first few days I was here. And later at a soiree at Sargent Shriver's house I had the chance to meet his wife, Pegge, and to continue my conversations with Nick, and to learn about representing Alaska, which is as large as most countries are.

My service in Alaska during my 2 years with the Army was a matter of common conversation with Nick. We very frequently talked about the beautiful scenery around Fort Richardson where his school district was located and where he spent so many years, productive years, of his life.

As it happens, I, myself, happen to be the son of immigrants to America, as was Nick's. I am sure that his parents were made extremely pleased and honored by his distinguished career in public service in America. I share the feeling of those who try to make this country better by reason of our service. I would just simply like to join tonight with all of our colleagues. the distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, and all who have delayed departures for our homes and our families in order to make some small recognition of the service that Nick gave, and of our love for him and our love for Pegge and our love for his family. Certainly we ask for all possible blessings on his family for the future.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to the one person in this House who represented a larger area than I do in the

State of Wyoming. Our late beloved colleague, Nick Begich, represented an area just about six times that size, 550,000 square miles.

His death in the height of a reelection campaign in October of 1972, was a loss to Alaska, to his colleagues, and to his beloved Nation, and, indeed, to humanity. His memory will remain with the countless numbers of youth he taught and counseled as a teacher and an administrator, by those who supported his years of public service to his State of Alaska, and by all of us in Washington who had the pleasure and good fortune of knowing and working with him in the 92d Congress.

I will always remember my trip to Alaska for the Nick Begich tribute. It took place on Sunday afternoon, January 7, this year, 1973. In a high school auditorium were gathered many hundreds of friends of all ages and from all walks of life to share with Pegge, his young children and his parents, the feeling of deep, personal loss.

Nick and I sat side by side in the Committee on Public Works, and we sat side by side on the Committee on the Interior and on about three subcommitees of each of those two committees, and I also sat beside the late Congressman from Illinois, Mr. Collins, as well.

Nick's dynamism, his sincerity, and his determination to handle the problem of each and every one of his constituents who wrote to him from Alaska impressed me a great deal. I used to watch him come to work with great manila envelopes loaded with correspondence from his constituents, and he would go through each one personally and with a intricate coding system recorded his correspondence. He identified each one with long, long, sometimes handwritten reply to each constituent.

I watched him work on the Alaskan Native claims bill which he steered through the Committee on the Interior with great expertise. I enjoyed his statesmanship, so rarely found in one so young. There was no doubt in my mind that Nick Begich would have been around here for a long time.

I think his family, his friends, and his colleagues can take great comfort in knowing he had come a long way already. He was proud of the fact that his fellow Alaskans had elected him to represent their needs here in Washington, and he carried with him and fulfilled his responsibilities greatly.

He was a man of warmth, of compassion, of service to his fellow man. We shall sorely miss him.

Mr. CULVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given 1 hour to continue this tribute to our former colleague preceding other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McKAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with all of the other Members of the Congress in taking this time to eulogize the memory of our dear friend, Nick Begich. Nick and I, Mr. Speaker, were more than just friends. We were neighbors. We often found ourselves sharing a car coming to work in the morning. I have known, on many occasions, as our friend, the gentleman from Wyoming noted, those tremendous bundles of correspondence, and the tremendous amount of work that he carried home with him.

This was I think indicative of the man. I miss him and miss very much the fellowship we enjoyed. My wife Patricia joins me in wishing his wife Pegge and his children the very best. Let me say that Nick Begich was a man just as big as his congressional district.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. McKAY).

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

As one of the Members of the 92d group I would like to say that there is one responsibility that no man can shirk and that is being what he is. We are each a conglomerate of all those we meet and we are better for having had that association with Nick Begich. I served with him in the leadership of the 92d group as we came in. He was a personality, forceful, warm, and magnetic, and we were attracted to him immediately. Then he went on from that point, from that original attraction to hold it and prove it and show its real worth in gold. As he served in that organization his work became evident constantly by his attention to detail and followthrough that is not too often found.

Nick was a close friend and one who was easy to be a friend to because he was a friend. He and I were friends. We rode home from the late hours such as tonight together because we lived in a close area. His wife and mine associated together in the 92d wives group. Our children went to school together. This association will not be forgotten.

I remember and I will not reiterate the other examples that have gone on. I would associate myself with them and acknowledge that they are true.

Nick came to my office one day and said, "GUNN, will you go with me to Alaska?" I said, "I do not know whether I can or not." But one could not turn Nick Begich down, so I went to Alaska. I am grateful for that invitation. We went with the Public Works Committee. We went and made stops all the way from Ketchikan to Prudhoe Bay and looked all over Alaska all the way. We held hearings and he set such a pace that it was very difficult to follow.

In fact, that was verified by a statement made by the majority leader who went on that fateful trip with Nick. I rode with Hale Boggs as far as Denver, Colo., on his way to Alaska on that fateful trip. In Denver as we were talking before we each caught our planes, Hale said, "I am tired. I sure hate to go to Alaska but how can you turn down a guy like Nick Begich?" He said, "I could not do it. I have got to go." And he went.

In Alaska we visited the capital and the Governor and talked to some of Nick's senators with whom he had labored in that capital city. The virtues that have been expressed here were also expressed there by an older senator who said, "You could always tell that Nick Begich knew the facts. You could not pull the wool over his eyes."

He had always read the bills and the reports. He knew where the facts were. That was typical. He was a man noted in education as has already been expressed.

The country has lost a noble soul, an exemplary public servant.

I would like to say to his children: I in my own life, having lost my father in my youth, would like to express to them my sympathy and would like to say to them that there may come a time when they feel a loneliness, when they wish they had that companionship and that reminiscence of their father.

At that point, talk with your mother. Search out those who worked with your father and let them tell you the stories of the greatness of your father. He was a great man, and I can say to you, as was stated by a poet when speaking about a father and about an individual who could be emulated, You could rightly say that if you followed the example of energy, of personality, of zeal, of determination, and if you follow those footsteps you can proudly say, "I stepped in his steps all the way."

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add a word to what has been said in addition to my gratitude for everything that has been said, because it has been so well said.

I think perhaps FRANK EVANS had in mind what I had, and that is that if there was any one quality that Nick brought to us, to this House and therefore to the country, it was a sense of joy in his work and in his mission; a kind of gladness, as if it was the most natural thing to come down here and wrest from 434 other Members the mysterious, difficult answers to the problems of Alaska and the questions he had.

He had a kind of zest for that. I remember best, really, his eyes. He also had a sort of half smile, but it was his eyes; it was this haunting combination of curiosity, insistence, compassion and a kind of belief that the answers that he would get would be the ones he wanted. It was very difficult, really, to look at Nick's eyes and see "Yes" written there and say "No."

It was virtually impossible, and yet he did it all with a kind of natural happiness which is a tremendous credit to a great many people I have never met.

One philosopher has written that every man, every human being is the tip of a pyramid, an invisible pyramid of the hopes, plans, character, blood of many men and women who have gone before and from whom he descends. I do not know those people, but they must

have been sturdy and strong, uncommonly wise, great people; for certainly, he was.

So, I join my colleagues in hoping very much that his wife Pegge and his children and family will bear in mind that that is how we will ever think of him.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay a special tribute, because having come in as a Member of the 92d Congress 4 months later than most of my colleagues, one of the first men I got to know was Nick Begich. I felt like I got to know him pretty well because he and I shared several hours trying to learn the rules of this House by sitting and observing.

He was a man of love, a man of compassion; but more so he was a man who was loved.

I shall never forget the evening after his legislative victory here on the floor on the Alaska Native Land Claims Act, seeing him in a restaurant with several of his staff and his constituents. I noticed in the eyes of those he represented a look of true admiration, a look of true respect, a look of true gratitude, a look of love.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the 92d class can stay here many years, but it goes without saying that Nick Begich was a leader in this class. Those of us who remain here today, and who perhaps will be here tomorrow, will always remember with the greatest fondness this gentleman from Alaska who came down and in such a brief period had such a great effect on our lives.

To his wife and his family go our deepest sympathies. While we realize that perhaps words are of small comfort we know they know that their friends share with them this great loss.

In closing let me say that one of my favorite verses from the Bible is in the Book of Micah. It says:

> What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

Mr. Speaker, this was Nick Begich. He did justly, he loved mercy, and we know that he will always walk humbly with his God.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting, in a way, that we should be here after midnight paying this tribute to our colleague, Nick Begich, because it symbolizes, in a way, the dedication which he brought to his work here in the House of Representatives.

It was my privilege to come to the Congress with Nick as a Member of the 92d Congress. I believe all of us who are in that class recognized him immediately for a person of extraordinary quality. It took only one meeting and one opportunity to talk with Nick for just a few moments to recognize that here was an uncommon person, a person of great capacity and great ability, a person of quality which was unusual, quality which was seldom seen.

He brought a breadth of vision to his work here and to all who had contact with him, a vision for his State and a vision for the Nation, a vision which really matched the breadth of the land he represented here.

He brought a keenness of mind, which I believe was recognized by all of us who had the opportunity to talk with him about problems facing the Nation, for we gained new perception and new understanding from him.

He brought that sense of life which others have referred to. I do not believe there was any one of us who did not welcome the opportunity just to see and talk with Nick, because we walked away from that feeling better than we had felt a few moments before. There was no question about that. He communicated to us the sense of life and of purpose and of joy and a sort of sense of humor and happiness that made one feel the better for being in his presence.

But above all these things I believe all of us perceived in him a person of fundamental decency. There was a great moral strength to Nick Begich. There was a great sense of integrity. There was a feeling in anyone who talked with him that this was someone who turned no corner, who cut no edges, who sought to speak plainly and honestly.

And he did it from a sense of values that was rooted in the very best of what this Nation's heritage has come to mean.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members in extending my deepest sympathies to Pegge and to his children. I hope they will take some comfort from the example which he left, from the contributions which he made, and from the realization that their husband and their father stood as a tower of strength in this Hall and represented to those of us who were privileged to work with him the very finest that can be embodied in a public servant in this Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like to think of Nick Begich and his contribution to life in terms of the love that he expressed in his actions every day of his life. That love was a love of giving.

I remember well a trip he made to Cleveland for the Croatian community, for he was extremely close to the Slavic people, which was his heritage. It was in loving these people that he went to Cleveland to speak to them on the purposes and achievements about which he felt very strongly in this Congress.

I believe it was a love of people and the love of his country that motivated him on that trip with our dear and beloved majority leader, Hale Boggs. It was the love of two men to serve this country that took them on that fateful flight.

I hope that the love that Nick Begich had for humanity will be a source of comfort for Pegge and the children. I know that it will be something that I will share always in the memory of a man who loved deeply.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

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

Sitting tonight with my colleagues and listening to the tributes paid to Nick Begich, one has a strange feeling of both sadness and, in a way, warmth as various of his colleagues cast in our minds the reflections of his unique character and personality.

The words have gone out tonight to describe him as bright, dynamic, youthful, energetic, open, friendly, and expansive. They mean something to us who knew him, but I believe it must be impossible for one who did not know him to know how those qualities came together to make the person who was Nick Begich so unusual and indeed the unique person that he was.

I think back individually on the moments of humor in watching this enormously energetic young Congressman literally achieve miracles in legislative history and yet earnestly plead with us that we had to help him because Alaska only had 1 Representative, while he was proving that he could do the work of 10.

I remember saying to him, seriously, "Nick, what are you going to do in your second term?"

This was a man who won the respect and the admiration, as I think has been demonstrated here tonight so many times with deep affection, of what is considered to be a very difficult jury, his fellow Members of Congress, his fellow Members who shared with him his profession in public life.

Nick had a proud title which only a few States gave to their Representatives; he was not the Representative from the 5th or the 2d or the 22d district; he was "the" Representative of Alaska. And indeed he was. He was a representative of something broader than that. He was a Representative, I think, of the spirit of our country broadly—the youthful dynamic, restless, impatient, and, yes, the wonderfully idealistic spirit that we think of when we think of a great industrialized country such as ours.

It has been said that politics is the science of the highest good, and in a day and time when this profession is much maligned all of us who were his colleagues and who shared with him what we consider a great honor of public life are grateful to him and are grateful to his family for having shared him with us for this short period of time.

We are grateful for our memory of him, and we are grateful for the standard he set, and we feel that in his life and accomplishments there may be others to follow the example he set and who will seek his high ideals and help not only their States and regions as Nick did so well but help our country and the people all around the world who depend on us for achieving a better life and future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a most profound sense of admiration and a real sense of personal loss that I rise to join my colleagues in tribute to Nick Begich.

Nick and I came to the Congress at the same time. We served together in the 92d freshman Democratic caucus. Nick was treasurer of that caucus, and he was proud of that small responsibility. He carried it out with great enthusiasm and absolute perfection.

We worked together in the Committee on Public Works and often walked back and forth to and from the House Chamber to our offices, because his office was just down the hall from mine. We relaxed together after work. We were friends and our wives were friends.

It is striking tonight that the various statements made this evening by so many people expressed themselves as friends and talked about their personal relationships. Every one is obviously true. Together they set forth a mighty testimonial to a person who was Nick Begich.

Nick's devotion to the State of Alaska united us in our support for the State and our support for him. He fought hard for the Indian Claims Act and the Alaska pipeline and had the determination to move this legislation forward as expeditiously as possible for the future of Alaska.

I think it is fitting that this tribute tonight coincides almost to the day with what would obviously be the fulfillment of one of his most hard-fought goals, that is, the passage of the Alaska pipeline bill.

Nobody else in the modern history of Congress has accomplished anything like that much in so short a period of time.

He was a man of unswerving devotion and great energy, a young man of wisdom and thoughtful contemplation. He was a man with the ability to envision new solutions to old problems.

He had a real liking for enlightened Democratic leadership and a very high regard and a well deserved regard for the progressive Democratic leaders who are his friends in the House of Representatives.

While he belongs to history, he was a dedicated Member of Congress, and his many contributions here remain an inspiration to us all and a demonstration of what hard work, enthusiasm, integrity, and optimism can accomplish.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman and commend him and his colleague from Iowa for arranging this special order tonight.

I join them in paying tribute to a distinguished and able representative of the State of Alaska and a most able and respected Member of this body.

He is missed by the people of Alaska and the colleagues with whom he served, and among whom he had so many friends. I know that he is missed by his family whom he so much loved. I join not only in paying tribute to Nick Begich, but also in expressing condolences to the family that he loved, and that meant so much to him.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I learned a few moments ago of this tribute tonight for Nick Begich from our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE). I know the hour is late, and the admonition has been given that in order to have these remarks included in the RECORD we must conclude this as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have just two items that I want to cover, and to have included in this eulogy.

It was our privilege many times right back by the door to sit and talk with our good friend, Nick Begich—and I say good friend because, although we were not freshmen Members of the 92d Congress as he was, but because he was the sort of a person who was so easy to become acquainted with.

As I say, there are two things about this eulogy tonight. One is the fact that at this very later hour, after a long and hard day, and when we are at a half-hour after midnight, that there are this number of Members on the floor who have remained to pay tribute to this colleague, a colleague who represented, it is true, a big State, but he was a big man. And back there in those conversations we had the opportunity to discuss the things that were so uppermost in his mind, and that was the passage of the Alaskan Native Land Claims.

Nick said to me one time:

I hope if you cannot speak for this bill that you will not speak against it.

How could one refuse a request like that? Someone said that you could not refuse Nick Begich. We thought so much of him. We miss him. It was the greatest shock of our time to learn the sad news that came to us from Alaska last October.

We all hope and pray that his good widow, Pegge, will be sustained in her bereavement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DENHOLM).

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

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that most of us realize that it is sadness to go to the open grave and look down, but it is faith to look beyond.

I believe that if there is one thing that the gentleman whom we honor tonight left with this body it is the faith that he gave us, the hope that he gave to the people of the wilderness, and the performance that he made in history.

I know that the name Begich will follow in the annals of history the word "Alaska," just like the letter "B" follows the letter "A" in the alphabet. It is indelible there, and it will be remembered.

He had courage, honesty, and integrity. We learned to trust him and to know him. I was of his class as a Member of the 92d Congress in the year of his death. One of the moments that I shall never forget was that shortly before we adjourned to go home with our people we were gathered in the patio at the home of our beloved leader, Hale Boggs, and as we left there that evening our majority leader said to us:

I have but one wish, and that is that we can all meet again.

None of us knew that Nick could not come back or that our leader would not return. And in our infinite wisdom here as a collective body we know not their whereabouts, or whether they are with us and can see us, and know and understand the problems of our time. But tonight we have seen the great orators of our body come into the well, in a Chamber hushed in sadness, knowing that these men are gone.

We know that we will not feel their warm hands and have the benefit of the words of their courage and understanding, but I think also we know that we are all better because we had them for a little while. If lives could be measured in deeds and not years, I could say to the loved ones of Nick Begich and Hale Boggs that they lived for hundreds of years, for they did many things for many people. They sought to serve their God through serving others, and it is in this spirit and with this courage and in this faith that I accept the challenge to try to carry on their good works for all mankind.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to a woman who is a most fitting participant in this tribute to Nick Begich, the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Mrs. BOGGS).

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in joining with my colleagues in all of the beautiful things that have been said about Nick Begich and his family.

Imbued with the fervent patriotism of his immigrant parents and determined to express it in an effective manner, Nick Begich accomplished more in his short span of life than most men achieve in the proverbial three score years and ten.

His buoyant spirit, keen intelligence and compassionate heart suited him especially to represent the remarkable people of Alaska.

As his parents had inspired him, so he left a beautiful legacy of dedication to God and country and to the betterment of the quality of life for his fellow man to his valiant and beautiful wife, Pegge, and to his splendid children.

I am grateful for the opportunity of knowing firsthand the love and respect which Nick's constituents felt for him and their appreciation of the worth of his public service.

I believe that Hale would join me in offering as consolation to them, to his devoted family and to his good and loyal friends in this House these words of Robert Louis Stevenson:

Every heart that has beat strong and cheerfully has left a hopeful impulse behind it in the world, and bettered the tradition of mankind. And even if death catch people, like an open pitfall, and in mid-career, laying out vast projects, and planning monstrous foundations, flushed with hope, and their mouths full of boastful language, they should be at once tripped up and silenced: is there not something brave and spirited in such a termination? and does not life go down with a better grace, foaming in

full body over a precipice, than miserably straggling to an end in sandy deltas? Death has not been suffered to take so much as an illusion from his heart. In the hot fit of life, a tip-toe on the highest point of being, he passes it abound onto the other side . . . trailing with him clouds of glory, this happy starred, full-blooded spirit shoots into the spiritual land.

By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON.

I do know, FRANK, that they are here with us tonight, and I appreciate so much the opportunity of participating in this small gesture.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to pay tribute to our late colleague, Nick Begich, who disappeared with the late majority leader, Hale Boggs, during an airplane flight from Anchorage to Juneau last October.

Nick's tragic death was a loss to his family, his State, Congress, and the Nation. Those of us who had the pleasure of working with Nick in the 92d Congress knew him to be a gentleman, highly able, and committed to improving life for all Americans. It was for this reason that Nick was elected to the executive committee of the Democratic Study Group, to which no other first-term Congressman ever had been elected.

A member of the House Interior Committee, Nick was largely responsible for passage of the Alaska Native claims legislation in 1971. He helped pull together the disparate views of the Natives, miners, oil interests, and conservationists, and, as a result of his efforts, the final bill was hailed by all parties as a landmark achievement.

Besides his outstanding work in government, Nick worked as an educator in Alaska for 16 years. He is remembered by Alaskans as "Mr. Education," and deserves the honor.

Nick's brave and lovely wife, Pegge, and his six children, Nichelle, Nicholas, Thomas, Mark, Stephanie, and Paul, have my sincerest sympathy.

He shall be missed.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker. Fate struck down one of the brightest lights with whom I have been associated in my service in the Congress.

Nick Begich was a man of brilliance and all who knew him predicted a tremendous career of public service for him.

Nick came here as Alaska's Representative to the 92d Congress. All who met him liked him. They came to know him as a man of ability and integrity.

We were stunned when he was lost on a flight over the State he loved and served so well. With him were three others, including the great Hale Boggs of Louisiana, the majority leader of the House.

I well remember how we received the news in shocked disbelief. We shared with Mrs. Begich the belief that the plane was only down and would shortly be found.

As the days lengthened into weeks, and the weeks into months, hopes began to fail.

Nick's career in the House was short, but it was brilliant. He made his mark and we are all richer for having had the privilege of knowing him.

To his lovely wife and six children, I extend my deepest sympathy. I can only hope they can be comforted in the knowledge that he was truly a great man and that we have lost a very dear friend.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, 1972, a small, private aircraft was reported missing over Alaska. After months of intensive search, the Cessna was determined to be lost. The public and certainly the Congress were aggrieved by the passing of two of our most diligent Members—Majority Leader Hale Boggs and Alaska's Representative-at-Large, Nick Begich.

Mr. Begich was elected to the House in 1970 and was, in his first year of service, recognized as a tireless, dedicated worker and one of the finest among the freshman legislators in the 92d Congress. His industrious service on the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs earned him recognition as an authority on matters concerning Indian Affairs, National Parks and Public Lands. He led the floor fight which resulted in the passage of his bill, the Native Claims Settlement Act. He also played a major role in the passage of other important legislation for Alaska including the Fairbanks flood control project. Representative Begich will surely be missed.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our former colleague, the late Nick Begich of Alaska, whose service in this body was ended so abruptly by the tragic accident which claimed his life, and that of the late majority leader, Hale Boggs.

Death at any age, at any stage in an individual's professional career, or at any point in an individual's personal development is difficult enough to cope with. It reaches tragic dimensions when one is struck down, as was Nick Begich, early in life and with his career just opening up before him. Nick was just 40 years old, finishing out his first term in this body, when he lost his life on that ill-fated airplane flight from Anchorage to Juneau.

Those of us who had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives with Nick Begich will remember him as one who appeared on the scene only briefly, but who nonetheless left his mark on this institution, and on the cause of representative government to which this body is so deeply committed.

Nick Begich was a dedicated, able, and compassionate legislator, Mr. Speaker, and all of us who had the opportunity to work with him miss his counsel and his friendship.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues, Mr. CULVER and Mr. BURTON, in honoring the late Representative Nicholas Begich. I commend the gentleman in the well for taking the special order.

Mr. Speaker as a freshman Congressman from the State of Alaska, Nick Begich impressed me as I am sure he impressed us all, with his intelligence, his sincerity and his drive. I will never forget how deeply committed he was, to people and to his constituents. He was concerned and dedicated to the poor, the unfed, the ill-clothed and the uneducated.

It was because of his limitless concern and dedication, his personality, that Nick Begich commanded the kind of respect and admiration from his colleagues that he possessed.

With the loss of Nick Begich the House has lost one of those rare voices that could rise above the often loud and anguished cries of conflicting issues and divergent questions. He spoke softly, clearly and with humanity, regardless of the issue.

When Nick spoke, he spoke from the heart, you listened, you understood.

I fully comprehend and share the sense of grief and deep personal loss that his family and all of us here on the Hill are experiencing at this hour.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the memory of our late colleague, Nick Begich, the Congressman from Alaska. My words today are tinged by great sorrow and immense pride. Sorrow that the life of one so young should be snuffed out, sorrow that our Nation will miss the presence of a Member of Congress who had so much to give in service to his State and country, sorrow for Nick's brave wife, Pegge, and her children. But even in a time of sadness, I am proud of this man, Nick Begich. For in the brief span of his legislative career, he compiled a record of achievement which would fill the lifetime of a lesser person.

Nick was not a native son of Alaska, but this did not dim his love for our 49th State and its people. He was born, raised and educated in Minnesota, where he compiled a distinguished academic record. In 1956, he followed the course of many courageous young men and resettled in Anchorage, where he became a guidance counselor and later director of student personnel in the Anchorage School District. In 1962, Nick was elected to the Alaska State Senate, where he was selected as chairman of the Committee on Health, Education and Welfare. During his 8 years in the State senate, he labored tirelessly in behalf of Alaska's schoolchildren and teachers. During this busy time he also served with distinction as superintendent of schools in Fort Richardson and as an instructor at the University of Alaska.

Nick Begich came to Washington as a freshman Congressman in January, 1971, and even during his single term in the House of Representatives he compiled an enviable record of accomplishment. He made his mark early as a conscientious and progressive legislator, with an impressive attendance and voting record of 99 percent in the House, while at the same time carrying out duties as a member of both the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works.

Congressman Begich maintained a farsighted and liberal record in both domestic and foreign matters. He voted his conscience in opposing U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, while lending voice to those of his fellow Members who had a deep and abiding concern for the environment of our nation. He consistently supported increased Federal aid to education as well as progressive legislation in the fields of civil rights, consumer protection and labor relations.

Nick Begich was active and committed

on national issues, but he concentrated his efforts on matters that pertained most directly to his constituents. He felt a special obligation to them, and, as he put it in his own words:

I believe, that with only one seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, Alaska should expect its Congressman to do the essential, practical jobs as an absolute first priority, using every bit of energy at his disposal.

It was this philosophy that motivated Nick Begich in working for his State and Nation when he helped bring about the passage of the Alaska Native Lands Claims Settlement Act in 1971. Although this worthy legislation had been actively considered by Congress for more than 6 years, it was due in large part to his active and energetic support that final action was taken, and that this vital bill became the law of the land, recognizing the long-standing claims of Alaska's Natives.

Now he has passed from this life, leaving behind him a legacy which will give honor to his name for years to come. The people of Alaska have lost a great friend and a fearless defender, the Congress has lost an outstanding legislator, his family has lost a loving husband and father. Nick Begich was a rare and good man; his loss will be felt by us all.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, though nearly a year has elapsed since his tragic death, I wish to pay tribute today to the Honorable Nick Begich of Alaska. Nick served on the Alaska State Senate for two consecutive terms prior to being elected to the 92d Congress in 1971. He served ably and conscientiously from then until his tragic disappearance last October with the late majority leader, Hale Boggs.

As a fellow member of the Public Works Committee, I know that Nick was a hard-working and dedicated Member of Congress. He was a leader in the struggle of Native Americans for social justice and introduced legislation providing for this. As the recipient of the 1965 NAACP Human Rights Award, Nick Begich was truly a man of conscience and compassion, especially for the socially and economically oppressed. A former school superintendent and long-time educator, Nick was also sensitive to the growing educational needs of this Nation.

The country has lost not only an outstanding public servant, but also a good and decent man. I am happy that his colleagues have set aside this time to pay tribute to his life and social achievements, indeed worthy of the highest praise.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, seldom in the long history of the House of Representatives have our collective emotions been so strained as during the days of anxiety over the fate of two of our colleagues who were lost in the frozen mystery of Alaska.

When the curtain of certainty fell—as certain as anything can be in the massive backlands of our 50th State—my thoughts turned to the man who served with us from there—his contributions to humanity—his service to his country, rendered in the short span of time Nick Begich was our colleague.

Nick Begich served within a scope of interests almost as large as the State he represented—human rights, education, business, and national government. He served with devotion and compassion, with pride and affection. He served well and humbly those he represented, and he will not be forgotten as a pioneer of progress in behalf of his land, his State, his people—Alaskans who will miss him and remember him as we do here in this House.

Nicholas Begich's memory will nurture our own hope and courage, and the hope and courage of his wife and six children in the days ahead.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for providing us with this opportunity to pay our respects to the late Congressman Nick Begich of Alaska.

Although Nick Begich's time of service here in the House was not of heroic proportions in terms of length, it was heroic in terms of the contributions he made.

No newcomer to public service or elective office, having served 8 years in the Alaska State Senate, he quickly learned the ropes here in the House.

Nick Begich was in the unique position, shared by only five other Congressmen, of representing all of the residents of his home State. And represent them all, he did. He will, undoubtedly, be well remembered for his work for the Alaskan Indians.

Conservation of the bountiful natural resources of his beautiful State was one of Nick Begich's prime concerns. All of us who, too, love the rugged State miss his knowledge and wisdom in that area.

His lovely family, along with the family of the late distinguished Majority Leader Hale Boggs, have been through a long, heart-rending ordeal. All of us here shared in the agony of the extended search for the aircraft carrying these two fine men; we shared in the grief at their loss; and today we again share with them—this time in remembering Nick Begich, the Congressman, public servant, husband and father.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Pegge Begich and the six Begich children.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to our former colleague, the late Nick Begich of Alaska, and to state once again our deep sorrow at his untimely passing.

In his all-too-brief lifespan, Nick Begich accomplished more than many men ever achieve in a long lifetime. Perhaps as typical of the affection and respect his fellow citizens in Alaska afforded him was their electing him to represent them in the U.S. Congress. By doing so, his friends and neighbors expressed very simply their faith and trust in him.

Insofar as I know, no person who ever placed his faith and trust in Nick Begich ever had reason to regret it. Those of us who labored with him in the House of Representatives found him to be astute, level-headed and altogether trustworthy. We soon learned to know how great a potential existed inside this quiet unassuming young man. That that potential was snuffed out so early in his lifetime is as great a loss to the Nation as it is for his family and his friends in his beloved Alaska, and here in the Nation's Capital.

But a nation can survive the death of a statesman. What we who knew him well mourn most of all is the loss of a good man, a good friend. Nick and Peggy Begich enriched the lives of all who came to know them and their delightful children. Theirs was a happy marriage, filled with good humor and high spirits, and they infected all who came their way with happiness.

In his first year of service in this House, Nick and Peggy Begich came to visit in my home city of New York during the congressional New York trip. They enjoyed themselves immensely, and before they left, Nick promised us and his wife that when it came time for the next trip they would bring their children with them.

Two months ago, we held that trip. And with the courage and the sturdy character that she possesses, Peggy Begich made good that promise for her children. Nick Begich had every reason to be proud of his wife and his children, and nothing else could typify that pride more than the moral stamina and loyalty to their departed father and husband than his family displayed on that trip.

And so we have all lost much with this early passing of Nick Begich, and it can never be replaced.

Too soon was he taken away from us and long will we suffer that loss.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues today in honoring the late representative from Alaska, Nick Begich.

Nick came to Congress in 1971 with much diverse experience. He had been a builder, an educator, and a legislator. Nick made full use of all his experience and his enormous capabilities and became one of our hardest working Members.

In the course of his brief 2-year stay in the House, Nick Begich and I worked together on a number of issues, including consumer affairs, congressional reform, and an end to the Indochina war. I always found him to be intelligent and sincere, a man with much to offer this House.

Nick Begich was a man of principle, yet a man who knew when to compromise. He worked hard in the interests of Alaskans and in the interest of all Americans. This body and this country need more men like Nick Begich and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Nick Begich was a man destined to make a lasting mark in the Congress of the United States. That he was campaigning to be returned to the job which he had come to love so much is a compounding irony of his tragedy. In addition to solid demonstrations of his future legislative potential, Nick Begich was also an open and unstinting supporter of his party. The fact that he was accompanied by his party's majority leader on his ill-fated campaign flight last October is evidence of the esteem the Democratic leadership had for him. The people of Alaska in par-

ticular and the people of the United States in general have suffered the loss of a potentially strong and effective leader in the Congress. We are all the less for it.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the start of each new Congress witnesses the appearance of a number of new, often young, Congressmen. The ways of the House of Representatives are such that it is rarely possible for these newcomers to distinguish themselves in their first, or even second terms. Nevertheless, many exhibit traits and abilities which mark them as men of promise—as legislators who, if they remain in the body, will eventually rise to positions of leadership and respect. Some stay and fulfill this promise. Some, for personal reasons or by virtue of the wishes of their constituency, leave soon after they arrive. And, in a few, tragic cases, a newcomer is struck down before he has the opportunity to prove the promise he has shown. Such was the case with Nick Begich, the Representative from Alaska during the 92d Congress, who with Hale Boggs, the Representative from Louisiana, was reported missing last October 15, when a plane carrying them from Anchorage to Juneau disappeared.

Nick Begich came to Washington from a career in Alaska as a businessman and educator. His prime interests however always seem to have been in the area of public service. From 1962 to 1968, he served as superintendent of schools for the Fort Richardson district. From 1964 until his election to Congress, he held a seat in the Alaska State Senate. Yet these offices only reflect a part of Nick Begich's involvement in public affairs, an involvement that was recognized in the bestowal of the VFW Community Service Award in 1963, and the NAACP Human Rights Award in 1964.

As a Member of the 92d Congress, Representative Begich continued to render admirable service to his State, sitting on the Committee for Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee for Public Works. He succeeded in securing funding for much-needed public works projects, and measures aiding and encouraging the development of various Alaskan industries. In addition, he pursued an active role in issues of broader national significance, sponsoring legislation dealing with defense, justice, and medicare, among other things.

During his brief tenure in the House of Representatives, Nich Begich showed himself to be a man of talent and ability, of industry and integrity, of dedication and purpose, in short, a legislator of great promise. His loss is to be greatly regretted. It is a loss not only to the State of Alaska, but also to the Congress and the country. Men such as Begich are the life-blood or our political system, the sources of its vitality. I am sure I speak for all the Members of this body when I say we deeply mourn Nick Begich, and extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Pegge and six children.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, rarely have this House and the people of the United States suffered such a grievous loss as we did in the accident in which my friend and colleague, the late Nick Begich of Alaska, lost his life.

Nick Begich died in service to his country. He was seeking reelection so he could continue pursuing those ideals and objectives to which he had dedicated his public service. He faced an exceedingly difficult task in reaching the people of the immense State of Alaska to exchange views, and the hazards of transportation involved were revealed all too clearly in the plane loss which robbed us of his dedicated commitment.

Nick was eager to work for and help his constituents. He was a crusader, ambitious to resolve the problems faced by the people of Alaska. As their lone U.S. Representative, he toiled long hours in pursuit of the far-sighted governmental programs necessary to continue the evolution of this great State from primitive wilderness to full participation in the economic destiny of our country.

He was energetic, resourceful, and wonderfully human. One of Nick's geniuses was his ability to get along with all those he met, whether humble or mighty. By his perseverance and sheer ability, he was able to accomplish many deeds in his short congressional career.

We had in common the fact that both of us represented States separated from what Alaskans call the "lower 48". Because Alaska and Hawaii shared many of the same kinds of problems, often Nick and I worked together on legislation to meet some mutual need of our respective States. I had many occasions to learn of his effectiveness as a legislator, as well as to know his cheerful personal camaraderie.

Nick performed with skill and distinction as a Representative able to enlist the Government in transforming the challenges of Alaska to solutions. Yet he was much more than this. He also had a keen perspective on his responsibilities as a national legislator, and he followed policies of great wisdom to benefit all the people of our country. He was imaginative and compassionate in seeking to meet the needs of the people, rather than powerful vested interests. He was a skillful lobbyist for the many in little-noticed areas where all too often the special interests of a few prevail.

Still young, Nick may have been destined for roles of even greater leadership had not the hand of fate dealt a tragic end. He was a truly great American and a splendid Representative of Alaska. We shall sorely miss Nick Begich.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those paying tribute to our friend and former colleague, the late Nick Begich. His disappearance and untimely death last year was indeed a shock.

During his brief career in Congress, Nick Begich displayed an avid interest in his work and a great dedication to the interests of the people of his district. He will long be remembered as one of our outstanding Congressmen—one who brought to his office a wisdom and judgement that distinguished his service in the House of Representatives.

The premature loss of this young, capable and dedicated legislator was, and continues to be, deeply felt by us all.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our colleague and friend, the late Nick Begich.

Nick Begich was an amazing man. With the support and assistance of his capable wife and a hardworking staff he was able to accomplish a great deal more than any other freshman Congressman in recent history.

When Nick came to Congress the Alaska Land Claims was a child of congressional neglect. Nick quickly sized up the situation and began to plan the brilliant strategy which resulted in the passage of the Land Claims Act during his first term in office.

Nick was able to carry through his plan because he was willing to work hard for his constituents and because of his ability to win the respect of the House membership. Few Congressmen have shown the ability to establish a coalition of such varied interests as Nick was able to do. In addition to the House leadership, Nick befriended many leading conservationists and used this friendship as an aid to insure immediate consideration of the Land Claims Act.

I was saddened to learn of his untimely death. The country lost a good leader and the people of Alaska lost a fine representative. His passing is a loss to us all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in honoring our late friend, Nick Begich, Representative from Alaska.

Nick served with us in Congress only a short time, but in that period, he made his presence known and felt. His work on the Alaskan Native Land Claims bill, which he considered his biggest accomplishment, resulted in the passage of legislation allotting 40 million acres to the Natives. Before Nick arrived and applied the pressure, the bill had been stalled in committee.

Political service filled most of Nick's time during the latter part of his life, when he served as an Alaskan State Senator and then as U.S. Representative. But during his political career, he did not forget the problems of American education with which he dealt during his years as a high school teacher in his home State of Minnesota, as principal and later as superintendent of schools in Fort Richardson, Alaska, and as a part-time instructor at the University of Alaska in Anchorage.

Nick voted against bills to delete aid to higher education and ethnic studies programs, and cosponsored legislation to assist the States in equalizing the quality of elementary and secondary education.

The gratitude of Nick's constituency for the concern he showed them was evident in their vote to reelect him last November when his plane was feared lost.

Although the shock of Nick's death has passed, the void it left for his family and friends will not go as quickly. The sharp edges of emptiness can perhaps be softened by the memories of the work Nick did and the knowledge that he will not be forgotten.

Like the Apostle Paul, Nick would accept death as a new beginning rather than as an end, I believe, Paul wrote:

If it is to be life in the flesh that means fruitful labor for me. Yet which I shall choose I cannot tell. I am hard pressed be-

tween the two. My desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better.

Today I remember Nick with a touch of sadness because he is gone, but also with joy because he was with us.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, Nick Begich, so tragically lost last fall in the Alaska he loved, was my friend in this Chamber and out.

He and I had our Washington homes in the same community. I knew his fine wife and their children. Nick and I worshipped at the same church. I have felt a deep personal loss since he is no longer among us.

Although Nick was serving his first term in the House, he already had earned the respect and good will of his colleagues. We miss him here and I, like others, will long remember him.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I had just begun the first day of fall campaigning at the gates of a San Diego industrial plant when I learned of the Alaskan air tragedy involving our majority leader and the man whose memory we honor this evening, Nick Begich.

That news added to the bleakness of a rainy October dawn. It signaled the loss not only of valued friends, but of a brand of leadership our Nation and our party can ill afford to give up.

Few first-year Members of Congress had left so imposing a mark as the youthful Begich. Here were the breadth of vision and, equally important, the vitality needed to represent a vast, emerging frontier State. We, of the west coast, think it a drain on our energies to move in comfort by airliner between Washington and the home district. How much greater the physical dedication to serving an area it takes twice as long to reach, and which itself spreads across 3 times the land space of California.

Nick Begich never felt self-pity on this account—indeed, he relished the prodigious work, accompanied by the lost sleep that goes with the job for a "gentleman from Alaska."

Those who served with him will long remember Nick.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House, we are always saddened by the death of one of our colleagues. But the tragedy is particularly painful in the case of Nick Begich, because he was so young and because he had such a bright future ahead of him.

Nick was a worker and a leader in everything he did. As a businessman, he built and managed apartment houses in Anchorage. As an educator, he served as a principal and later as superintendent of schools in Fort Richardson, and lectured in American history and Government at the University of Alaska for 12 years. As a legislator, he was chosen by his Democratic colleagues in the State senate as minority whip. As a community leader, he was honored for his work in promoting human rights.

These were some of the accomplishments that Nick brought to the House of Representatives in 1971. But at age 40, before the completion of his first term, a tragic accident took his life. We mourn him not only for what he was, but for what he would have become. For this was a young man with courage and ideals, who surely would have become an important and influential Member of the House.

I join with my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to Pegge Begich and her children. Our sense of loss is as great as theirs. My greatest hope is that we will see more men like Nick Begich in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Nick Begich gave a lot of himself to this Congress. He worked hard, taking his responsibilities with seriousness and devoting that extra effort to the people of his district and the welfare of the Nation.

I had an opportunity to work with him rather closely over some period of time. Many times we hear that Members are parochial in their interests, lacking both time and desire to involve themselves in matters immediately outside of their intimate interests. Nick Begich was an honorable exception to that claim.

Not too long ago a matter of great importance to my State and district came before the Congress. It revolved around Gateway National Park and Recreation Area. In New York, especially in the area of New York City, recreation space is at an absolute premium. What was incorporated in Gateway was essential, and we Members from that part of the country had to educate many other Members of the House as to the need for this facility.

I spoke to Nick, who served on the House Committee on the Interior, and who represented a district a continent away. He was interested, concerned and willing to help.

He took invaluable time and interested himself in our situation, lending unique talent and concern to our cumulative effort. That Gateway National Park and Recreation Area is now a reality to millions of people is in large part due to the efforts of Nick Begich.

We all know that he worked on behalf of his constituents and State with vigor, compassion, and honesty. In the too short time he served here, Nick left an impressive mark as a legislator, a friend, and a man.

Taken so tragically from us in the prime of his life, he has been missed keenly and will not be forgotten. To his wife and children I extend the sincere condolences at this time.

His State can be proud of him. This Congress can be proud of him. We shall continue to miss his presence and contributions.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, Nick Begich was a rare individual. He was a person of intellectual force and boundless energy. He was a person of genuine sincerity and modesty. Yet, at the same time, he had the spark of a true leader, the ability to draw men to him and to his vision.

One of the most gratifying aspects of my first term in Congress was working with Nick as a fellow first termer. He took a leading role in organizing the 92d Congress Democratic Congressional Club. He was held in such warm regard and sincere respect that he was made an officer of that group. For the same reasons he was also made the "freshman" representative on the steering committee of the Democratic Study Group.

Nick and I shared the same viewpoint on all of the key issues that came before the 92d Congress. But even when we differed on issues, as we did on some, he had the knack of arguing an issue without ever irritating or seeming to be irritated. He was a master of marshaling the facts and presenting them with clarity and persuasiveness. He relied on this rather than on emotionalism or other unworthy means of persuasion.

Nick was, as far as I can determine, universally liked by the Members of the House. To me he was a very good friend. It seemed impossible for a long time to believe that he had been suddenly taken from us.

In a very true sense his spirit and his vision for Alaska and for the country and the memory of his vital personality live and will continue to live among all of us who were so fortunate as to know and work with him.

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to pay tribute to our late colleague, Nick Begich of Alaska. Nick Begich, one who devoted himself totally and with unlimited energy to working for the benefit of his fellow human beings, was an extraordinary man. As a teacher, boys' counselor, principal, and superintendent of schools, Nick gave freely of himself, as not many men are able to do. When he became a State legislator in 1963, he contributed the same efforts to his work as a public servant that he had exerted, and continued to exert, as an educator. The extent and effectiveness of his dedicated service are evidenced by the awards he received: the Distinguished Alumni Service Award, St. Cloud State College; the Human Rights Award, NAACP; the VFW Community Service Award; the PTA Life Membership Award; Honorary Membership in the Filipino Community of Alaska, the Alaska branch of the American Federation of Government Employees, and the Alaska Native Brotherhood.

As one of my fellow freshmen in the 92d Congress, Nick tackled the monumental task of being the sole Representative from the young State of Alaska, which has so many needs and problems far different than those we encounter in the mainland States. Armed with a strong educational background in political science and with many years of experience in the Alaska State Senate, Congressman Begich served his State and his Nation with remarkable vigor and talent for almost 2 years. I only regret, as I know we all regret, that he was taken from us before he had the chance to make the contributions to our society which he so earnestly strived to make, and which would have made our world a better place for all of us.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join today in paying tribute to our friend and colleague, the late Nick Begich.

As the at-large Representative from Alaska and during his service in the House, before his tragic death, Nick quickly earned the esteem and respect of his colleagues. He was a fine man who gave untiringly and unselfishly of himself in dedicated service to the people of Alaska and our Nation.

Only 40 years old at the time of his

disappearance, Nick brought to the House of Representatives experience as an educator, businessman and as a member of the Alaskan State Senate. His interest in and knowledge of the problems of the Indians of Alaska, the national parks and public lands was of particular value to him and to the House Committees on Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs upon which he served.

Nick's efforts in support of the Native Claims Settlement Act is only one example of his admirable and dedicated service on behalf of the native people of the State of Alaska. He was an able Representative and will be missed by the people of Alaska and his colleagues in the House of Representatives.

To his wife, his children and other members of his family, Mrs. Flynt and I extend our condolences and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I admired my friend Nick Begich, who came to Congress with me, for many personal and professional reasons.

The personal reasons why I lament the tragic death of Nick Begich are many. But the personal association with Nick Begich which I shall cherish the most occurred on the evening of Sunday, March 5, 1971 when Nick Begich and his lovely wife Pegge came to a reception on my behalf amidst a wild New England snow storm. It was on that evening that I learned from the address of my fellow freshman Congressman about the intensity of his idealistic and moral purposes in coming to the Congress. Representative Begich spoke passionately about the necessity of reordering our priorities, of diminishing the enormous military budget and of enacting legislation which would bring adequate education and health benefits to all of the citizens of America.

I worked closely with Nick Begich on a number of issues. I joined him in his opposition to the detonation of the nuclear blast off the coast of Alaska in the project called Cannikin. I sought and followed his counsel with regard to the historic bill enacted in the 92d Congress which after many decades finally settled the claims of the native Alaskans. Congressman Begich was a conferee on that landmark legislation and in that capacity spent what seemed to be countless days in settling long disputed points between the Senate and House versions of a monumental bill designed to finalize decisions to protect the human, the economic and the environmental interests of the people of Alaska.

Nick Begich had a distinguished career even before becoming a member of the 92d Congress. He obtained his MA in Educational Administration and Political Science from the University of Minnesota in 1954. He was finishing his doctorate work at the University of Colorado when he went to Alaska with his new bride in 1956 to become an instructor at the University of Alaska in Anchorage. During the years that followed Nick Begich was a principal of a high school for 4 years, the superintendent of schools for 5 years in Fort Richardson and a member of the Alaska State Senate from 1963–71. He served as minority whip of the State Senate in the years 1967–71.

Nick Begich came to the Congress after his election on November 3, 1970 because of his profound devotion to the State and the people of Alaska. He was happiest when we could inform his colleagues in the Congress about the problems and the fantastic potential of his adopted State. He took the long and immensely tiring trip to Alaska as often as he could.

It was a tragedy beyond description for the State of Alaska, for the Congress of the United States and for all of us that Nick Begich died tragically at the age of 40. I shall always be indebted to him and devoted to all of the admirable ideals to which he devoted the work of his lifetime. Our prayerful and compassionate feeling goes to Nick Begich's wife Pegge and to his six children, Nichelle, Nicholas, Thomas, Mark, Stephanie and Paul.

The memory of Congressman Nick Begich will always be held in everlasting benediction by those who knew him and loved him.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to convey the profound feelings one has over the tragic and premature death of our colleague, Nick Begich.

I could insert reams of material concerning Nick's leadership and dedication to service both in the Alaska legislature and as a Member of Congress and tell of Nick's wife and young family which he has left behind. All deserve mention.

The tragedy is that a rising young Congressman was killed in an airplane crash trying to fulfill his duties in his own State and at the same time be an effective legislator in the House of Representatives. We will never know what Nick's potential might have given our country.

But even in the short time Nick was with us as a Member, he gave us all a heightened desire to make the system work and bring new ideas and concepts into the staid halls of Congress. We can consider ourselves fortunate we knew Nick and worked with him. Some of his frontier spirit rubbed off on many of us who had thought the frontier was no more.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness and pride that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our former colleague, the late Nick Begich of Alaska, whose career was snuffed out last October when the plane in which he was riding with our late Majority Leader Hale Boggs, disappeared.

Shortly after Nick came to Congress I had a very personal acquaintance with him. After arriving in Washington I had the pleasure and privilege of serving with him on the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as in our deliberations on important legislation in the Halls of Congress. I was also privileged to know him socially and found him to be an intelligent, responsive Representative of the great State of Alaska.

I found him to be a very able Legislator, a man who represented his State and his people in an outstanding, dedicated manner. I feel that he would have had a long and brillant career in the Congress had he not lost his life so tragically.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his beloved wife and the members of his family, who suffered a great personal loss.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my profound sorrow over the loss of our colleague from Alaska, Nick Begich. The circumstances surrounding his untimely death are familiar to everyone. It was indeed a tragic loss not only for his wife Pegge and their six children, but also for his fellow Members of Congress and the Nation.

Nick served his State well and left a record of which he and any of us can be proud. His near-perfect record of attendance attests to his dedication. He was always willing to devote his energies to fighting for legislation on issues in which he deeply believed. Nick was in the forefront when it came to civil rights, education, the environment, and ending American involvement in Southeast Asia. Words seem inadequate in trying to assess his contributions to his State and to his country.

In his short time on Capitol Hill, Nick Begich contributed a great deal. We will never know how far he might have gone or what great deeds he might have accomplished had his life not ended so suddenly. One thing is certain—I will miss him and treasure his memory always.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my friend and colleague, Nick Begich of Alaska.

When Nick came to Congress in 1970 he already had a long record of public service for his adopted State. He served for 8 years in the Alaska State Senate and for his hard work as chairman of the Health, Education, and Welfare Committee he earned the title of "Mr. Education." Here in the Congress we knew him as a dedicated and tireless legislator. During the 92d Congress Nick was a member of two committees and eight subcommittees, truly an extraordinary workload for a freshman representative. Many of us knew him best for his outstanding contributions to the Democratic Study Group where he served as the first freshman member of the executive committee.

Nick Begich was on the threshold of a great career in public service. He accomplished more at the age of 38 than most men do in a lifetime and he was surely on the way to a future full of exemplary service to his State and his country.

Tragically Nick Begich was not given the chance to fullfill his great promise. All of us on the Hill feel the loss of his energy and ability, but more than that, we miss him as a friend. I hope that his wife and six children can find some consolation in happy memories of their husband and father.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is never a happy occasion when we set aside time to eulogize our colleagues. But there is comfort in cataloging the accomplishments of long lives well spent, lives in which promise was fulfilled.

The tragedy of Nick Begich's disappearance leaves no such comfort. He has been denied fufillment of his promise. He accomplished much, though a young

man, and was on his way to greater achievements. He was here just a short time, but it was evident his presence was a positive driving force. His compassion and commonsense as well as his breadth of knowledge were always productive in debate.

Representing the State of Alaska is not an easy task, for its problems and needs are unique in this Nation. Like so many Alaskans, Congressman Begich was born elsewhere, but once settled in, he came to love and revere the beauty and splendor of his State. He was proud to represent Alaska and spoke forcefully in its favor and for its people. Alaska and the Nation were well served by his presence in this Chamber.

My sympathies and thoughts are with his wife, Pegge, and their six children, and I share their grief. We miss Nick Begich as a Member of this body, and we miss him as well as a good human being and a fine man.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have gathered here today to pay tribute to our distinguished friend and colleague, Nick Begich, and to express profound sorrow for his untimely death.

Nick was not only an outstanding person in private life, he was also a dedicated statesman for he was responsive to the needs of the people. His sensitivity and understanding drew the respect of all of those who knew him. It is unfortunate that Nick was unable to finish his work.

It is most difficult to adequately express how deeply distressed we are by his death. Nothing I say can replace the loss we feel or fill the void caused by his absence. But I wish to join with my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his wife, Pegge, his children and all of his family and friends. I share in their sorrow and hope that they may find some small consolation in knowing that he will always be fondly remembered.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this day we are again recounting our recollections of a deceased colleague. Senator SAM ERVIN recently described us as fellow travellers to the tomb. Because we are, we should not be surprised at the frequency with which, in a body this large, we are called upon to memorialize the lives of Members. But recognizing our mortality does not make this task easier. And it is an especially difficult task when the colleague we honor was killed in the prime of life, at the outset of a promising congressional career.

I think this describes Nick Begich's situation precisely. We know that he and our respected majority leader, Hale Boggs, were aboard an aircraft that was lost on a flight between Anchorage and Juneau in the State Nick represented so well and so briefly—Alaska. Nothing further has been heard of that plane.

Nick was 40 years old at his death. He had been elected as Alaska's only House Member in 1970 and served through most of the 92d Congress. He was posthumously elected to this 93d Congress.

Nick and I shared several things in common and this mutuality of interest and background always compound and intensify the feeling of loss experienced when a colleague dies.

We proudly shared the label of liberal Democrat. Each of us headed Kennedy-Johnson campaign committees in 1960. Both of us were members of the Democratic Study Group Executive Committee, Nick being the first freshman to have these duties. We both were natives of Minnesota and both of us attended and received graduate degrees from the State university. We both served in our State legislatures before coming to Washington.

But it was Nick's dedication to the enactment of a fair Alaska Native claims settlement bill and my interest in this and other legislation concerning native Americans that represent my closest identification with Nick. The pages of the October and December 1971 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD testify to the effectiveness with which Nick pursued his goal. Without a doubt his effort on the Native claims bill was the high point of his brief career in the House. But the important thing to remember is that while it may have been a high point of a brief career, it was a high point seldom reached by many long-term Members of this body.

During the debate on the conference report on the Alaskan Native claims bill, the majority leader voiced his assessment of Nick Begich's role in steering the bill through the legislative shoals. Tributes to Nick Begich were also expressed by others who worked with him on the bill, members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. It is ironic that so soon after these tributes to a young active colleague were expressed we should be honoring his memory.

Perhaps others will also quote what Majority Leader Boggs said about Nick Begich on December 14, 1971. But these words bear repetition and I close my remarks with them. They say much about the man we honor here today. And they may also explain, in part, why the majority leader journeyed to Alaska to campaign for Nick.

We have lost a valued colleague. His wife and children have lost a devoted husband and father. His constituents have lost a talented spokesman. We are all diminished.

Mr. Boggs' remarks of December 14, 1971 follow:

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a very special tribute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Begich). It is the rarest of circumstances when a freshman Congressman, as the only Congressman from his State, is confronted with a challenge of this magnitude, and one which is so crucial to the future of his State. It is all that much rarer for such a man to successfully answer such a challenge, but that is what Nick Begich has done.

The people of Alaska, every one of them, are fortunate to have such a man in Congress. On every bill, there is the temptation to represent only one interest, but Nick Begich absolutely refused to yield to such a persuasion. He represented one purpose throughout the consideration of the Native land claims bill, and that was the best interests of all Alaskans and all Americans. He has my respect for the job he has done.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to honor my former colleague and friend, Nick Begich. In the 2 short years of his term as Representative of the people of Alaska, he demonstrated the talent and the promise of being an outstanding Member of the House.

It was my privilege to know well both Nick and his delightful wife, Pegge. Since my district falls in the closest neighboring State of the lower 48, we worked together on legislation of mutual concern.

Perhaps the clearest indication of his promise and sensitivity was his leading role in passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Act. To do the job he did on such major legislation during his freshman term deserved the admiration of all of us.

His loss is a tragedy both to the people of Alaska and the Nation. It has already been felt in Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the pleasure of knowing and serving with the late Nick Begich knew a man of deep compassion, great intellect, and unswerving loyalty and devotion to the people of Alaska and their special needs.

His service here in the House of Representatives, though brief, was marked by his skill and mastery of the legislative process and by his ability to educate and enlighten us on the uniqueness of the problems of Alaska. His talent was illustrated by the enactment of the Alaskan Native Claims Act in which he forged a coalition of the diverse groups and interests in Alaska to provide both equity for the Eskimos and Aleuts, and for protection of the great natural resources of his State.

Nick and I served on the Public Works Committee where we worked closely on projects of mutual interest—specifically, water pollution control legislation, and proposals to create employment by constructing needed schools, hospitals, nursing homes, and community structures. It was at that time that I was asked by Chairman JOHN BLATNIK to chair a special Public Works Subcommittee which was charged with the responsibility of conducting a brief on-site investigation of the progress and the future possibilities of public works projects in Alaska.

As the sole Representative in the House from Alaska, Nick coordinated the subcommittee's activities and helped determine the agenda and the locale of the hearings. I was especially impressed by the love he shared with the people, of the great beauty and the great potential of our 49th State.

As I returned from the investigation, I recall how my outlook—my conception of Alaska—had changed, primarily due to the influence of Nick. Until one has actually been to Alaska, it is difficult to understand the vastness, the dangers, and the promise of this great land. He showed me a side of Alaska that could only be shown by one who really cared and really understood the area and the people, and I believe that all of us who knew him came to share that concern.

We in the House of Representatives miss the talents and creativity of the late Nick Begich, and both Alaska and the Nation miss his many contributions. But, surely, this Earth is a better place today because of the dedication and the service of Nick Begich.

I join with my colleagues in this tribute to Nick, and Lee and I join in wishing nothing but the best for his widow Pegge and their six children.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly in tribute to the late Nick Begich of Alaska.

When I first heard the news about the disappearance of the airplane carrying Hale Boggs and Nick Begich, I was shocked and dismayed. As the days grew into weeks and it became obvious that the plane could not be located, my dismay turned to sadness. I knew Nick personally, and knew him well. We had shared with each other many of the problems we faced in serving enormously large and geographically diverse congressional districts. I had worked closely with him on a number of issues, and was always impressed with his wide-ranging knowledge and willingness to pitch right into difficult matters. Above all, I think, I was impressed by his quiet independence, and his imaginative approaches to the difficult problems confronting Alaska and the nation.

Mr. Speaker, in this Nation of ours, we like to judge a man not by what he is, but by what he does or has done. On that basis, Nick Begich certainly distinguished himself. His list of accomplishments is long and rich. He proved himself extremely competent as a freshman Congressman. He worked long and hard as a teacher, school administrator, and legislator in Alaska. He was innovative and successful as a teacher, and was able to continue that success in his work, in business, and in the legislature. There is an inscription on Christopher Wren's tomb in England which says: "If you seek a monument, just look around." If we need to find a monument to Nick Begich, I think all we have to do is look around. His work, and his accomplishments, are still with us; there can be no better tribute.

All of this is little comfort to Nick's wonderful family. To Pegge and the children, Mrs. Ullman and I offer our heartfelt condolences.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying highest tribute to Nick Begich, Congressman from Alaska, whose brilliant future in the House was tragically ended when his airplane disappeared in Alaska last fall.

Nick was my friend, respected colleague, and more—he was like my younger brother. He grew up in Eveleth, a town close to my own hometown of Chisholm, on Minnesota's Mesabi Iron Range. I watched him grow to manhood—saw boyish idealism become the steely determination to serve his fellowman with his full talents and abilities.

Like everyone who knew him, I was early impressed by Nick's sincerity, his alertness and awareness of what ought to be done—and by his dedication, determination and sense of duty—and his incredible energy.

Nick Begich and I were a generation apart in time, but we were friends from the first day we met, and our lives ran a strangely parallel course but about 20-some years apart.

We were both sons of immigrant parents; our fathers worked in the iron ore mines of the Mesabi Range. Nick and I both worked our way through Minnesota State Teachers College—I at Winona State and he at St. Cloud State. But it took me 4 years; and Nick only 2½ to get a teachers degree and certificate.

We, then, both taught school for several years—20 some years apart—I, in the thirties, he in the fifties. Likewise we then started our political careers in our respective State senates.

Nick was only 24 when he pulled up stakes and moved to Alaska in 1956, but he was already a veteran of 4 years of high school teaching in Minnesota and he brought his zeal for education along with him.

He devoted the remaining years of his life to promoting the education of Alaska's youth, both in the school system in Anchorage, and in the State senate.

I hope I may be permitted a few moments of indulging in sentimental reminiscing, for it brings back many memories of close friendships that were brought together a quarter of a century later in time. I was still a schoolteacher in 1940 when I was first elected to the Minnesota State Senate, as Minnesota's youngest State Senator. I mention it only because in that same year Hale Boggs, at the age of 26, was elected to the 77th Congress as the youngest Democrat, Nick Begich, at that time, was an 8-year-old elementary school student in Eleventh. Little did any of the three of us realize that while starting at the same time, but widely separated geographically, our lifelines would converge in the Halls of Congress in Washington, D.C., and later end for two of them in our northern-most State of Alaska. Hale Boggs and I then served in World War II, and strangely enough in 1946 he was reelected to Congress by his Second District in the city of New Orleans, and I was elected to the 80th Congress for my first term from northeastern Minnesota.

It was 10 years later, in 1956, that Nick Begich moved to Alaska where, as I mentioned earlier, he gave such splendid leadership in the field of education both as a teacher, school administrator, and later State senator.

Nick was elected to the Alaska State Senate in 1962—22 years after Hale Boggs was elected to Congress and I was elected to the Minnesota State Senate in 1940.

Nick's active mind and his sense of duty and awareness of the great needs to be met attracted him to the political arena and I encouraged him to enter politics. He made his first run in 1968 and made a creditable showing but fell short. We encouraged him to continue, somehow feeling how great was his potential for public duty and service to the people.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY went up to speak in behalf of Nick. I made two trips to Alaska and finally Speaker CARL ALBERT gave the final push that helped Nick be elected to the 92d Congress in 1970—30 years almost to the day that John A. Blatnik was elected to the Minnesota State Senate in 1940 and Hale Boggs was elected to the U.S. Congress.

Nick was deeply and effectively involved in everything that touched the lives of all our people—and above all, he was always loyal to his friends, and deeply loved his family—Pegge Jendro, and their six lovely, bright children, and his parents, and two brothers and one sister—all dear friends of mine.

He will be long remembered for his remarkable accomplishments in Washington where, in his first year in Congress, he won passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Act.

He served on the Public Works Committee, which I have the honor to chair; and I have never seen a Congressman more dedicated to his work, both in committee and on the floor; or more determined to represent the people of Alaska, and to make the full Government serve them as he did.

Much, much more could be said of Nick Begich's public service, not only to his State but to the Nation, in environmental legislation, consumer protection, civil rights, labor, and a long list of other issues.

Brief as was his term with us here, it was crowded with achievements many of us do not attain in a lifetime.

He is the only freshman ever to serve on the Democratic Study Group Executive Committee, where he added his leadership and commitment to liberal reform.

We here today confidently tell each other that the past is prolog; and for us, at this moment, that statement is true.

For Nick, prolog was everything, but he seized the lead from the first parting of the curtain. and played it better than many.

A portion of this stage, the House of Representatives, will remain dark now, as will a part of all of us who were privileged to know him.

Nick Begich was an uncommon man, and one of the most promising Congressmen I have ever met. He left us with much of his promise still unrealized.

We take this opportunity to officially commemorate, once again, a great man, and through him, the people of Alaska and our many Minnesotans whom he served living there, so well.

We, as well as the people of Alaska who chose him to represent them, have known true greatness; and, having known it, the memory remains vivid.

We will not forget Nick, or his achievements.

The people of Alaska, whose lives he changed materially, will not forget him.

Nick has left us all with a higher standard of expectation, and of performance.

Nick was a splendid man, who truly served his fellowman in every sense of the word—but, above all, he was my friend, as Hale Boggs, and I shall always miss them more deeply than I can ever adequately say.

I shall remember them both always in the words of a long ago poet, as one of those shining young men "who died in their glory and never will be old."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join in these tributes to the Honorable Nick Begich. Nick's disappearance, along with our great majority leader, Hale Boggs, was a

tragedy not only for his family, but for all of us in the House of Representatives and indeed for the whole State of Alaska.

Nick made a tremendous impression in his all-too-brief service in the House. His enthusiasm was heart-warming, and it was always a signal pleasure to be associated with him on any legislative matter. I greatly regret that I did not have more opportunities of this character.

My wife and I extend to Mrs. Begich and the Begich family our deep sympathy in their loss. May they take some comfort in the fact that Nick Begich had so many friends and admirers.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues tonight in remembrance of our colleague from Alaska, the Honorable Nick Begich. He was truly one of the bright stars of the 92d Congress—a leader of the freshman class in that Congress.

He was a man of infinite promise and potential. He had the youth and exuberance that one would expect from the Representative of our last frontier, last wilderness State. He was dedicated to the service of the people of his State and to the good of the whole Nation.

It is symbolic of our country that Alaska, the 49th State, is made of the various diverse peoples and nationalities which settled our Nation. It is symbolic that this State chose as one of its first Representatives a man whose ancestors had emigrated to the New World from Croatia. One of the largest centers of American-Croatian citizenry in the United States is in my Congressional District. I remember being with Nick in Cleveland once when he spoke to a fraternal group—and I can remember how much he impressed his audience there—as he impressed all of us here—with his drive, with his purposefulness, with his dedication to his country.

My wife and I had occasion to be with Nick and his charming wife on several occasions at our home. We will always remember him as the brave young crusader and fighter—for the betterment of Alaska and the Nation.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Nick Begich probably accomplished more in his short time as a Congressman than any member in a comparable period. He was a shrewd, persistent, knowledgeable legislator who represented his people with fidelity and skill.

I sat near Nick all during the important and often heated deliberations of the Interior Committee on the Alaska Native claims legislation. He often came to my office for consultation and advice though we took different positions on main facets of that bill. I found him resourceful and a man of his word at all times.

The death of Nick Begich was a tragedy not only to his family and his State, but to the country, and to this House. Nick was the kind of legislator who would have helped so much in elevating and improving the Congress and the legislative process. He was an idealist, and yet a practitioner of the possible. We all miss him.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in eulogizing Nick Begich, a stalwart spokesman for the people of Alaska, late a Member of this House, who disappeared last fall while campaigning for reelection to this body with our dear friend Hale Boggs.

Mr. Speaker, the Almighty works in strange ways and for reasons of His own He took Nick Begich from us at the age of 40. All of us in the House know that Nick would have served in the Congress for many years had not fate intervened. A singularly useful legislator, he was making a name for himself across the Nation as a young man deeply concerned with the problems that face us and willing to work toward solutions.

Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss Nick Begich and I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow, Pegge, and to their six surviving children. May Almighty God look down upon him and may perpetual light shine upon him.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sincere and heartfelt sorrow about the tragic loss of our dear friend and colleague, Nick Begich of Alaska.

In the short time that Nick Begich was a Member of this body, I grew to admire and respect him. We served together on the same committee. Nick Begich was genuinely concerned about the welfare of his beloved State of Alaska and worked diligently to serve his constituents. His outstanding record of public service is an inspiration to all of us. Nick Begich was a man of compassion and concern, he was a man of integrity and a man of superior intellect. I consider it a rare privilege and a memory I shall long cherish to have known and worked with Nick Begich.

To his lovely wife, Pegge, and to their six children, Nichelle, Nick, Tom, Mark, Stephanie, and Paul, I offer my heartfelt condolences. It was his love and devotion for his wonderful wife and family that shall be Nick Begich's greatest memorial.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today in Griffin, Ga., our State's little league baseball championship is getting underway. This event has a special meaning to me as my youngest son, Fred, is a member of one of the teams participating in the championship series.

And, because of this, I am reminded of a conversation which I had with our late colleague, Nick Begich, just prior to his tragic loss last year.

Walking with Nick through the subway from the Capitol to the Cannon Building our conversation turned to one of my favorite topics—baseball. I eagerly recounted to Nick just how much we in Georgia play the game and how fortunate we were to have an exceptional number of motivated youngsters as well as a warm climate which is greatly beneficial to playing.

Then, much to my surprise, Nick told me just how well the young men in Alaska play baseball. He was extremely proud not only of the fact that the game was being played in his State, but, more importantly, that it was being played to a high degree of excellence.

During his service in this Chamber Nick Begich gained our respect for his tireless and dedicated work. He never once missed an opportunity to speak out on behalf of the people of Alaska—not even when walking down the hall with one of his Southern colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with all of our colleagues in paying tribute to Nick Begich. His absence from this body will be long felt and I certainly share this deep genuine loss with his wife and children and the Alaskan people.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague and friend, Nick Begich.

In my years in Congress, I have had the pleasure of working with many bright, young Members having high ideals, almost unlimited energy, and great ambition—in the best sense of the word. One of the finest of these able young men was the articulate spokesman for Alaska.

It was the Nation's immediate loss when we lost our majority leader—the late Hale Boggs. He was well known, highly respected, and well liked by people all over the country. But it was an equally great tragedy that we lost a bright, young man who offered great promise and potential as a future leader for the Nation.

As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Nick Begich showed great talent as a legislator. Not only did he show perception in asking key questions on proposals before the committee, but he showed leadership in guiding through the committee one of the major legislative accomplishments of the 92d Congress—the Alaska Native Land Claims Act.

Nick's work was not selfishly motivated. He worked diligently as a member of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation on projects of all kinds, but he never forgot to get in a pitch for the interests of his constituents whenever the opportunity arose. Just a short time before his last trip to Alaska, he successfully pressed our subcommittee to consider—and convinced us to approve—legislation enlarging and improving the Sitka National Monument in his home State.

Mr. Speaker, besides being a hard worker, an able advocate, and a constructive legislator, Nick Begich was the kind of a person everyone likes to have as a friend. He added warmth and enthusiasm to the legislative process. To him every day was a challenge and an opportunity. Together with his wife, Pegge, he could bring light into a dark day, a smile to your face, and turn a cold room into a warm, friendly place.

As a colleague, Nick Begich was tops. He understood the legislative process and its problems—he did not fight it, he worked with it—and he usually succeeded. As a friend, we could work and laugh together—perhaps we might disagree on an issue, but when the debate was over and the votes were counted we were still friends. Our loss is beyond words, but the memory of this man and the mark which he made in all of our hearts will remain with us in the years ahead.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to join with my colleagues in

honoring the memory of our colleague, Nick Begich. I am proud to have known Nick, to have entered the House with him in the 92d Congress and to have had the privilege of working with him.

Although our acquaintance was much too brief, I was deeply impressed with Nick's boundless energy, his dedication, and perseverance and his effectiveness as a legislator, even as a freshman. He came to the Congress after a distinguished career as an educator and State legislator and very ably represented the vastness of his State. A tribute to the tireless and effective efforts of Nick Begich was the passage of the Alaska National Land Claims Act, a measure which had languished in the Congress for some 6 years before his arrival.

Nick Begich had a bright and most promising career before him and there is no question, but that he is sorely missed in these halls. His premature loss is a great tragedy—for his family, his State, and his country.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 9 months since our friend and colleague, Nick Begich, failed to return from a flight over Alaska. The passage of time has not lessened the tragedy that struck his family, his State, and the Nation that day. Indeed, it has only demonstrated the extent of the loss we have suffered, because of his passing.

Nick Begich, after only one term in the House, had established himself as a conscientious legislator, dedicated to the welfare of his State and his country. He served with distinction on the Public Works Committee, and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, vigorously and successfully fighting for legislation to benefit the citizens of his State.

Nick's devotion to his work, which he pursued with uncommon energy and enthusiasm, helped him make his mark in the House. He had wisdom beyond his years, and his opinions were greatly respected by all who knew him. It is men and women like Nick Begich who will turn the promise of a great American future into a reality. It is indeed tragic that his life was cut short at the very time that he was working so vigorously for constructive progress and change. It is with great respect and admiration for the late Nick Begich that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to him today.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the loss of great leaders has been felt by this country throughout our history. They have been tragic losses, known by all, touching all hearts. But the loss of a potentially great leader, an inspiring beginner, an idealist with the ability to place dreams in a working perspective, a man such as Nick Begich, seems the most tragic loss of all.

Nick Begich was a workingman, dedicated and devoted to the ideals of his country, the preservation of his great State, and the welfare of its people. Although he was a Member of this House for barely 9 months, his accomplishments proved him to be one of the most active and conscientious freshman legislators in recent history.

He worked for better education, he worked for legislation to include environmental protection relating to the Alaskan pipeline, he was vice-chairman of the DSG and the Indian Education Task Force; just a few of the many accomplishments signifying his dedication to the ideals he held so high.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to join my colleagues in honoring the late Nick Begich, a truly great legislator.

Mr. ZWACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying special tribute to Nick Begich.

Nick was born in our great State of Minnesota and was a distinguished alumnus of St. Cloud State College in our Sixth Congressional District. He was an outstanding example of the quality of citizens we have in Minnesota.

The last time Nick and I walked to the Capitol from our offices on the fifth floor of the Longworth Building was the Friday in October before he was to be honored as the alumnus of the year at St. Cloud State College. We discussed Minnesota and the upcoming homecoming of the college. We were both scheduled to ride in the homecoming parade but were detained in Washington and could not make it.

The next Monday Nick's plane was lost.

I have and shall continue to miss Nick's presence in the House of Representatives very much. Even though we sat on opposite sides of the aisle, our friendship crossed party lines.

I will always remember Nick as one of the finest colleagues with whom I have served. He did an effective job for his district. I shall always feel proud that this distinguished man had his roots in our great State of Minnesota.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, while on an official leave of absence with our Science and Astronautics Subcommittee on International Cooperation in Science and Space in Moscow and Japan, I regrettably missed the special order honoring our former colleague, the late Honorable Nick Begich of Alaska. I, therefore, appreciate the opportunity to join in this well-deserved tribute through the insertion of my memoriam to Nick in today's historic journal of Congress.

Nick was a junior freshman to me by 1 year—having joined the Congress 1 year after I took office—and I will never forget the warmth of the exchange of views and the friendship and understanding that kindled between us in the brief time that I had the good fortune to know him.

He was a great American statesman himself, but always expressed awe and appreciation for the leaders and makers of history in our Government. I will always remember his great admiration for Presidents Truman and Kennedy especially.

I too now stand in awe of his many accomplishments as an educator, businessman, and all-too-brief career as a Congressman. As my colleague on the Public Works Committee I was able to observe firsthand the quality of his leadership and the richness of his wisdom in his quest for answers to the problems to meet the needs of our people.

It is difficult and incredulous to understand his tragic disappearance cutting off his expertise in the middle of our deliberations here in the Congress, at such a young age in our society. He is indeed sorely missed by all of us who had the good fortune to know him.

He served his country with distinction and honor and was a credit to his family and the constituency he represented here in the House of Representatives. Our Nation is indeed grateful for his dynamic and courageous endeavors in outstanding public service to the citizens of his congressional district and the United States of America.

Words are inadequate to fill the void of his great loss—but I do trust that his wife, Pegge, and his children, Nichelle, Nicholas, Thomas, Mark, Stephanie, and Paul will soon find abiding comfort in the faith that God has given them and in the knowledge that the Honorable Nick Begich is now under His loving care.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to express my deepest sympathy and profound homage to a great American.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to the late Nick Begich who served his constituents and his Nation with great effectiveness, distinction, and accomplishment.

While Nick was afforded the opportunity of serving only one term in the House of Representatives, he exhibited to all of us a devotion to duty that should serve as a goal for all present and future Members of Congress.

No more fitting memorial could be left to us and to those near and dear to him than the knowledge that Nick Begich was a man of complete devotion to the duties bestowed upon him by the people of the State of Alaska.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss that I join in paying tribute to the late Honorable Nick Begich. His service in the U.S. House of Representatives was all too brief, but his accomplishments were many.

It has been just a little less than a year since I had the opportunity to be in Alaska to speak at a banquet of the American Federation of Government Employees in Anchorage. Nick had persuaded me to accept their invitation, and I was struck by his dedication to the Federal employees. No one knew better than he did the adverse conditions for workers in Alaska and no one cared more about their welfare.

My remarks at the banquet contained a good bit of sincere praise for Congressman Nick Begich, and I would like to repeat it here.

These tributes should not be treated lightly. They are well deserved. For in today's world of self-declared expertise, instant criticism, and self-imposed blindness, one often loses sight of the tremendous service performed by the civil servant and by outstanding Congressmen such as Nick Begich.

Before I discuss with you those legislative matters in which you are deeply interested, I would like to tell you about your own Congressman, Nick Begich.

He has one of the most unique Congressional jobs. As the lone Congressman from a State as large and complex as Alaska, he does not have the same freedoms that a Congressman from another State might have to choose his issues.

In a State with ten or twenty Congressmen,

a trend often develops that one man might specialize in health care, while another chooses foreign policy or education, For Nick Begich, and Alaska, this isn't possible—he must do the whole job, and there are some things about him that make certain he does it well.

First, Nick has a clear view of Alaska's priorities. From the very first day he came to Congress, back in January of 1971, he knew that the Alaska Native Land Claims would be his first job.

He knew that he had to do all that was necessary to get progress on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline project, and to make it a safe project environmentally.

He knew he has to deal with Alaska's unemployment, which is usually at least double that of the rest of the nation.

He knew he had to gain better water and sewer systems and other community services throughout Alaska, and to make new jobs while doing so.

He knew he had to improve the transportation system in Alaska by working on a bill to allow Alaska's beautiful ferry, the WICKERSHAM, to operate with a waiver of the Jones Act, and by working with the C.A.B. on the Alaska air service cases.

He also knew how vital the needs of government employees were, but I want to say more about that later.

Very rarely has a freshman gone after his committee assignments as Nick Begich did. He knew that Interior and Public Works were the key committees for Alaska, and he never let up in seeking them. Of course, he won. Since a Member is limited to two, Nick had to skip others which were vital, such as Merchant Marine and Fisheries and my own Post Office and Civil Service, but he is like an extra committee member on both of those and others.

Next, anyone who watches Nick sees immediately that he believes idealism is worthless without hard work. I understand Nick has a voting record of over 99 percent. I can add to the fact that he attends about 99 percent of all his committee meetings as well.

Perhaps you don't understand why that is so important, but let me tell you it is vital. First, it means Alaska is *always* represented, even with its single Member. Next, it means that Nick is there when someone else's problems are considered, and as a colleague I respect that.

Another factor of crucial importance is that Nick Begich insists on getting his colleagues to Alaska. The fact that the Speaker of the House Carl Albert and Public Works Chairman Blatnik have come to Alaska for Nick is amazing.

Now I understand our distinguished majority leader, Hale Boggs, is coming, and, of course, he had talked me into coming to see the government employees of Alaska.

I can tell you that, one year ago, I never thought I would be here but I am, and it is as important to see why Alaska is different—as your Congressman said it would be. Also, I think I can hint that Nick has some surprises in store for future visits.

To conclude these thoughts, let me say that Nick has been incredibly successful.

After years of failure on the part of others, the land claims bill—and a good one—passed overwhelmingly in the House during the first year that he was in office. Before Nick Begich came, such a bill had never been reported out of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee.

Nick's bill to secure a waiver of the Jones Act which allows the WICKERSHAM to operate between all ports in Alaska was also passed, and there are vital public works projects moving forward for every area in the State.

Your Congressman has done so much in such a short time that I recall when the Wickersham bill came before the full House, only a short time after the Native Land Claims bills, Members were shaking their heads and going over to joke with Nick that "he was getting too much."

He just tells us it is a big state.

Travel to Alaska, across the width of our continent, is a major undertaking, to my way of thinking. Yet Nick took it in stride, as part of his duty to his constituents and their interests—even during the major airline strikes, when delays drove ordinary people to distraction, Nick considered the sacrifices a part of his service.

During my visit, I had the pleasure of meeting his lovely wife and family, and felt the closeness of their relationship. Our hearts and our thoughts go out to them and we share their sadness.

Alaska is indeed a big State, and Nick Begich was a big man who represented it in a big way. I am sure that we all thought of him yesterday, when the trans-Alaska pipeline bill was passed—even though he is gone, much of the impetus for passage was his. He will be greatly missed.

Mrs. Dulski and I extend our sincerest condolences to the Begich family.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Nick Begich. I do not believe this Chamber has seen many freshman Members who were as knowledgeable and effective on legislative matters as was Nick. While always striving to serve his Alaskan constituents to the best of his ability, Nick also grasped the wider implications of measures presented to this body and served the entire Nation well.

I was privileged to serve with Nick on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 92d Congress, and learned to appreciate his personal qualities of kindness, humor and ability when we were working together so closely on the Alaska Native claims legislation. Nick showed a keenness of mind and an understanding of the intricacies of this bill that could only come from deep study and personal involvement with the issues. Without his counsel, we would have had a rough time moving this urgent legislation through the committee and the House.

Early this year, I traveled to Alaska as a representative of the House of Representatives at a tribute for Nick. I was impressed by the high respect in which Nick was held in his home State.

The State of Alaska has lost an effective Representative; America has lost an able legislator; and I have lost a good and valued friend. But our loss cannot compare with that of the charming and brave Pegge Begich and her children, and to them I again express my sorrow and regret at Nick's untimely death and my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add a word to what has been said, so well said.

I think perhaps FRANK EVANS had in mind what I had, and that is that if there was any one quality that Nick brought to us, to this House and therefore to the country, it was a sense of joy in his work and in his mission; a kind of gladness, as if it was the most natural thing to come down here and wrest from 434 other Members effective answers to the complex problems of Alaska and the Nation.

He had a kind of zest for that. I remember best, really, his eyes. In his eyes was this haunting combination of curiosity, insistence, compassion and a kind of belief that the answers he would get would be the ones he wanted. It was very difficult, really, to look at Nick's eyes and see "Yes" written there, and say "No."

And he did it all with such a keen, clear spirit. His character and personality were a tremendous credit to a great many people we have never met.

One philosopher has written that every man, every human being is the tip of a pyramid, an invisible pyramid of hopes, plans, character, and bloodlines of men and women who have gone before and from whom he descends. We cannot know those people, but we know they must have been sturdy and strong, uncommonly wise, great people; for certainly, he was.

So, I join my colleagues in hoping very much that his wife Pegge and his children and family will bear in mind that that is how we will ever think of him and all who were close to him.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay humble tribute to the memory of my friend Nick Begich.

Soon after being elected a Member of the Congress Representative Begich established an outstanding record with all of the Members. Honor, ability and integrity were the hallmarks of Nick Begich's career in the House of Representatives.

I had the honor to preside at the time the Alaskan bill was before the House. For a great many years efforts had been made to settle this particular problem and it was through the efforts of Nick Begich that this legislation was enacted. I recall distinctly that during general debate on this bill he presented the case of the residents of Alaska in a brilliant manner and with his warm humanity and congeniality had no difficulty in receiving the assistance of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Few men in any walk of life have attracted so large a share of public attention as he did in presenting the claim of his people. He was always cheerful, humble, and dedicated and possessed a delightful sense of humor.

We all miss Nick Begich in the House and the record that he established will long live in the minds and the hearts of the people in this country.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the terrible tragedy which claimed the lives of our distinguished colleagues, Hale Boggs of Louisiana and Nick Begich of Alaska has cast a pall of sadness over the House of Representatives. We have previously honored the late Hale Boggs with appropriate eulogies, and we are now engaged in eulogizing Nick Begich. Although his length of service in the Congress was cut tragically short, in a relatively brief period of time, he established an enviable reputation as a man of highest integrity and as a valuable and devoted public servant. I share the admiration which has been expressed by so many.

To Mrs. Begich and other members of the family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Nick's family, the gentleman from Iowa, and the gentleman from California, I should like to thank everyone who participated this evening.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the life and services of our late colleague, the Honorable Nick Begich of Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McKAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

THE FUTURE OF COMMONWEALTH STATUS FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. BENITEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BENITEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today on the future of Commonwealth status for Puerto Rico. It is a status which has no equivalent in this hemisphere. It sprung neither from a theory nor from a pre-established formula. Commonwealth evolved and continues to develop rather from the needs, experiences, vicissitudes, conflicts, achievements, adjustments, contradictions, and aspirations inherent in 75 years of close relationship. It has been a fruitful and rewarding association even though at times it has been confusing and perplexing, certainly for Puerto Rico, probably for the United States also. In the immediate years ahead, we hope to dispel or at least reduce the confusion and perplexities and to enhance, in mutually acceptable ways, the fruits and rewards of permanent association.

As a juridical reality Commonwealth was created jointly in an unique process of deliberation and adjustment between the government and the people of Puerto Rico and the Congress and the President of the United States, 21 years ago. On that 21st anniversary, last Wednesday, July 25, Governor Rafael Hernández Colón reviewed the history and the basic orientation of Commonwealth in a compelling speech which I ask leave to insert as part of my presentation. Governor Hernández Colón stressed, among other things, a basic tenet of our approach concerning the meaning of Commonwealth status.

Commonwealth is not a midway station to statehood or to independence. It is a new modality of free and voluntary association based upon common citizenship, common defense, common trade, common democratic ideals, and a mutual commitment to a common Judaeo-Christian ethical outlook. This outlook proclaims the dignity and the brotherhood of man, the worth of democracy, an awareness of the vulnerability of man and his government, the lasting need to protect both through eternal vigilance, self-control, self-improvement, and an abiding sense of human solidarity and also of human fallibility.

We do not wish to alter, jeopardize or weaken any of these essential solidarities and aspirations. But we wish to work for constantly meaningful contributions within these fields as well as in the broad expanse of initiatives in self-government. We believe such potential initiatives should be fully exercised and explored by the people of Puerto Rico. Hundreds of years living together in isolation and 75 years of close association have produced our own style, rhythm and complexities. We deem it important that we should have the widest freedom in evolution. Our institutions must enjoy an ample framework of responsibility essential to variations, experimentation and even mistakes inherent in the process of life and self-fulfillment.

After 21 years of Commonwealth status its fundamental postulates remain valid and sound. Commonwealth is a creative, flexible, forward looking, political contribution. It is free from hatred and from abiding hostilities, it believes in interdependence rather than dependence or independence. For us the ultimate is not that man should serve the structure but that the structure should serve man and should do so both as an individual and as a member of society.

No one has done more for Commonwealth nor has expressed better its humane goals than our peerless leader and founder of Commonwealth, Luis Muñoz Marin. I shall include also as part of this presentation his words on the day when Commonwealth was established on July 25, 1952. Against that background I include also Muñoz Marin's own review of the unfinished agenda of social justice. The grand old man, eternally alert and eternally young, points to the vistas ahead in the unending task of stimulating and rendering possible the noble, uplifting, worthwhile lives of maximum service and achievement which must be open to every Puerto Rican in the years ahead.

But Commonwealth is considerably behind itself in very many of its legal expressions and its many ambiguous zones of day to day relationships and practices. The Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act needs to be rewritten and modified.

On July 23, 1967, pursuant to recommendations formulated by a joint commission of Puerto Ricans and Continentals appointed under congressional and Puerto Rican legislation, a plebiscite was held in Puerto Rico concerning future political alternatives and including the improvement of Commonwealth, the search for statehood or for independence.

The improvement of the Commonwealth won by a broad margin. In the November elections the Popular Democratic Party committed itself to the pursuit of that objective. Under it, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico was charged by Puerto Rican law to work toward the advancement of Commonwealth status. In keeping with the pledge and with the law, I have written the White House requesting the appointment, jointly with the Governor of Puerto Rico, of a Special Advisory Committee, "to delineate and clarify all measures leading toward a maximum of self-government for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico within its relationship with the United States", and, "to recommend the most suitable, effective, and expeditious means for the formulation and joint consideration and adoption of specific measures for such development."

I am happy to report that the President of the United States through the Director of the Domestic Council has responded affirmatively to this request and that tomorrow the Director of the Domestic Council itself, Mr. Kenneth R. Cole, Jr. and its Associate Director, Mr. Richard Fairbanks, will leave for Puerto Rico to confer with Governor Hernández Colón and his advisors on the nature and scope of this initiative. I ask leave to include both of these letters into the RECORD.

We stand, Mr. Speaker, on the threshold of what I trust will be important developments for Puerto Rico and for its relationship with the United States. They are developments on which undoubtedly this House of Representatives and this Congress will be called upon to deliberate and act.

I expect to participate in these deliberations both in Puerto Rico and in the Congress. I trust that it will be my privilege to continue to receive from my friends on both sides of the aisle the same warm and sympathetic consideration for all matters relative to Puerto Rico which heretofore has been accorded.

One final word on the symbolism of the 25th of July.

It is also the day of the patron saint of Spain, Santiago or Saint James, the legendary warrior sent from above to assist Spain in its heroic defense of Christianity against Islam. This profoundly Spanish holiday has become interwoven within the fabric of Puerto Rican history and sociology since 1494 and has come to dominate it. It is the same day when in 1898 Gen. Nelson Miles landed his troops in Guánica and proclaimed the advent of a new and great future for Puerto Rico. What has been and what will be the nature of that future? We are addressing it now. Santiago is also identified in Catholic tradition as the Apostle of Hope. We hope that in the many 25th's of July to come we may continue to honor this legendary holiday as one where the hopes of the people of Puerto Rico will be amply fulfilled in the years ahead. To that purpose we ask your understanding and your cooperation.

ECONOMIC LEVIATHAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of economic history will demonstrate that every major inflation has been caused by the expansion of the money supply by a central bank. This is no less true in the United States than in other countries where in times past one has needed a bushel basket of money to buy a loaf of

bread. It is clear that when the rate of growth of the stock of money exceeds increases in productivity, inflation results. Conversely, the way to reduce the rate of inflation is to reduce the rate of growth of the money supply.

One wonders then why the Government does not simply decrease the rate of growth in the money supply. Brief analysis will make the answer obvious.

Our economy is plagued by a number of Government sanctioned rigidities such as monopolistic labor unions, minimum wage laws, protective tariffs, and so on which prevent wages, and hence prices, from being flexible downward or even stable for very long. Consequently, a decreasing price level affects the level of employment and not simply the nominal, as opposed to real, level of wages. The result is that so long as we do not eliminate these unnatural structural problems we will have to sustain some pain in dealing with inflation. Milton Friedman, the noted economist, points out that in the slowdown of 1969–70, as with earlier periods of monetary restraint, the Government reversed its policy and eased the monetary situation just as the policy was beginning to work. The inflationary spiral boomed once again. The Government could not stand the heat that was necessary and reacted by getting out of the kitchen.

It is thus not surprising that Government has embraced the current mess of economic controls. They allow the Government to appear to be doing something when in actuality the necessary steps are avoided because of the temporary problems that would arise. Free enterprise is made a scapegoat for a problem caused solely by the Government.

Controls can never work to arrest inflation for anything more than a temporary period. In fact, if controls are successful in holding down prices in the face of increasing costs, shortages will inevitably occur. It is no exaggeration to say that wage and price controls are faulty in concept, disasterous in practice, and most importantly represent an unconscionable tresspass by the State on the individual's freedom to trade as he desires.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share Milton Friedman's important analysis of economic controls which appeared recently in Newsweek and insert it in the RECORD at this time:

MONUMENTAL FOLLY

(By Milton Friedman)

The new freeze and phase four are a tragic mistake. They take us a long way down the road to rigid and widespread controls. Such controls cannot halt inflation. But they can destroy our freedom and our prosperity.

Are we returning to more rigid controls because our recent experience demonstrates that they are an effective method of stopping inflation? Hardly. Consumer prices rose at annual rates of 5.5 per cent in 1970; 3.8 per cent in the eight months of 1971 preceding the freeze on Aug. 15; 3.4 per cent in the whole seventeen months of the freeze and phase two; and 4.1 per cent in the final six months of phase two. Wholesale prices rose at rates of 2.3 per cent, 5.3 per cent, 5.9 per cent and 8.9 per cent in the same periods. The price explosion since the end of phase two has been greatest in foods, never controlled under phase two. For the rest, it mostly continues a trend that started during phase two or unveils price increases concealed by phase two.

Are we returning to more rigid controls because other experience demonstrates that controls are an effective method of stopping inflation? Hardly. The standard life history of controls—documented time and again—is initial apparent success, growing difficulties as distortions accumulate, and a final price explosion when controls collapse or are repealed.

Are we returning to more rigid controls because economic reasoning demonstrates that they are an effective method of stopping inflation? Hardly. A few economists—John Kenneth Galbraith is the most prominent—argue that they are. But for two centuries and more, most economists have regarded controls as an attack on symptoms, not causes; as an interference with the market that creates shortages, distorts production, and breeds further controls; as a desperate expedient for a time of war.

The President, the legislators, and even the shortsighted denizens of Wall Street who cry for controls know this record. They cannot possibly believe that controls are an effective way to stop inflation. Why then do they favor them?

The answer is clear. Any effective policy to stop inflation will be painful. Once inflation gets the start it has here, there is simply no way to stop it without a slowdown in the economy and probably a recession. Three times in the past fifteen years we have taken the cure: in 1960–61, 1966–67, 1969–70. Each time, the cure has started to work. Each time, the policymakers became impatient before the cure had done its work and revved up the monetary and fiscal engines of inflation. Each time, we have suffered the pains in vain.

This time, policymakers do not want to pay any cost. They do not want to stop inflation. But they want to *appear* to be doing something about inflation. Controls look like a way to have their cake and eat it.

In 1971, controls achieved this confidence trick for a time. Perhaps they will again. But conditions are far less favorable. In 1971, surplus capacity was available to increase output; today, we are pressing against capacity limits. In 1971, the public had no experience with wage and price controls in peacetime. It could be gulled into believing that pronouncements were a substitute for policy. Today, the public is less gullible.

The temptation will be strong to try to make the retreaded controls work by piling one intervention on another—the scheduling of production, the allocation of raw materials, the rationing of consumer goods. The proposed export controls are a first portent.

If the U.S. ever succumbs to collectivism, to government control over every facet of our lives, it will not be because the socialists win any arguments. It will be through the indirect route of wage and price controls.

Is there no way to prevent this act of monumental folly?

PATRIOTIC FESTIVAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of people from the city of Scranton and surrounding areas gathered at Nay Aug Park for a July 4 ceremony. That ceremony, entitled the "Patriotic Festival" attracted a most important crowd who met for a most important purpose. A great deal of the program convened to "Honor America Week" devoted itself to an unalterable commitment dedicated to our MIA's, those from my congressional district and those from every State in this great Nation.

The deep and meaningful significance of this program was brought to my attention by Mrs. William E. Fleth who has been appointed by Mayor Eugene Peters to serve as chairman of the 1976 observance. Mrs. Fleth was kind enough to bring to my attention the magnificent column written by Mr. Joseph Oravec of the Scranton Times which details much of the activity that took place. Mrs. Fleth was fortunate to have working with her Mr. Edmund Bojnowski who has long been active in veterans matters in our area.

In requesting permission to reprint this column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would call particular attention to two things which I believe to be notable. First, I would point out the enduring memory and love of the people of my congressional district for those who are still listed as Missing in Action, and in particular their concern and the concern of the parents for Captain Wesley Ratzel, who is still listed as Missing in Action in Vietnam.

I would point out that there were present for these ceremonies approximately 600 children and 600 adults. The patriotism which all of us feel on that day celebrating the birth of our Nation is still strong, and is still among the young who will carry on the work and traditions of America.

I know my colleagues join me in pledging that we will never forget those who are Missing in Action in Vietnam until all are accounted for. We are speaking of Captain Ratzel, Sergeant Pearce, and Colonel Giannangeli, all from our area, and more than 1,000 MIA's who are still unaccounted for. As Mrs. Ratzel said on this occasion, "You just can't forget someone you love just because a few months go by." Nor shall any of us in the Congress be content until the last MIA is accounted for.

[From the Scranton (Pa.) Sunday Times, July 8, 1973]

CITY DESK NOTES

(By Joseph Oravec)

The "Patriotic Festival" attracted a crowd on July 4 to the Lincoln Swim Complex at Nay Aug Park, Scranton.

But it was the participation of the younger element in the community that impressed the adults present. Mrs. William E. Fleth, who was named to serve as chairman of Scranton's 1976 observance by Mayor Eugene Peters, and Edmund Bojnowski, who, along with a large committee, directed activities, planned the program to have the youngsters join the adults in the presentation.

Joan Williams, a Girl Scout; R. Stephen Carter, a North Scranton Junior High School student; junior members of American Legion Post 568, and Howard Pittle, a Cub Scout, had active roles in the program.

There were others such as David J. Wenzel, a Vietnam veteran, and Edwin Glorius, a student at Dickinson College, who participated.

What's more, each of those present—young and adult—were there because of a deep feeling of patriotism . . . and as the Mayor's Flag Committee, sponsor of the program, listed one of its purposes, "to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom as stated in the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence."

A very solemn note was struck when a Freedom Tree was planted in honor of Capt. Wesley Ratzel, 26, who is listed as missing in action, and others who served in Vietnam. He was shot down while piloting a plane on May 18, 1972.

The expression of faith by Mr. and Mrs. Wesley Ratzel, 510 Leggett St., Scranton, that their son is alive has not wavered over the passing months. They will not give up hope.

They call for public opinion to be mustered as never before in order that terms of the peace treaty are complied with and all prisoners of war are returned.

The list of missing in action is long. The fate of those U.S. servicemen is unknown.

The Ratzels will "never give up trying to find Wesley."

"You just can't forget someone you love just because a few months go by," the missing pilot's mother said.

There was another couple present on July 4 whose hearts also ached over the loss of a loved one in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Vancosky, 1709 Luzerne St., Scranton, met the Ratzel family after the program had ended.

The Vancosky's son, Michael, a Marine, was killed in action on May 4, 1970, the day that propelled Kent State into history.

"The word Kent remains indelible in my mind. It was a day of flag burning, demonstrating. I can understand a difference of opinion but I can't for the life of me understand why anyone would march carrying the Viet Cong flag," is the way Mrs. Vancosky put it.

The memories remain ". . . that was the saddest Mothers Day of my life, waiting for Mike's body to be brought home from Vietnam. He arrived the next day," she added.

The flag is important to the Vancoskys. "My earliest recollection of the flag goes back to my childhood. I remember every Armistice Day. We didn't have school on that day. My mother would call us in before 11 o'clock and when the bells would ring she would tell us to say a prayer with her in memory of the boys who died. We prayed on the 11th hour, 11th day of that 11th month. She would tell us when carrying the flag, never let it touch the ground, or never defile it. By today's standards she would be considered a lowly immigrant. She came from the Ukraine."

Michael Vancosky, who made the supreme sacrifice was born on Aug. 14, 1950. "It was the fifth anniversary of V.J. Day . . . the day when the war with Japan ended. It's ironic that a son is born on the anniversary of one war's end and grows up to die in another war," his mother said.

"Pray God we have no more wars," she added.

Yet, the memories remain. Mrs. Vancosky wears a POW bracelet. The name is that of Marine Capt. James Carlton, missing since April 17, 1967.

"The agony the family goes through not knowing," Mrs. Vancosky noted.

On July 4th—at a "Patriotic Festival"—the Vancoskys and the Ratzels, whose sons gave their utmost in the service of this country, met, shared their grief—but never relinquished faith in their country.

They—and people like them—have built the ramparts of America.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of many Members, I am presenting the Report and Recommendations on Campaign Finance Reform by the House Republican Task Force on Election Reform, dated July 31, 1973.

The report will be followed by at least 2 more; one on Registration, and another on Constitutional Amendments.

The core of this report is our recommendations to insure maximum individual participation, maximum party responsibility, and reduced influence of vested interests. The requirement that candidates' committees can accept contribution only from individuals or party organizations is the most significant feature of the report.

Also extremely important is our recommendation favoring a Federal Elections Commission. In 1971, the House rejected this concept, but a majority of the Task Force believes that an FEC is now necessary.

The report is as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The fact that the people of this nation possess and cherish a great system of representative government is well known. Less well known, and often obscured, is the fact that we also have a unique, and equally great, political system.

The American political system, while not immune to defects, has produced responsive leadership and responsive government in the most complex, diverse and changing society the world has ever known.

Safeguarding the integrity of this American political system should be among our highest priorities. Recent revelations of unethical and illegal political activities now give this priority a new urgency.

During the past few years, there has been a growing awareness of abuse of our political system. Officials, elected and appointed, in all branches and levels of government, have been involved in improprieties and illegal ties ranging from bribery to kickbacks to dirty tricks to illegal and unreported contributions and expenditures. Unfortunately, these problems are not a new phenomenon. They have been occurring with disconcerting frequency through modern political history.

Revelations such as these may well have contributed to the decline of public trust and confidence in the institutions and leadership of our country. A May–June 1973 Gallup Poll found that while 42% of the Americans surveyed expressed confidence in the U.S. Congress, 50% expressed little confidence. The Harris Poll, published on November 13, 1972, showed that only 27% of those sampled expressed a great deal of confidence in those running the Executive Branch of government. The same survey showed that a mere 21% had confidence in the leaders of Congress.

The House Republican Research Committee established the Task Force on Election Reform to study and make recommendations to strengthen the vitality and preserve the integrity of the electoral process. Under this charge, the Task Force herewith makes its initial recommendations with respect to campaigns, disclosure, contributions and expenses.

First, the Task Force, after diligent research, recommends that our campaign laws be amended to achieve the following goals:

(1) Build public confidence in the electoral process by making the process visible, understandable and credible.

(2) Ensure maximum individual participation, interest and responsibility; reduce the excessive influence of vested interests, strengthen political parties and make them responsible for their candidates.

(3) Increase penalties for violations and ensure vigorous and complete enforcement of election laws.

(4) Provide challengers with a fair opportunity to present their case to the public, so they have a reasonable chance of defeating the incumbent.

(5) Place reasonable limits, consistent with challengers' needs, on the mushrooming costs of running for office.

(6) Place reasonable limits, consistent with constitutional rights, on excessive individual contributions.

Next, the Task Force determined that the following specific recommendations would best achieve the above goals. The Task Force does not mean to exclude other worthy proposals but believes strongly that these recommendations should be included in any election reform bill to be considered by Congress.

SUMMARY

The House Republican Task Force on Election Reform after extensive deliberations and debate, makes the following recommendations:

1. An independent Federal Elections Commission should be established to supervise the Federal Election Campaign Act. The FEC would have all the powers of the existing supervisory authorities and in addition, the power to subpoena. Prosecuting powers shall be left to the Justice Department. If the Justice Department fails to act when violations are referred by the Commission, the Commission may request the Justice Department to give information as to what action is expected, and if none, why not. The Justice Department shall make a complete response which shall be public information, within 90 days.

2. Each candidate in any Federal election shall designate a single committee as his authorized campaign committee which shall designate a single depository of its funds. In a general election, all major party presidential candidates must designate the national committee of his or her political party as his or her authorized campaign committee.

3. All campaign expenditures shall be made by the candidate's authorized campaign committee, except that expenditures may be made on behalf of any candidate by political party organizations but such expenditures will be considered as a contribution to the candidate's authorized committee and will be subject to the limitations in No. 5.

4. No authorized committee may accept contributions from other than individuals or political party organizations. It may receive contributions from other organizations acting as agents of individual contributors provided the individual contributor so designates and the contribution is identified as to the original donor.

5. Except in those instances in which a contributor has expressly designated or earmarked a contribution for the benefit of a particular candidate, a political party organization may contribute to an authorized committee without identification of the original contributors.

6. No authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office for the House and Senate shall accept more than $5,000 from any individual contributor for any Federal election contest. No authorized committee of a candidate for President shall accept more than $25,000 from any individual contributor for any Presidential election contest.

7. All amounts knowingly contributed or knowingly accepted in excess of the amounts designated in recommendations 5 and 6 shall, upon the determination of their illegality, be paid over to the Treasury of the United States.

8. No authorized committee of a candidate for the House of Representatives, Senate and President may spend more than $150,000 or 25¢ per eligible voter, whichever is greater, for any election.

9. No checks or other campaign funds shall be drawn on foreign banks.

10. No authorized committee or political party organization shall accept contributions from non-resident aliens.

11. No authorized committee shall accept cash contributions made in excess of $100.

12. (a) General election day shall be a national holiday.

(b) Primary elections for the House and Senate shall be held no earlier than August 1.

(c) Polls should close simultaneously throughout the country in Presidential elections.

(d) Presidential primaries shall be held no earlier than May 1.

13. The Equal Time provision of the Communications Act of 1934 shall be repealed for all federal candidates.

14. Congress shall make a study of Federally issued scrip. This scrip should be serially numbered, computerized, containing names and addresses of donor, recipient and redeemer, and available at post offices and Federally insured financial institutions. It should be the only valid medium of exchange in all Federal primary and general elections for all expenditures by or on behalf of candidates and for all contributions in excess of $100.

15. The Federal Election Campaign Act shall preempt individual state laws wherever they are in conflict.

16. The penalty for violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act shall be increased from $1,000 and/or 1 year to a maximum $25,000 and/or 1 year.

17. The Task Force reiterates its endorsement of President Nixon's proposed Non-Partisan Commission on Federal Election Reform to study the entire pattern of campaign practices and recommend a comprehensive set of reforms and regulations.

DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. An independent Federal Elections Commission should be established to supervise the Federal Election Campaign Act. The FEC should have all the powers of the existing supervisory authorities and in addition, the power to subpoena. Prosecuting powers should be left to the Justice Department. If the Justice Department fails to act when violations are referred by the Commission, the Commission may request the Justice Department to give information as to what action is expected, and if none, why not. The Justice Department shall make a complete response which shall be public information within 90 days.

The Task Force considered a six-member Commission, no more than three of whom could come from any one party, but also recognized that there are many forms that such a Commission can take. Some members recommended that the FEC include the chairmen of the major political parties and that other appointments be made by the Congress.

The powers of the Commission should include power to administer oaths, subpoena witnesses, and subpoena documents.

The Justice Department should continue to have primary responsibility for initiating, defending or appealing any court action arising out of the Commission's findings. However, if the Justice Department fails to act when violations are referred by the Commission, the Commission can demand that the Justice Department give information as to what action it expects to take. If the Justice Department has decided or does decide not to take action, the report to the Commission must contain the reasons for failure to prosecute. The Justice Department must make a complete response within 90 days of the request, and all responses will be made public. The Task Force felt that this reporting process would help ensure prosecution, while, at the same time, using the traditional prosecution procedures of the Justice Department.

The 1971 law clearly provides the Justice Department with civil enforcement powers, thereby allowing it to use this less stringent remedy as a means of achieving compliance. The Justice Department should not hesitate to use these powers.

The creation of a Commission should in no way abrogate any of the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the Congress itself.

An independent Federal Elections Commission would be advantageous for several reasons:

At present, three separate agencies—the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate, and the Comptroller General—are charged with enforcing the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971. This makes it difficult (if not impossible) to achieve fair, consistent and coordinated supervision of the law. Such matters as preparation of reporting forms or interpretations of the law may be treated differently by each entity or may require burdensome and extensive consultation to achieve consistency. A single Commission would solve these problems.

Combining the three agencies into a single Commission would reduce the amount of bureaucracy needed to enforce the law. Although it was argued in 1971 that the present arrangement would prevent the neeed for creating additional bureaucracy, the fact is that the Clerk of the House has assigned over 20 employees to this function, the Secretary of the Senate 8 employees, and the Comptroller General 26. The creation of a single Commission would combine these employees and probably reduce the total number needed to carry out these functions.

A single Commission would make it easier for those seeking information regarding federal elections to get access to such records.

Currently, a conflict of interest situation exists in which employees of the House and Senate are charged with identifying and reporting possible violations of the law committed by their employers. Even with the most conscientious and well-intentioned Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate, questions are certain to arise as to the objectivity and zeal of their enforcement efforts against persons to whom they owe their jobs.

An independent elections commission could also reduce the workload of the Justice Department. After the 1972 elections, thousands of complaints were sent to the Justice Department by the Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate and the General Accounting Office. However, in some cases, these complaints were unprocessed and included trivial and peripheral violations. For example, some reports and filings that were only one day late were considered violations and were reported to the Justice Department en masse. The Justice Department was forced to spend a considerable amount of its valuable time deciphering and sorting out these complaints. An independent commission could classify all of the various complaints in a logical fashion and send on to the Justice Department almost immediately the more serious violations of the law.

Some of the cases sent to the Justice Department are being held in "limbo" for an excessive period of time. This practice places an unfair burden on the individuals involved and keeps the public in the dark about possible violations. Under this system, the initiation of prosecution may occur long after the events actually occurred, when many people have little recollection of the circumstances surrounding the alleged violations. If the Commission could demand a report from the Justice Department, legal actions might be expedited and the public would know the status of the alleged violations while the events are still fairly fresh in its mind.

The creation of an independent Federal Elections Commission is the most important change needed in the 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act.

2. Each candidate in any Federal election shall designate a single committee as his authorized campaign committee, which shall designate a single depository of its funds. In a general election, all major party presidential candidates must designate the national committee of his or her political party as his or her authorized campaign committee.

The single account concept can be implemented at all levels of federal elections by making all of a candidate's committees accountable to one centralized depository. The single account concept can be used to centralize accountability at the state and national level for Senatorial and Presidential candidates respectively, as well as for centralizing responsibility at the Congressional level.

In Presidential general election campaigns, the political party national committees would handle collections and disbursements of funds. Organizations at the local levels could raise funds for Presidential candidates, but all monies must be reported to the National Committee. In return, local campaign organizations could receive funds from the National Committee to handle necessary expenses.

A single accounting agency would be beneficial for the following reasons:

Accountability is the most important benefit. A series of local committees all financially accountable to a centralized, single account focuses responsibility by having a single point of control.

This action would greatly simplify reporting procedures, make accounting simpler, and make election campaigns much easier to monitor.

This action would also help curb the proliferation of political committees. In many cases, the primary goal of setting up innumerable committees has been to avoid disclosure and potential tax liability. A single accounting agency would help put a stop to this practice.

3. *All campaign expenditures shall be made by the candidate's authorized campaign committee, except that expenditures may be made on behalf of any candidate by political party organizations but such expenditures will be considered as a contribution to the candidate's authorized committee and will be subject to the limitations in recommendation #5.*

The single expense agency concept can also be implemented at all levels of federal elections in a fashion similar to that of the single accounting agency concept.

Authorized campaign committees would be allowed flexibility to disburse funds through local and state campaign organs. However, central records of disbursements would be maintained at the national, state and Congressional level for Presidential, Senatorial and Congressional races respectively.

In some instances, political party organizations will make expenditures on behalf of a candidate for poll workers, election officials, party workers and so on. These expenses should be prorated for each federal candidate for House of Representatives and considered as a contribution to the candidate's authorized committee subject to the $50,000 limitation on designated contributions from political party organizations to a candidate for House of Representatives.

A single expense agency would be beneficial for the reasons listed above under the single accounting agency.

In addition, the single expense agency would make it more difficult to establish secret funds, maintain slush funds, to exceed expenditure limitations, to conduct undercover operations or to commit other illegal acts.

4. No authorized committee may accept contributions from other than individuals or political party organizations. It may receive contributions from other organizations acting as agents of individual contributors provided the individual contributor so desig-

nates and the contribution is identified as to the original donor.

The candidate's authorized committee can accept contributions only from individuals, with the sole exception being that of political party organizations. Other organizations may act as agents of individuals, but the individual must designate to whom the contribution will be given to, and the agent must identify the individual donor.

With exception of contributions to political party organizations, all monies must be fully identified as to their original source.

This would ensure the full disclosure of all contributions, and is necessary to complement and make enforceable a limitation on campaign contributions. (Recommendation #6).

This provision will foster individual participation and responsibility. During recent years, candidates and their parties have been relying to an increasing extent on the gifts and contributions of groups and organizations. This reliance has lessened participation on the part of the individual and has sometimes resulted in efforts to avoid disclosure and circumvent the law. This provision will help reverse this trend, give the individual greater control over the money he contributes, and increase the importance of the individual in the electoral process.

5. Except in those instances in which a contributor has expressly designated or earmarked a contribution for the benefit of a particular candidate, a political party organization may contribute to an authorized committee without identification of the original contributors. No authorized committee of a candidate for House may accept undesignated contributions for any election from political party organizations in an aggregate of more than $50,000. Contributions from a political party organization which have been earmarked for a particular candidate shall be so identified and will be subject to the limitation placed on the amount of money which the authorized committee can receive from an individual.

Political parties would be exempted from both the requirement that original donors be identified and the $5,000 contribution limitation, and a candidate's authorized committee would be allowed to accept up to $50,000 from political party organizations in undesignated contributions. (Political party organizations would be allowed to give in excess of this amount if the contributions were specifically earmarked.)

Political parties would be greatly strengthened by these exemptions. At the same time, no major loophole would be opened through which illegal funds could be funneled. The present law already provides for disclosure of contributions to political parties.

A strong national party would help curb some of the excesses that have been witnessed during the past few years and would make it easier for the public to isolate responsibility for illegal actions. Strong parties could also provide an invaluable public service in the form of oversight of a candidate's campaign.

The Task Force believes that the political parties are the most broadly based organizations in the political process and that strong political parties will increase public confidence and make government more responsive to the people.

Provisions #4 and #5 would outlaw the "washing" and tacit or secret "earmarking" of political contributions.

6. No authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office for the House and Senate shall accept more than $5,000 from any individual contributor for any Federal election contest. No authorized committee of a candidate for President shall accept more than $25,000 from any individual contributor for a Presidential election contest.

The Task Force felt that limitations on campaign contributions are necessary for several reasons:

Limits on contributions would prevent any one individual or a group of individuals from having a disproportionate impact on any campaign.

Limitations on contributions should increase the number of small contributors. A study by Senator Pearson found that 1% of the population makes 90% of all campaign contributions and that only 4–6% of the population makes any sort of financial contribution. Limitations on individual contributions would force candidates to seek a broader popular base to raise large sums of money.

Contribution limitations would help reduce the access and influence that monied groups and individuals are presently able to obtain as a result of campaign contributions. Public officials would be able to place less reliance on special interest groups and would be less susceptible to pressures from these groups.

When these limitations are coupled with the prohibition on the "washing" and secret "earmarking" of funds, they should be reasonably enforceable.

The issue of contribution limitations raised several concerns.

They may be unconstitutional because they inhibit free political expression. The rights of free speech and association protect explicit peaceful political activity from regulation by the government. Contribution limitations might curtail political activity and expression.

Restrictions on campaign contributions may be difficult to enforce. Even with a prohibition on the "washing" and secret "earmarking" of funds, campaign contributions would be solicited by hundreds of candidates and by numerous committees. A person who contributed to several such candidates and committees might violate the restriction unintentionally. On the other hand, intentional violations might easily be made to appear inadvertent. Unless strictly and stringently enforced, limitations would only penalize the honest candidate.

Some individuals and groups will undoubtedly criticize the above limits as too high. However, when considered in the aggregate, politics is underfinanced. Total spending of $400 million is just a fraction of one per cent of the amounts spent by governments at all levels. This fraction of one per cent determines who will gain control of government, what policies will be made and how tax monies will be spent. Excessively low contribution limitations will further reduce the total supply of funds and impoverish the electoral system.

The amounts that are considered to be needed for any single campaign may be formidable. Political money is relataively scarce, and there is great competition among many candidates and committees at the various levels for financial assistance from those who are willing to give. Unreasonably low contribution limits will increase the incentives to circumvent the law. Many candidates may be faced with an untenable choice: either losing at the polls because they lack the needed funds to attain necessary name identification, or accepting illegal contributions on the sly to raise sufficient funds. Even the most vigorous enforcement methods might be unable to uncover many of the resulting campaign abuses. As a result, honest candidates would be penalized.

Excessively low limitations on campaign contributions would tend to limit a challenger's ability to compete effectively. Incumbents have a formidable array of advantages before they enter a campaign, most important among these being name identification. In order to beat an incumbent, a challenger often must be able to raise enough money to achieve similar identification. Contribution limitations would impair his ability to raise funds, thereby insuring incumbents (who win about 97% of the time already) an even further advantage.

7. All amounts knowingly contributed or knowingly accepted in excess of the amounts designated in recommendation #5 and #6 shall, upon the determination of their illegality, be paid over to the Treasury of the United States.

The Task Force felt that organizations and individuals who knowingly make illegal contributions should not be allowed to take back their contributions when they are discovered. This feature, coupled with the increased criminal penalties recommended in #16, would encourage individuals and groups to think twice before they made sizeable, illegal campaign contributions.

8. No authorized committee of a candidate for the House of Representatives, Senate and President may spend more than $150,000 or 25c per eligible voter, whichever is greater, for any election.

The Task Force felt that some kind of limitations on campaign expenditures are necessary for several reasons.

They would help bring a halt to the spiraling costs of campaigning.

They would reduce the necessity for raising huge sums of money to finance a political campaign. As a result, public officials and challengers would be able to place less reliance on special interest groups and large contributors and would be less susceptible to pressures from these individuals. This would help reduce the access and influence that monied groups and individuals are presently able to obtain through campaign contributions.

Considerable concern was expressed that, as a reaction to the events of the last few months, expenditure limitations might be set too low. There was several reasons for this concern.

While the amount of expenditures in a campaign is not the only variable affecting the number of people who vote, a reduction in expenditures would lead to a reduction in political advertising and campaigning which might very well further reduce citizen interest and participation. One of the witnesses before the Senate Commerce Committee stated: "One of the key goals of the political system should be a more highly competitive system because it helps to make the system more responsive. Limitations tend to reduce opportunities for voters to learn something about candidates, but even more significant, ceilings reduce the opportunities for voters to learn something about politics . . . Electioneering helps to structure and politicize society, and this is periodically essential to the smooth functioning of a democracy."

In setting strict limitations on the common man's ability to get himself elected to Congress, expenditure limitations would fail to do anything about the problem of the man who brings not money but other resources to the election. The celebrity, the sports figure, the movie star and other famous individuals all have had their advertising done for them as a result of their occupations. They don't need to spend money on their political campaigns. Financial restrictions imposed on their opponents may simply insure an unequal contest and deny the common man a chance to serve in Congress.

Stringent, sweeping overall expenditure limitations may invite violations of the law because such violations may be extremely difficult to document or prove. It gets progressively harder to keep track of what a candidate or his supporters are spending on such easily manufactured items as bumper stickers or other printed materials. Extreme

limitations would increase incentives for circumvention of the law.

Limitations on campaign expenditures would tend to limit a challenger's ability to compete effectively. A $150,000 limitation for a Congressional campaign may sound generous to reformers or to incumbents whose reelection does not require spending of amounts anywhere near that figure. However, for the challenger the limitation imposes nearly impossible problems. With today's costs there is no way a challenger can make himself known over a well-identified incumbent under stringent circumstances.

Incumbents have a formidable array of weaponry available to them. They have staff allowances. Legitimate staff legislative work frequently overlaps the political function. They have the franking privilege. Legitimate use of the frank can be extremely helpful politically, and the use of postal patron mailings is commonly thought to be a powerful political device as well as a means of communicating with the district. Incumbents also have name and face recognition because they have ready access to the media. Since most political expense is directed toward name recognition, the incumbent need not spend nearly as much as a challenger.

While political spending is increasing at a rapid rate, political spending in the United States is still not excessively high. While total spending for all political campaigns was $400 million in 1972, this figure was still less than the combined advertising budgets for Procter and Gamble, Ford and General Motors for the same year. In 1972, advertising for all U.S. companies totaled $22.5 billion. Is this a rational allocation of national priorities? Should the cost of the debate on which type of soap suds or car to buy exceed by fifty times the cost of the debate on the important political issues of our time?

Furthermore, the costs of campaigning in the United States are not significantly higher than the corresponding costs in some nations and are actually lower than in many other countries. An index of political expenditures per voter for various countries showed a range of 27 cents for Australia to $21.20 for Israel. The United States, at $1.12, is clustered near India and Japan at the lower range of the index.

9. No checks or other campaign funds shall be drawn on foreign banks.

Prohibition of the "washing" of funds through foreign banks and accounts will reduce the opportunities to commit illegal activities. It will also help ensure full disclosure and make elections easier to monitor.

10. No authorized committee or political party organization shall accept contributions from non-resident aliens.

Presently, there is considerable doubt and uncertainty as to the scope of the law governing contributions by foreign nationals and aliens. Congress should consider amending the law to expressly prohibit these contributions. Up to now, repeated disclosures of contributions by nonresident aliens have elicited little Congressional or public reaction. The reverse is true in foreign countries where reports of American involvement in their elections frequently sets off an uproar.

11. No authorized committee shall accept cash contributions made in excess of $100.

Many of the recent campaign finance abuses stem from the giving of large contributions in cash. Since cash is difficult to trace, it can be easily used for illegal activities. Prohibition of large cash contributions could severely inhibit illicit escapades financed by political aides with briefcases stuffed with cash.

12. a. General election day shall be a national holiday.

By clearing election day a holiday voter turnout could be increased. If they did not have to work, many voters would be more willing to go to the polls.

b. Primary elections for the House and Senate shall be held no earlier than August 1.

If Congressional primaries were held in August and September, the length of the campaign would be shortened, and there would be less time in which to make campaign expenditures. Hopefully, this would help reduce the costs of campaigns.

By shortening the length of the campaign, voter interest and participation might be increased. Presently, some voters become bored and disinterested by the seemingly interminable length of Congressional campaigns.

c. Polls should close simultaneously throughout the country in Presidential elections.

This proposal would end the problem of the results from the East influencing the voters in the West.

d. Presidential primaries shall be held no earlier than May 1.

If Presidential primaries were held in May, June and July, the length of primary campaigns would be shortened.

By shortening the length of the Presidential campaign, voter interest and participation might increase and expenditures might be reduced.

13. The Equal Time provision of the Communications Act of 1934 shall be repealed for all federal candidates.

The advantages of repealing the Equal Time provision apply to both Presidential and Congressional races. To repeal the Equal Time provisions for the Presidency and not for Congress would allow substantial amounts of free broadcast time for Presidential candidates thus increasing their overall resources, while providing no such benefit to Congressional candidates.

With repeal of the Equal Time provision, the fairness doctrine would still apply. No major party or viable minor party candidate could be discriminated against by television, radio or other media. The fairness doctrine would require that every important candidate be given a fair and equal opportunity to present his views on the issues.

The repeal of section 315 would be advantageous for several reasons.

Repeal could mean greater amounts of free time for Presidential and Congressional candidates. Experience has shown that the Equal Time provision of section 315 has substantially discouraged broadcasters from supplying free time to federal candidates, because the broadcaster is required to afford an equal amount of free time not only to the major party candidates, but also to "fringe" candidates. In 1960, when section 315 was suspended, the national television networks provided over thirty-nine hours of free broadcast time for candidates in the Presidential election, while in 1964, 1968 and 1972 they afforded only four and a half hours, three hours, and one hour respectively.

Greater exposure might result in greater participation at the polls. Since 1960, the amount of free time given to Presidential candidates has decreased markedly. Simultaneously, voter turnout has decreased from 64% in 1960 to 62.9% in 1964, to 61.8% in 1968, to 55% in 1972. Repeal of section 315 might help reverse this trend.

Greater exposure for Presidential candidates has been promised by all three networks if section 315 is repealed. Congressional candidates would probably also receive more free time. This would enable Presidential and Congressional candidates to reduce their campaign expenditures.

The repeal of section 315 could give greater exposure to challengers in what are now considered "safe" districts. It is deplorable that many qualified candidates are unable to raise money and gain public exposure, because of the huge margins incumbent opponents have run up in the past. At present, the vast majority of Congressional districts are considered "safe". The repeal of section 315 would make these districts more competitive and would help insure that all qualified candidates are given a reasonably fair chance of winning their election.

14. Congress should make a study of Federally issued scrip. This scrip should be serially numbered, computerized, containing names and addresses of donor, recipient and redeemer, and available at post offices and Federally insured financial institutions. It should be the only valid medium of exchange in all Federal primary and general elections for all expenditures by or on behalf of candidates and for all contributions in excess of $100.

The Task Force thought that this idea was worth special study, because it might enable the federal government to maintain close control of the monies used and spent in federal campaigns.

The principal features of this scheme are as follows:

Federally issued scrip, serially numbered (for rapid computerization and reporting), in the same denominations as money, and with detachable certificates (to record each transaction) would be the exclusive medium of exchange for all campaign contributions and expenditures, with the requirement that non-scrip contributions would have to be exchanged for scrip by the recipient committee or candidate prior to further use.

With the sole exception of contributions of up to $100 per individual, there would be a complete prohibition against the use of any other medium of exchange for contributions to candidates or political committees or for expenditures designed to advance or oppose the candidacy of any person for nomination or election to federal office.

Scrip would be readily available for purchase and would be redeemable at all post offices and all federally chartered, licensed or insured financial institutions, including commercial and savings banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, and similar organizations.

Any and all parties to any transaction in which any medium of exchange, except scrip, was used for political purposes in federal election campaigns would be in violation of the law and subject to criminal penalties.

The Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, or an independent Federal Elections Commission would be assigned administrative and enforcement authority and would be responsible for making public (at least weekly) computer printouts showing current and cumulative amounts being contributed and expended for or against each candidate for office, including names of donors and recipients and the nature of the expenditures.

The principal advantages are as follows:

The plan would be simple to administer. There would be no detailed recordkeeping or reporting requirements. Scrip would be readily available. The redemption of scrip into cash would be the same as cashing a check or making a deposit.

This plan would be self-enforcing. The computerization of the serially numbered scrip, which provides the ability to trace contributions and expenditures, together with the outright ban on the use of money in political campaigns will reduce the opportunity for evasion to a minimum. Even if under-the-table cash contributions were made (in violation of the law), they couldn't be spent without turning them into scrip which, in turn, would require identifying the source of the contributions. Since most providers of goods

and services (radio, TV, newspapers, etc.) couldn't risk violations of the law forbidding acceptance of cash, likely violations would be limited to payment for personal services in a campaign, a relatively small category and one which enforcement efforts could be concentrated on.

Computer experts who have looked at the scrip plan report that present computer technology far exceeds what would be required to implement the plan.

This plan would increase accountability. Since *all* contributions and expenditures would have to be made in scrip, regardless of when or where or by whom they are made, and since the public would have access on a year-around basis to complete information on campaign financing, there would be no gaps in the process, no period uncovered by the requirements, no possibility of delaying announcements of candidacies for the purpose of obtaining unreportable contributions or making unreportable expenditures.

The study should assess several possible drawbacks to this idea:

While the plan seems to be theoretically sound, it may prove to be administratively unworkable. Scrip could actually do more harm than good if implemented.

Those who are genuinely committed to circumventing the law will find a way to evade the use of scrip as well. Coupled with the possible additional administrative burden, the plan might have a negative effect on the electoral process.

15. The Federal Election Campaign Act shall preempt individual state laws wherever they are in conflict.

The Task Force felt that the intent of many of its proposals might be invalidated by the restrictions of state laws. For example, a state may limit expenditures made through any campaign committee to an unreasonably low amount. Presently, a candidate might evade this limit by setting up numerous campaign committees. Under the Task Force's proposals he would be allowed to set up only one campaign expense agency. The state law would then essentially cripple his ability to campaign. By providing that the Task Force's recommendations shall preempt state law, situations such as this can be avoided.

Concern was expressed that this provision might nullify otherwise well-constructed and well-intended state laws and create loopholes for federal, state and local candidates.

16. The penalty for violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act shall be increased from $1,000 and/or 1 year to a maximum of $25,000 and/or 1 year.

The penalties under the present law are too lenient. No one has ever gone to jail for violation of a federal campaign finance law. It is somewhat unlikely that anyone ever will. A fine of $1,000 per violation for a corporation, labor union or wealthy individual is a mere slap on the wrist. A $25,000 fine would be a greater deterrent to illegal activities covered by the Federal Election Campaign Act.

17. The Task Force reiterates its endorsement of President Nixon's proposed Non-partisan Commission on Federal Election Reform to study the entire pattern of campaign practices and recommend a comprehensive set of reforms and regulations.

Even though the 93rd Congress may enact a series of election reforms, there will still continue to be a need for on-going study of additional ways the election process can be improved.

A Non-partisan Commission would help restore public confidence in the governmental processes through increased citizen participation. Seven of the Commission's members would be chosen from the public.

President Nixon's proposal called for a final report by December 1, 1973. Unless Congress approves the proposal before the August recess, this date should be moved forward to December 1, 1974.

The Task Force also endorsed expanded disclosure of assets and income of public officials which pose a possible serious conflict of interest.

The Task Force felt that none of the present proposals for public disclosure would adequately implement in practice what it had agreed upon in principle. In particular, none of these proposals seemed to balance sufficiently the need to improve public confidence with the right of privacy.

Although it failed to approve several proposals for federal financing of elections, the Task Force feels that this question should receive further study.

There are strong arguments both for and against public financing of political campaigns.

Proponents of federal financing state that it would eliminate the corrosive effect of big money, curb the mushrooming growth of campaign expenditures and ensure equality of access to the political process. Federal financing would eliminate the demeaning and degrading task of raising money from private sources. It would ensure fair, honest and open elections, thus restoring citizen confidence in the electoral process.

Opponents of federal financing believe that it will aid incumbents, unconstitutionally limit the right of free expression, undermine the traditional political process, and narrow the base of popular support a candidate would need. Federal financing might actually reduce confidence in the electoral process, because the beleaguered taxpayer will see his hard-earned money being squandered on candidates who have little popular support and candidates in which he has no positive interest—not to mention all of the inane paraphernalia and superfluous advertising of political campaigns. Finally, it would open the way to further federal manipulation of elections. When the federal money goes, strings always seem to follow. In addition, the federal agency in charge of federal financing could use its resources to develop previously unthought of and unimagined ways of manipulating the outcome of federal elections.

The Task Force thought that a proposal that entails dramatic changes in the political process and has powerful arguments both for and against should warrant a most careful examination and evaluation.

SANTA CLARA VALLEY SKILL CENTER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished team of reporters, Mr. Harry Farrell, political reporter for the San Jose; Calif., Mercury and News, and Mr. Elias Castillo, have recently concluded a series of six articles concerning the Santa Clara Valley Skill Center.

The series makes startling revelations about the manner in which Federal funds from the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare have been illegally spent by an agency which had contracted with the Federal Government to provide vocational training for disadvantaged citizens. In my opinion, this is one of the finest examples of investigative reporting I have ever seen.

Because the revelations by Mr. Farrell and Mr. Castillo concern programs which have been authorized and funded by this Congress, each Member of Congress has a concern with the series of six articles. I, therefore, include them as part of the RECORD at this point and sincerely hope that all Members of Congress will read them:

[First of a series]

POVERTY CENTER'S WEB OF POLITICS AND BIG MONEY

(By Harry Farrell and Elias Castillo)

A tangled web of business dealings has diverted resources from a tax-supported anti-poverty agency into a private San Jose business venture, a four-month probe has revealed.

The agency is the Santa Clara Valley Skills Center (SCVSC), which has received more than $2 million in government manpower training funds.

It is linked to the strictly private Avance Technical Development Corp. by Jose Lopez, the kingpin of both establishments.

Lopez is executive director of the Skills Center. He is also president of Avance, which runs a print shop as its most visible operation and engages in a wide range of other enterprises.

San Jose Mercury and News interviews with more than 90 persons, supported by extensive documentation, show that:

A substantial amont of Avance business has been carried on at the Skills Center.

Skills Center equipment has been installed at the Avance shop and used for commercial work.

Both employes and students have been supplied to Avance for work on Skills Center. time.

A pattern of pork barrel politics also emerges in the Skills Center investigation.

Despite a clear, consistent record of substandard performance, the SCVSC has operated under a blanket of political influence extending as far as Washington, D.C.

More than half of the Skills Center's $2 million in federal money has bypassed normal channels en route to the school.

One contract has enabled the Skills Center to reap $47,127 in tax funds for work never performed.

The Skills Center, a private, nonprofit corporation, began business in Sunnyvale in 1967 and moved to San Jose in 1970. It is one of many such vocational schools spawned by President Johnson's War on Poverty.

From the start its guiding spirit has been Lopez, 43, who was in the hierarchy of the old Santa Clara County Economic Opportunity Commission, the original antipoverty agency here.

In the mid-1960's Lopez, a native of Crystal City, Tex., came to San Jose as an insurance agent, investigator, and public relations man. He has been active in such groups as the Community Service Organization, American G.I. Forum and the United Latin American Council.

Since its beginning, the Skills Center has had such firms as Lockheed, General Electric and IBM represented on its Industrial Advisory Group. Their names on its letterhead have enhanced its political clout and contributed an image of stability, masking a hand-to-mouth existence.

Wesley P. Smith, recently retired state director of vocational education, confirms the precarious existence of the SCVSC.

"There has been a kind of little ragged history as far as the Skills Center is concerned," he says. "Anybody who has followed it at all has to recognize that it has had the problems that are common to almost a shirt-tail operation . . . Its existence has depended solely on getting federal contracts of some kind—cliffhanging all the time."

It is in this cliffhanging maneuver that Lopez has demonstrated his political muscle, growing from a tight clique of his high placed friends in government.

Time after time he has overcome normal priorities to win large chunks of money, in the form of training contracts. He has tapped at least six government agencies and programs for significant sums.

The Skills Center has received $131,000 in excess or surplus federal property; $127,229

from the Work Incentive (WIN) Program; $68,002 under a preferential Job Corps subcontract; at least $9,600 from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO); and $268,000 in Model Cities funds—part of it under a contract approved by the San Jose City Council only two weeks ago.

Operation SER, another local manpower agency, has farmed out its own trainees to the Skills Center at a federal cost of about $188,000. In part, this has happened under political pressure.

By far the largest share of Skills Center revenue, however, has come under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) programs of the federal government. From this source, the SCVSC has received $1,297,959.

MDTA is jointly administered by the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) under an incredibly complex bureaucratic structure.

The program is 11 years old and aims at developing marketable job skills among the unemployed, underemployed, displaced workers and members of racial minorities. The payoff is measured pragmatically in job placements.

Most MDTA money is filtered through state monitoring agencies. In California the Department of Human Resources Development (HRD) first determines which vocational skills are in demand in a particular labor market and then writes an MDTA training order accordingly.

For example, HRD may determine that it can put 35 auto tune-up men to work in San Jose.

Once the training order is written, the State Department of Education develops a curriculum and assigns the course to a suitable school. The HRD refers trainees there, paying them a stipend in lieu of unemployment insurance.

This allocation system is aimed at the most bang for the buck. It provides assurance that jobs await trainees when their courses end.

Of the $1.3 million allocated for MDTA courses at the Skills Center, however, only one-fifth has gone through this usual procedure.

More than $1 million of the Skills Center money has come direct from Washington, where the Labor Department has "discretionary" funds that may be handed out without regard to state quotas.

Lopez' tugging on political strings has repeatedly won him access to this "discretionary" money.

It has detoured the state's normal choice of training schools on the basis of "track record."

State officials say the Labor Department has simply notified them that the funds were available for the San Jose area—provided the Skills Center got the training contract.

Once the money has been thus earmarked, the state agencies have been responsible for monitoring its use, but without the impact they might ordinarily exert.

John Saulsbery, regional supervisor for MDTA in the State Department of Education, views the matter philosophically:

"It's sort of like playing football," he says. "I might not agree with the quarterback's selection, but once he calls the play, if I want to stay in the game, I'd better carry out my assignment. I've felt that once these programs were funded, it was up to me to make them as successful as I could."

Robert Eissler, former state MDTA program supervisor, says the direct funding of the Skills Center from Washington was "an absolutely unusual procedure—unheard of. Personally I do object to it . . . but my attitude is, 'Why fight it? If that's the way the Department of Labor wants to operate, that's their business.' "

[Second in a series]

EVIDENCE SHOWS CLOSE LINK OF AVANCE, SKILLS CENTER

(By Harry Farrell and Elias Castillo)

Jose Lopez, asked to explain the relationship between the Santa Clara Valley Skills Center and Avance Technical Development Corp., replied emphatically:

"There is no connection."

The identical words are used by his nephew, Rudy Gonzales, the Skills Centers' assistant director.

But Lopez and Gonzales themselves are exhibits A and B in a vast pile of evidence showing the two enterprises inseparably linked—physically, fiscally, and in daily operation.

The Skills Center is a non-profit corporation with Lopez as its executive director, owing its existence to federal allocations topping $2 million.

Avance is a purely commercial enterprise of which Lopez says, "I own it, period."

Both Avance and the Skills Center have print shops. Avance's is for commercial orders. The Skills Center shop is for training low-income youths.

Since 1971 Avance has branched out into other endeavors, ranging from the sale of secondhand furniture to governmental "consulting."

When Avance applied for its San Jose business license on April 12, 1971, it was Gonzales who signed the application, giving his title as "coordinator." Gonzales has been associated with his uncle in Skills Center operations over a period of several years.

Today the Skills Center and Avance maintain separate premises. But the business license application for Avance shows it originally shared the Skills Center address, 1147 N. 10th St., and the Skills Center phone number.

Another early link between the two establishments was Leonard Espinoza. He was assistant director of the Skills Center in 1971 but also had business cards identifying him as Avance's general manager.

The cards carried the Avance trademark and a telephone number which, when called today, turns out to be the personal line of Jose Lopez at the Skills Center.

Lopez maintains that Espinoza was on the Avance payroll half-time during part of his 1971 employment.

But Espinoza volunteers the information that he declared no Avance salary in his federal income tax return that year. He produces an IRS Form W-2 which shows he indeed worked for the Skills Center, earning $3,426.72.

In an affidavit which has been in state files at Sacramento for nearly two years, Espinoza declared:

"I spent 20 per cent (of my time) at the beginning, to 100 per cent at the end of my employment, on Avance."

After a costly assortment of printing and duplicating equipment was moved into the Skills Center in the spring of 1971, Espinoza says he went out and started drumming up Avance business.

"Yeah, I heard that before, that he went out hustling," Lopez comments, "and later we even found out that he had done some printing, but it was not charged by Avance."

The time element, is pertinent in tracing the earliest days of the intertwined history of Avance and the Skills Center.

Avance's home was at the Skills Center headquarters for about two months before the firm moved to its present shop at 332 N. Market St. in mid-1971.

Lopez, queried about whether it was proper for a private firm to operate out of a federally funded facility, responds that in its earliest days Avance was nothing more than "a name—a mailing address."

"There was no Avance press, no Avance anything at that time," he says.

"You didn't do any work at all?"

"I answered the phone."

A wealth of evidence, however, establishes that Avance conducted a lively business, apart from just phone answering, at the Skills Center for more than a year:

Avance's first invoices carried the Skills Center address. Records of the San Jose Unified School District show numerous purchase orders addressed to Avance there between July 9, 1971, and July 14, 1972.

In May and June, 1971, when Avance was only a few weeks old, the Assocated Students of the University of California at Berkeley paid the firm $1,493, in response to five different billings. All the payments were directed to the Skills Center address.

On April 27, 1971, only 15 days after Avance applied for its business license, it sold a load of office furniture to the Foundation for Research and Community Development (FRCD), 235 E. Santa Clara St., for $936.50. The deal was handled from the Skills Center, where the merchandise was stored.

The deal with the FRCD exemplifies a key feature of Avance's operation. Largely, its clientele consisted of other federally funded anti-poverty agencies similar to the Skills Center in function and philosophy.

Thus Lopez funneled the Skills Center's federal resources into a business which thrived largely in other federal resources.

The furniture sold to the FRCD by Avance include seven desks, a file cabinet, and a receptionist's seating station. Payment was via the FRCD's check No. 223, dated April 29.

One of those who remembers the desk deal is Espinoza, who says the old metal desks went to the Skills Center auto body shop for repainting in "psychedelic colors."

Dale Mallet, who at the time had just taken over as head of the FRCD's Project Intercept, a Labor Department program to rehabilitate first offenders in the courts, offers corroboration.

One of his first duties, he recalls, was to go and inspect the furniture that had been ordered by his predecessor. He did so at the Skills Center, where he found the desks unrepainted and ordered them re-done in brilliant hues chosen by his staff.

Ernest Lara, formerly an auto mechanics instructor at the Skills Center, confirms that the auto body shop was used for repainting desks, but he cannot pinpoint the precise occasion. Students did the work, he says.

Efforts to question Lopez about this and certain other matters involved in these articles have been unsuccessful. On May 23, he granted the writers a one-hour interview, which he cut short after about 30 minutes. He agreed to resume it two days later, but cancelled out and has since refused to answer any questions.

Interestingly, the FRCD says today it has no records of any dealings with Avance, despite cancelled checks showing at least four payments to the firm. Copies of the checks are in state possession at Sacramento.

An element of mystery also surrounds Avance's 1971 billings to the U.C. student body—specifically to three of its subsidiary activist units—the Third World Board, the West Berkeley Huelga Center, and MECHA, a student group.

One item of $275 is shown for "bus rental," although Espinosa points out that at the time in question, June 7, 1971, Avance owned no buses.

The Skills Center did have a bus in 1971, however, and photographs exist showing it at a demonstration at the State Capitol in August of that year.

Other Avance billings to the U.C. student body about the same time have such generalized descriptions as "paper supplies," $379; "posters and office supplies," $294; office materials," $410; and "reference materials," $115.

Espinoza said in his 1971 affidavit that these purchase orders actually covered cam-

paign material for Jesus Ruiz, then running for president of the U.C.-Berkeley student body, and Jorge Klor, running for executive vice president. Both ran on the New Action Party ticket.

U.C. records confirm that Klor may have been involved, since he is one of those who signed the Avance invoices.

Ruiz, a supporter of the Third World Movement, denies knowledge of the Avance billings to U.C. agencies, but he says he has the impression some of his campaign posters were printed in San Jose.

"As far as I know, the stuff we ran off was on our own money," he says, estimating his campaign expense at $400 to $600. He is hazy about the details.

State records show that the Skills Center's first MDTA printing class did not start until Nov. 1, 1971. But there is additional evidence that the presses there were busy before then.

It was on April 13 of that year that Mayor Norman Mineta was elected, and still in existence are a few copies of a campaign piece printed in red and black, listing "Chicanos Por Norm Mineta."

Espinoza identifies this flyer as his own creation. He says he turned it out at Lopez instructions during a meeting of the future mayor's Mexican-American supporters at the Skills Center. He used paper from a 10-ream box obtained from the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), he adds. Mineta was unaware of this, Espinoza emphasizes.

In the same election Robert Stroughter was opposing City Councilman Joe Colla. Two former Skills Center employes recall seeing Stroughter literature being printed there.

Stroughter, director of the Mayfair Center, an Eastside community betterment agency, has no recollection of the job, but concedes donated material could have been printed for him on Skills Center presses.

Espinoza also recalls the printing of a batch of brochures for Ignacio Balli, running in early 1971 for the Chabot College board in Southern Alameda County.

Balli, who lost the election, is a former board chairman of the Southern Alameda County Economy Opportunity Agency (SACEOA) and ex-regional chairman of the American G.I. Forum.

[Third in a series]

UNITS SENT TO SKILLS CENTER WIND UP IN AVANCE BUILDING

(By Harry Farrell and Elias Castillo)

In late summer, 1971, a truck from the Santa Clara Valley Skills Center rolled up outside Globe Printing Co., an old San Jose firm to take aboard two pieces of machinery. Globe's proprietor, Jack B. Anderson, was donating a Norfin collator and Page Boy feeder—devices to arrange book pages in proper sequence for binding—to the struggling SCVSC for use in its graphic arts classes.

Globe had paid $7,267.04 six years earlier for the equipment. Now, allowing for depreciation, the firm was claiming a $3,600 tax deduction for the gift.

Skills Center Director Jose Lopez, in a letter to Anderson dated Sept. 3, acknowledged the $3,600 value as "realistic," adding:

"Thank you again, and be assured that we will put the equipment to good use in training our young potential printers."

The machinery ended up, however, not at the Skills Center on N. 10th Street but at the downtown print shop of Avance, Lopez' private firm, at 332 N. Market St.

One job on which it was used there was a 300-page Comprehensive Demonstration Program for the San Jose Model Cities agency. For this publication, the city paid Avance $1,764.

Larry Parr, a former Skills Center printing instructor, remembers the Model Cities job well.

Parr says he was exclusively on the Skills Center payroll while he worked for Lopez—never on Avance's. But he and his students as well were detailed to work on the Model Cities project, which he accurately recalls as "a big, thick book—an orange three-ring binder."

"Avance was the only place the collator was used," says Parr. He adds that the printing work on the Model Cities book was split between the Avance plant and the Skills Center.

Until last month Anderson was unaware that his equipment donation had in fact gone to a competitor. Globe and Avance have bid against each other on a number of projects, including some work for Model Cities.

Avance's possession of the donated items surfaced last winter in obscure public records.

When Lopez had written to Anderson in 1971, thanking him for the machines, he had used Skills Center stationery.

But last Nov. 27, using Avance stationery, he wrote another letter to Economic and Social Opportunities, Inc. (ESO), Santa Clara County's OEO-funded community action agency. He offered to sell his private printing operation to ESO for $42,500, and as negotiations progressed he supplied a detailed equipment inventory.

The collator and feeder appear on it, with a combined value of $3,250 assigned them. The serial numbers on the inventory invoice (507–04 and 30–65) are identical with those shown on Globe's 1965 receipt for the equipment and in Lopez' 1971 thank-you note to Anderson.

The Avance-ESO negotiations eventually collapsed.

Shuttling of other machinery and equipment between the Skills Center and Avance is also well documented.

Lopez acknowledges that an Old Town photocopy machine at Avance belongs to the Skills Center. It is broken, he adds, and was taken to Avance in contemplation of its sale to Community Legal Services, Inc., which leases part of the Avance building.

Steve Kottas, a former Skills Center student, remembers an IBM composer at Avance that "went back to the Skills Center for a few days."

Avence's biggest press, a 29-inch Chief that Lopez says he bought secondhand, was originally delivered to the Skills Center and later moved to the commercial shop.

Parr remembers rebuilding it after the move.

"I guess it had moved so many times that it wouldn't work," he says. "I had to get it operating. I actually set it up for Avance."

Leonard Espinoza, who doubled in 1971 as assistant director of the Skills Center and general manager of Avance, says all printing equipment at the school was moved when Avance opened its present building on N. Market Street. Specifically, he recalls the transfer of an A.B. Dick 360 press and a plate burner.

On the other hand, Lopez points out that he loaned one of his own Avance machines, a Multilith 1250, to the Skills Center for several months without charge, so his students there could learn color printing.

His reward for his generosity, he complains, was that his students broke the machine.

"I have not used the Skills Center for Avance," Lopez said flatly in the one brief interview he has accorded these writers. "I can deny this categorically, with no problem at all, okay?"

The interview took place May 23, however, before the episode of the Globe Printing Co. equipment had come to light. Lopez has not permitted questioning on this and many other specifics.

Parr and Espionoza are not the only ex-employes of the Skills Center who tell of students, employes and equipment being diverted to serve Avance's needs. Similar episodes are related by Chuck Becker, former printing instructor, and Ernest Lara, who taught auto mechanics.

Former students corroborate the teachers' accounts.

Kottas, who was sent to the Skills Center by the Job Corps for training, spent the best part of five months working for Avance without pay, except for his government stipends of $30 to $50 a month.

On Kottas' part, this arrangement was admittedly voluntary, since it enabled him to continue training when the Skills Center printing class shut down a month after he entered it.

But Lopez got the 18-year-old youth's free work, operating a camera, running a small press, cutting paper to size.

Lopez portrays the arrangement as a sacrifice on his part. He says teaching the youth cost time and material "out of my pocket."

Nevertheless, he was sufficiently pleased with Kottas to offer him a job as a lead man (teaching assistant) at the Skills Center, after only six months' training.

Another Skills Center student frequently pressed into Avance service during school hours was Lee Tomasello, 26, now enrolled at DeAnza College.

Often, he says, Avance would put out a call for three or four trainees when work was heavy. During compilation of the big Model Cities program binder, he adds, "they had maybe 10 or 12."

Twice, according to Tomasello, Avance paid him about $2.50 an hour for working on his own time—once at night and once on Saturday. But when he worked at Lopez' private shop during school hours, he says his only compensation was his $65-a-week MDTA benefit in lieu of unemployment insurance. This came from the government.

"Viva," the Model Cities newspaper for which the City of San Jose pays Avance $1,349 an issue, is one project on which both Kottas and Tomascello say they worked, as Skills Center trainess.

Avance was often "behind the eight ball" in meeting its Viva deadlines, says Tomasello, and that was when Skills Center students were pressed into service.

One sight that bemused Tomasello during his assignments at Avance was the Skills Center truck, bearing U.S. government plates, coming around to pick up the trash.

Becker and Kottas are among witnesses who say they saw Viva being run off, from time to time, at the Skills Center on one of two Harris presses that are federal property. Lopez got them from the excess inventories of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). When new, they cost the government $29,582 apiece.

An in-house HEW memo says the school received excess property items worth about $131,000, including jeeps, cars, mini-buses, auto shop equipment, machine tools, typewriters, adding machines, and printing equipment.

Another publication Kottas says was printed on occasion at both Avance and the Skills Center is "Informe," a bilingual paper issued every other month by the San Jose United School District.

For Informe, the SJUSD pays Avance $530 to $932 an issue, plus up to $264 in typesetting fees.

Parr says it was he who designed Informe's "logo," or masthead title. He remembers school district people coming two or three times to the Skills Center—rather than Avance—for lengthy conferences on Informe's design and layout.

Avance had superior type composition equipment, according to Kottas; so "anything fancy" at the Skills Center was sent there for this part of the work. By the same token, if the Avance presses were busy, he says commercial jobs were sent to the Skills Center and run by trainees.

Lopez denies the assertions that commercial work for Avance has been done at the Skills Center.

He says, however, that after certain jobs

were run at Avance, the photos and plates may have been taken to the Skills Center for use in training projects.

It is possible, he elaborates, to "bring in a newspaper and have the guys tear it apart and rebuild it again" as part of their class work.

[Fourth in a series]

HOW THE RENT WAS PAID

(By Harry Farrell, and Elias Castillo)

A testimonial to Jose Lopez' business and political know-how is the way he has arranged, in effect, for public funds to absorb the rental for his private firm, Avance Technical Development, Inc.

In this maneuver he dealt with a clique of associates who run federally subsidized agencies not unlike his own Santa Clara Valley Skills Center.

In 1971, Lopez was casting about for new premises so that Avance would have a headquarters apart from the Skills Center address at 1147 N. 10th St.

He settled upon a vacant structure of 11,000 square feet at 332 N. Market St., owned by Winifred Patten of Menlo Park. He leased it for $1,100 a month, or a dime a square foot.

Next Lopez arranged with Community Legal Services, which provides lawyers for the poor, to take over about 7,000 square feet of the building for $1,024 a month.

Community Legal Services has been funded from a variety of sources such as the OEO, United Fund, Bar Association, the federal VISTA program, and Model Cities.

It is headed by Atty. Stephen Manley, a long-time Lopez associate who in 1971 became chairman of the Skills Center board of directors.

Back in 1966, when Lopez had run an area service center for the Old Economic Opportunity Commission (EOC), Manley had been his assistant.

With Community Legal Services sharing his building, Lopez still had 4,000 square feet of his building left over for Avance, but he didn't need that much. So he found another Model Cities agency, Economic Progress for All (EPA), to take about half the remaining space off his hands for $525 a month.

To attract Community Legal Services as a tenant, Manley says Lopez had to renovate the warehouse-like building to the tune of about $7,000.

For part of this work, Lopez pressed into service his Skills Center assistant director, Leonard Espinoza.

"My job was to keep the guys busy and make sure they didn't slack off," Espinoza says. "I was the one that made the measurements, laid out the floor plan for the offices, and everything."

Among those who worked with him on the renovation, Espinoza names two Skills Center employes, Jose Fuentes and Jose "Lupe" Mendiola. He says they performed as both carpenters and electricians.

A postscript to the remodeling episode is added by the City Building Department. There are no records that a permit was obtained for the work, which incidentally was performed in downtown Fire Zone 1, where construction codes are more stringent than elsewhere.

Thus two agencies funded by Model Cities, not to mention Avance which prints the Model Cities newspaper have operated in uninspected premises.

Besides Avance's lucrative printing work for Model Cities, a $4,000 "consultant" contract was awarded to the fledging firm late in 1971.

This covered preparation of a "Resident Employment Plan." It was an 88-page document to tell Model Cities' own agencies how to carry out an obvious function—hiring the disadvantaged residents of the Model Cities neighborhood.

Why such a document was needed at all was a question enmeshed in federal red tape. At any rate, Avance's report was a rambling document in gobbledygook governmentese. A sample sentence:

"In order to build into the scope of this contract the utilization design for applicability, it must be noted that the parameters of the correct functions are in fact exceeded as part of that design."

The prose goes on that way for page after page.

In the introduction to the report, Avance incorrectly describes itself as a "research firm located in the Model Cities area of San Jose." Neither the original nor the present location of the corporation is in the designated Model Cities neighborhood.

The $4,000 price tag on the Resident Employment Plan, according to Avance's contract with the city, was based on compensation of four consultants, three of whom were to receive $200 a day, and the fourth, $150.

A substantial part of Avance's $12,328 in billings to the San Jose Unified School District cover the printing of "Informe," a bilingual newspaper distributed to families of deprived youngsters in the federal "Title I" program.

But the largest single item of SJUSD work performed by Lopez' outfit was the 1971 production of a 98-page "Chicano Bibliography"—a catalog of literature dealing with Mexican-American culture.

As a hurry-up job, the book went to print without competitive bids. The School District's purchase order to Avance was for $7,000, a figure later sharpened on the invoice to $6,828.24 for 4,000 copies.

The Mercury and News this month obtained an independent bid on the production of the bibliography and found that it could be duplicated, even after two years of inflation, for $3,950.

Even at the $6,828 price, the book emerged from Avance with pages missing or in the wrong sequence.

Another $1,402.52 of SJUSD money went to Avance for a 20-minute sound movie describing the Title I program. The purchase order for the motion picture was dated July 1, 1971, at a time when Espinoza, then doubling as Avance's general manager, says the firm owned no movie-making equipment whatever.

This lack, however, did not deter Avance from jumping into the motion picture production with both feet. As its photographer the firm used Brian Szabo, who had been a videotape specialist at the Skills Center.

Szabo, now a San Francisco City College instructor says he made the movie for Avance on a contractual basis, using rented equipment.

"I was paid only $1,000 or $1,200," he recalls. "It (the film) was done on a shoestring budget. My own work was a labor of love."

Szabo estimates the movie's total production cost at $3,500, indicating a substantial Avance subsidy to the project. An SJUSD spokesman confirms the subsidy, saying Lopez picked up the deficit in consideration of having Avance's credits on the screen.

A more sensational Skills Center film project explains belatedly the exceptional television newsplay accorded San Jose High School's 1971 graduation ceremony.

On that occasion valedictorian Liza Hirsch used her speech to blister school officials as "hypocrites and pencil-pushers." She assailed the police and lit into school policies on matters ranging from drug abuse to sex education.

Miss Hirsch, who later went to work for Avance, is the daughter of Fred Hirsch, longtime leftwing activist here. He is also a friend of Lopez and visited the Skills Center frequently.

Espinoza recalls how Lopez, on the eve of SJHS commencement, told him to get together with Szabo and prepare the Skills Center video equipment for taping Miss Hirsch's speech.

Szabo says today he had no foreknowledge of what Miss Hirsch was planning, and the filming of the commencement exercises was "simply a training thing." Many of the Skills Center's girl trainees, he explains, were dropouts who had never experienced a graduation; so the film would give them a chance to see one.

As it turned out, the pictures Szabo took had a far wider audience than the Skills Center girls.

With the videotape in hand after the ceremonies, the Skills Center contacted NBC, CBS, and ABC about airing Miss Hirsch's contentious valedictory. Szabo was dispatched to Los Angeles where he turned the tape over to NBC.

After the TV use of the tape, Szabo says it was transferred to movie film "so it could be shown more easily in educational-type situations."

Another use to which the Skills Center video equipment was put was taping the wedding of Bill Peters, who preceded Espinoza as the school's assistant director.

"It was my tape. I paid for it," Peters insists.

Szabo says one other wedding was filmed on a similar basis. There was talk of Avance going into the wedding-movie business, he remembers, but the idea never got off the ground.

[Fifth of a series]

SKILLS CENTER KEPT GOING BY AN "ANGEL"

(By Harry Farrell and Elias Castillo)

In the story of the Santa Clara Valley Skills Center, a name that looms large is Dr. Edward A. Aguirre.

Though the school has often been in hot water with state manpower training officials, they say Aguirre has bailed it out again and again.

Whenever the state has denied money to the Skills Center, under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)—and that has been often—the state people say Aguirre has bypassed normal procedures to provide the funds anyway.

Aguirre served from 1970 to 1972 as regional manpower administrator for the U.S. Department of Labor in San Francisco and then as the department's regional director until last March. He recently became regional commissioner for the U.S. Office of Education.

He disputes the state view of his activities, as will be seen.

The question arises at this point: If the state is reluctant to fund the Skills Center, why?

The answer begins with the premise that in manpower training, the name of the game is job placement.

State MDTA standards specify that 80 per cent of the trainees assigned to a vocational course should complete it. Of those who graduate, 80 percent should land jobs within 30 days. Thus the ratio of placements to original enrollees should be at least 64 per cent.

According to records of the State Department of Human Resources Development (HRD), the Skills Center has never come close.

Since May of last year it has had a dropout rate of more than 44 per cent in MDTA courses. And only seven of 10 graduates have won jobs within the 30-day period. The Skills Center's ratio of placements to total enrollees has been only 39.4 per cent.

In one clerk-typist-medical transcriber course, 156 trainees enrolled, but 101 dropped out. Of the 55 who finished, only 14 got jobs within 30 days—or 9 per cent of the original enrollees.

This particular course, incidentally, was on a high-budget basis. A memo by former Regional MDTA Supervisor W. K. Hickey, dated July 13, 1970, notes that the contemplated cost per trainee was $2,295.25. In a similar course assigned to the San Jose Uni-

fied School District, the comparable cost was $1,594.76, or $700 less.

Not long after the Skills Center first opened, state MDTA officials responded in 1968 by allocating it, under normal procedures, $249,670 for courses in five diversified occupations.

At all times since, these officials insist, they have given the SCVSC the same consideration as other schools. Perhaps for reasons suggested above, however, no further money went to the Skills Center through usual state channels until this year, when it got $33,419 for a bicycle repair class.

During his famine of state funding, Lopez turned to Aguirre for help. Repeatedly he was funded direct from Washington, from the Labor Department's unapportioned account.

Since 1970 this source has supplied $1,013,632 to the Skills Center, short-circuiting state control channels.

Few persons close to the picture doubt that it was Aguirre who made this money available to the Skills Center.

Says Wesley Smith, recently retired state director of professional education: "I don't think there's any question about it, no question at all."

Says John Saulsberry, regional MDTA supervisor: Dr. Aguirre is apparently Mr. Lopez' greatest friend in the Department of Labor."

Says Wilson H. Elledge, field representative of the State Bureau of School Approvals: "Lopez got on his political high horse and went to Aguirre. Aguirre has given a total umbrella of protection to Lopez in the federal government."

Says Bill Peters, former assistant director of the Skills Center: "Dr. Aguirre was a friend of Jose's . . . They spoke on the phone. When it was important for re-funding, there was obviously more contact than when not."

Aguirre's political guardianship of Lopez was never more evident than in June, 1971, when the Skills Center became embroiled in a bitter funding dispute wtih another local manpower agency, Operation SER.

At a meeting in San Francisco, Aguirre knocked heads together.

Ostensibly his admonition on that occasion was directed jointly at Lopez and Jose Martinez, director of SER. A neutral observer says his basic approach was, "I'm in a position to help you, but if you guys cut one another down, you put me in a bind." There was a further implication, according to this source, that if the feuding continued, funds would be diminished or cut off.

Martinez, however, did not interpret Aguirre's warning as bilateral. Since Aguirre was Lopez' friend, he says, he felt "the pressure was on me personally."

The "Forumeer," publication of the American G.I. Forum which sponsors operation SER, called Aguirre's ultimatum "forcible rape" in its July, 1971, issue.

"It looks like . . . Lopez has a personal friend in the right place in Dr. Aguirre is going to milk that friendship to . . . destroy Project SER," the Forumeer commented.

Aguirre, interviewed this week, said he is opposed "as a general rule, to special funding" for any manpower facility, including the SCVSC.

"Those people should get into the system," he added. "The idea of having to go through special funding circumvents the system."

Aguirre acknowledged he had tried to give such institutions as the Skills Center "some lead time" to qualify for funding via routine channels.

However, he declined to answer when asked whether he had ever talked or written memos to his superiors in the Labor Department, in the Skills Center's behalf.

Aguirre said he has known Lopez about four years.

In answer to the assertion that he is Lopez' "best friend" in the Labor Department hierarchy, Aguirre replied:

"I'm a lot of people's best friend. I got to know him as I've gotten to know dozens of people in government. I wouldn't consider him a personal friend."

Yet, the close relationship between the two men is evident in the fact that Aquirre, working through Lopez, lined up Skills Center employe Jose Fuentes to groom the garden of his home in San Mateo. He paid Fuentes $2.50 an hour, he said.

Aguirre added he was of the impression that Fuentes was a Skills Center student, and that he had always hired "people in the poverty level" when he had a chance.

A dismal placement record and high costs per trainee are only two of the many problems state officials have encountered with the SCVSC.

Another obstacle to easy funding of the school has been the fact that despite its name, it has never qualified as an officially designated "skills center" in the eyes of the federal government.

Such a designation, which carries a priority for funding, requires compliance to rigid standards far beyond the capability of the SCVSC, plus joint action of the U.S. Office of Education and the Labor Department.

The state's hesitance to allocate MDTA courses to the Skills Center is further illuminated in a thick file of memos and letters in the Department of Education at Sacramento:

After talking with Lopez in 1968, MDTA budget analyst R. R. Thompson filed this report with his superiors:

"It was quite evident . . . that he was not remotely familiar with the accounting procedures required to maintain the school's records in auditable condition. It was later borne out that no one there was familiar with the requirements. . . . This is not just an isolated instance of difficulty encountered with these people."

A recurrent theme in the state files is reprisal by the Skills Center against students who reported grievances to HRD.

On Aug. 3, 1970, auto tune-up trainee Roy Sanchez was expelled for an "uncooperative and negative attitude" after he registered several complaints with HRD. Among them: (1) that the tune-up instructor had quit two weeks earlier and the class was being taught by an unqualified ex-student; (2) that there was an acute tool shortage—only one toolbox for the entire class at the outset of the course.

MDTA officials who investigated confirmed Sanchez' charges.

As a result of the Sanchez incident, the State Bureau of School Approvals sent Elledge to inspect the Skills Center. In a scathing report, he found that 100 per cent of the auto tune-up class had flunked the smog control test. Elledge's report concluded, "A wonderful snow job." His recommendation: "Close the school."

On May 3, 1971, former Skills Center instructor Jetta Shapiro asked state officials for an investigation of the school, telling them that though she knew nothing about typing, she was assigned to teach it two hours a day.

"The Center couldn't afford roll books for the instructors or rulers for the students," she complained, "but when the auto specialist class graduated, the Center went out and bought a bottle of Jack Daniels liquor and another bottle of booze and served it on the premises at 2 p.m. during school hours."

Lopez wrote on May 4, 1971 to State Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson Riles, challenging the state's seeming preference for the San Jose Unified School District in MDTA course assignments. The letter elicited a flurry of state memos to assist Riles in responding.

Wrote Saulsberry: "HRD people in San Jose are reluctant to refer people to the Center . . . The San Jose Unified School District has handled MDTA assignments in a first-class manner."

Wrote State Director of Professional Education Smith: "This is another one of our problem private schools . . . Their performance has not been good."

Saulsberry sensed some improvement when he wrote another memo Aug. 10, 1972: "There appear to be improved relationships between the Skills Center and HRD. . . . They (the SCVSC) may not qualify for the 'Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval,' but this aspect of the center is improving. Fiscal affairs seem to have improved since the days in Sunnyvale when the nice little English bookkeeper seemed to have trouble converting from pounds, shillings and pence."

About a year ago, ex-Director of Vocational Education Smith toured the SCVSC. He says he found things much better than earlier when he had called the center "one of our problem private schools."

"I was very pleased," says Smith. "I thought they were doing a good job."

Saulsberry, however, offers a highly pragmatic motivation for Smith's post-inspection recommendation that the Skills Center be given additional funding—a recommendation that resulted in the award of its bike repair course.

"Wes Smith was an excellent politician," Saulsberry says. "He worked very hard on public relations. . . . I think Mr. Lopez complained to him that he was not getting anything from the state—that it would probably be a good political move to give him at least one project."

[Last of a series]

$52,693 To Skills Center But No Instruction

(By Harry Farrell and Elias Castillo)

A preferential 1972 Job Corps subcontract, negotiated in a politically charged atmosphere, has enabled the Santa Clara Valley Skills Center to collect $52,693 for instruction never given.

The pact was cancelled last month at the direction of Royce Halsey, deputy regional manpower administrator for the Department of Labor.

He gave the order, he says, because the situation was "so shady, so bad, so questionable."

The episode throws a spotlight on the relationship between Skills Center Director Jose Lopez and Xavier Mena, deputy director of the Job Corps, in Washington, D.C.

Other Labor Department officials say Mena has consistently guarded Lopez' interests in his dealings with the Job Corps.

"We're trying to run the program," says Halsey, "and he's trying to defend a situation that is throwing money down that rat hole."'

The cancelled contract provided for farming out Job Corps youths to the Skills Center for vocational training.

Parties to the pact were the Skills Center and Singer Educations Systems. Singer is the firm engaged by the government to run the Job Corps' San Jose facility, which occupies a row of one-time fraternity houses on S. 11th Street.

John Acquilano, who heads the Singer operation here, says there is "no question" that his firm signed with the SCVSC under influence from Mena.

And when the first steps toward cancellation took place, he adds, political pressure to reverse the action quickly began to mount.

But at this point, Halsey says he told Singer:

"I don't give a damn. Get out of that contract. You can't afford that sort of thing; so get the hell out of it and get out of it now." He later added, "I'm chartered to run

this program, and I'm going to run it like I would if it were spending my own money."

The Skills Center contract was one of five that Singer negotiated with local public and private schools for training of its Job Corps youth in a number of vocations.

Essentially these were form contracts, nearly identical. But the Skills Center pact contained an extra "Article XXI" that appeared in none of the others.

It provided that during a start-up period, the Skills Center would be paid $1.69 an hour for training 50 students a day (later reduced to 40), whether or not the Job Corps would provide them.

How this worked out is illustrated by figures for last August. During that month the Job Corps sent the Skills Center only enough trainees to receive instruction worth $674 at the specified hourly rate. The actual payment, order Article XXI, was $7,774.

For the full-term of the contract, instruction actually given by the Skills Center was worth only $22,844.99 at the hourly rate, but payments mounted to $75,538.80.

During negotiations on the agreement last year, at least two former Singer officials found Article XXI objectionable. Dean Dalby, who was deputy director of the Job Corps here, had reservations about it, and Dale Winston, who was manager of administrative services, says he "opposed it verbally."

Sometime during the negotiations, however, Mena arrived in San Jose.

Winston remembers him coming to the Job Corps Center for a lengthy conference in the office of Pedro Yadez, Aquilano's predecessor, after which the controversial contract was signed.

Lopez was on hand, too, according to Winston, and he and Mena left in the same car.

Dalby tells of sitting on another conference, which took place at Lopez' Skills Center, regarding the contract. He says others present were Mena, Yanez and Lopez.

Mena denies emphatically he influenced the contract. He says this would have been "unethical."

"I stepped out of the room because I did not want in any way to influence . . . the negotiations," he emphasizes. "I have never talked to anyone in Singer to try to buy a bowl of soup, let alone a subcontract. Never, never."

But Dalby says the very presence of the Job Corps' No. 2 man had its effect.

"Let me put it this way," he explains. "When you have a man that high-ranking present, you just draw your own conclusions."

At no time, Dalby recalls, did Mena object to the controversial clause.

Halsey's move to revoke the Skills Center contract began last year.

"They (Singer) didn't react as quickly as possible," Halsey says: "I think they were concerned about political ramifications. I don't give a damn about political ramifications."

Despite Lopez efforts to mobilize community support for his contract, it was ultimately terminated for reasons that went beyond excessive cost, according to Halsey and Aquilano.

Like state manpower officials, they had compiled their own list of grievances with the Skills Center's performance.

One was "recycling" of trainees—running them twice over the same curriculum. Two Jobs Corps women, Claudia Shaw and Francelia Stevens, reached Chapter 29 in their shorthand book, only to be returned to Chapter I when a new class started up.

Within days after Halsey and Aquilano moved to cancel the Skills Center as a Job Corps contractor, Mena flew back to San Francisco for conferences with Halsey and Regional Manpower Administrator Floyd Edwards.

Asked why the No. 2 man in the Job Corps would so concern himself with a purely local matter, Mena said several other items were also on his agenda for the trip. He acknowledged that Lopez had called him about his contract difficulties, but said he made the promises to intervene.

Mena's visit with Halsey and Edwards was May 21. He was briefed in detail about the Skills Center's unearned fees, which at that point amounted to $47,000.

"Those figures were laid out to him very, very coldly and very, very plainly," Halsey says.

Yet when Mena was interviewed by the Mercury and News two days later at his San Diego summer home, he claimed, "I haven't seen the figures you're telling me."

Mena, unlike other Labor Department officials involved, is strongly defensive of the Skills Center, particularly its capacity for bilingual instruction.

Referring to a visit there, he says. "What I saw, I liked."

Like many other similar agencies, the Skills Center today faces a clouded future.

The federal programs which have supported it are on the wane.

Federal revenue sharing may kill off many of them.

As a result of these articles. the Skills Center also may face an FBI inquiry, a probe by the Santa Clara County district attorney, and an internal investigation by its own board.

PANAMA CANAL: ONASSIS-OWNED VICTORY CARRIERS SUPPORT MAJOR MODERNIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative in the Congress from the great Port of New York with assignment to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am keenly alert to the needs of American shipping. Among the problems facing it are those of the safe, convenient and expeditious transit of the Panama Canal, which is now under consideration by the Congress.

At hearings on July 17, on interoceanic canal problems, discussions focused on the subject of what should be done to improve its operations and increase its capacity. Proposed legislation for these purposes is now pending.

One of the strongest and clearest statements submitted in connection with the indicated hearings was a letter to me from Constantine G. Gratsos, executive vice president of Victory Carriers, Inc., which is an important element in the merchant marine of the United States. This company is owned by Aristotle Onassis, one of the shipping leaders of the world.

In his letter, Mr. Gratsos strongly recommends prompt action on H.R. 1517, which measure, introduced by our distinguished and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) would authorize the resumption of construction of the suspended third locks project modified to include a terminal lake in the summit level in the Pacific sector of the canal. The plan has been authoritatively recognized by some eminent engineers, navigators, and other canal experts as providing the best canal for the transit of vessels practicable of achievement at least cost under existing treaty provisions.

In order to give the Gratsos letter wider circulation, I quote it as part of my remarks:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *July 16, 1973.*

Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: As Executive Vice President of Victory Carriers, Inc., a New York based carrier, operating ships which utilize the Panama Canal, I would like to share some views with you which may be helpful in tomorrow's hearings of the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The value of having a waterway across the Isthmus has been recognized since the age of discovery. Saving about 8000 nautical miles for intercoastal voyages, its continued efficient operation is a matter of prime importance. Interoceanic commerce is concerned primarily with its continued safe, expeditious and convenient transit.

Ever since the opening in 1914 of the canal thoughtful mariners have often asked why the Atlantic end of the canal has only one group of 3 lifts locks to raise vessels from sea level to the Gatun Lake level, about 85 feet high, while at the Pacific end of the Canal there are two groups of locks separated by a small intermediate level Miraflores Lake, 54 feet above mean sea level.

These experienced navigators generally recognize the differences between the two ends of the canal and have often reported to their operating companies about the double set of difficulties experienced when transiting the Pacific Locks. I have observed these difficulties from personal observation during transit of the canal.

For more than half a century every vessel that has passed through the Pacific Locks has had to make two approaches, make fast twice to towing locomotives, and let go twice as compared to only once for these operations at Gatun. The Pacific arrangement has involved not only loss of transit time but has also added to the danger of marine accidents. Our ship masters have often stressed the marine operational benefits that would accrue from the consolidation of the Pacific Locks in three lifts as close to the seas as possible so as to correspond with the layout at Gatun.

The crucial tests of World War II and marine operational studies incident thereto made in the Panama Canal organization inspired the development by the personnel in that agency of a proposal for the future canal based upon navigational experience, known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan.

Because of its inherent advantages, which are perfectly obvious, it makes a strong appeal to thoughtfoul mariners and their principals as the only logical solution of the Canal question when all its main aspects are considered. In this connection, I would emphasize that any plan that does not eliminate the bottle neck locks at Pedro Miguel does not merit the support of the Merchant Marine and from our point of view would be useless.

The problem of increasing the capacity of the Panama Canal has two elements of great interest to the merchant marine; locks and transit capacity.

The usable dimensions of the present locks are 110 feet by 1000 feet by 41 feet. While these dimensions are sufficient for a majority of the vessels that transit, the number of larger ones is steadily increasing to such a point that even Panama Canal pilots have

publicly complained about the locks being too small for some of the traffic.

The fact that the transit capacity can be increased by certain improvement is not enough. With the exception of the widened Gaillard cut the Canal is essentially what it was when opened to traffic 59 years ago. Specifically, many ship masters have complained that the location of the Pedro Miguel Locks squarely across the mouth of Gaillard cut causes problems and loses time. Those who have studied the subject almost uniformly urge the elimination of these locks for an adequate modernization. As previously indicated, any plan that does not provide for the physical removal of these locks cannot solve the marine problems of the Canal. Instead it would perpetuate what experience has shown to have been the fundamental error in the design of the Panama Canal—the separation of the Pacific Locks.

What is needed for the Panama Canal is a two way ship channel through the continental divide with a traffic reservoir in the summit level at each end.

The reservoir at the Atlantic end is supplied by Gatun Lake; the needed basin at the Pacific end would be provided by the elevated Miraflores Lake. And such a canal would be the best canal for the transit of vessels and it would be provided by H.R. 1517. The recommended modernization program involves much work: two years for planning and about eight years for construction. Prompt passage of the bill is recommended.

In addition to the increase in capacity and safety provided by the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan ships would obtain the added benefit of an increase of the water supply which would reduce the present problems caused by seasonal shortages of water.

Major modernization of the Panama Canal would be expensive, of course, but as time goes on costs would inevitably increase so that it is mandatory to undertake the project at the earliest moment. Panama Canal tolls can be raised within reason, and I believe that any increase in tolls should be allocated toward the improvement of the canal, not only for the benefit of American Shipping but for the commerce of the entire world.

Sincerely,

C. G. GRATSOS.

TWO-PARTY CONSENT REQUIRED TO INTERCEPT WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the practice of electronically monitoring private conversations without the consent of all parties to the conversation and without a warrant constitutes a serious threat to the civil liberties of all Americans.

In a recent decision, Federal District Court Judge Gerhard Gesell wrote:

> Whatever incidental good flows from this invasion of privacy is submerged by the growing appearance of police surveillance so typical of totalitarian states.

Judge Gesell noted that consensual overhearing, in which one party to the communication gives his consent to the eavesdropping:

> Does not violate any provision of the Constitution or any statute. Only legislation requiring a warrant in these cases can correct the growing intrusion of the right of privacy so central to the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing such remedial legislation. The law now permits a person to intercept a wire or oral communication where such person is a party to the communication or where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception. This means, as the revelation of the White House tapes indicates, that an individual's remarks, uttered under the most private circumstances, can be intercepted and recorded without his knowledge or consent and without judicial supervision. My bill provides that wire and oral communications can be intercepted without a warrant only if all of the parties to the communication give prior consent.

This requirement is similar to the Federal Communication Commission "beep tone rule." In 1947 the Commission, acting on the belief that the unregulated use of recording devices threatened the privacy of telephone conversations, ordered that any recording device used in interstate or foreign calls be accompanied by an automatic tone signal. In 1966, the FCC prohibited eavesdropping by radio devices unless all the parties to the communication consent. In making this ruling, the Commission relied on the recommendations of the Committee on Science and Law of the Bar Association of the city of New York. Incorporating the arguments of the association, the FCC found that—

> We should not sanction the unannounced use of listening or recording devices merely because one party to an otherwise private conversation is aware that the conversation is in fact no longer private.
>
> The right of privacy is precious, and should not be sacrificed to an eavesdropper's needs without compelling reasons . . .
>
> We do not believe it to be consistent with the public interest to permit this new product of man's ingenuity to destroy our traditional right to privacy.

Unfortunately, the FCC regulations lack substantial criminal sanctions. The individual who records a telephone conversation without the required beep tone risks only discontinuation of his telephone service. Eavesdropping by radio device is punishable under the FCC regulations by a fine of $500.

The time has come to take decisive action to regulate electronic eavesdropping. Privacy is essential to liberty. Unwarranted and unregulated intrusions on privacy threaten Americans of all political persuasions. The requirement of prior judicial authorization for the interception of wire or oral communications can stop the proliferation of "consensual overhearing." My bill mandates such judicial supervision and provides substantial penalties for illegal invasions of privacy.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 9698

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the interception of certain communications unless all parties to the intercepted communication consent.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2511 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by—

(1) striking out, in subsection (2)(c), "or one of the parties to such interception" and inserting in lieu thereof ", but only if all of the parties to the communication have given prior consent to such interception."; and

(2) striking out, in subsection 2(d), "or where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception" and inserting in lieu thereof ", but only if all of the parties to the communication have given prior consent to such interception,".

RESOLUTION OF IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, with great reluctance I have come to the conclusion that the House of Representatives should initiate impeachment proceedings against the President. My mind has resisted that conclusion for many months. I have now, however, come to the point where I must follow my convictions and my conscience and recommend that the House of Representatives pursue its duty under article 2, section 4 of the Constitution which provides for the impeachment of the President.

Before discussing the historical, constitutional, and legal justification for my conclusion I think that it is appropriate to note that the recent revelation which persuaded me that I could no longer be silent on this point was the recent disclosure that President Nixon conducted a totally secret air war in Cambodia for 14 months prior to April 30, 1970. On that day President Nixon announced to the Nation that he had ordered American ground forces to enter Cambodia. The President stated to the Nation that in the 5 years prior to April 30, 1970, the United States had "scrupulously" observed the neutrality of Cambodia. The President made this statement with the full knowledge that he had personally ordered thousands of B–52 air raids over Cambodia during the 14 months prior to America's invasion on the ground of neutral Cambodia.

It is appropriate to discuss the following issues:

First. An impeachment cannot be substituted for either a vote of no confidence or an indictment for criminal offenses.

Second. The activities and omissions of President Nixon add up to conduct which merits impeachment by the House of Representatives.

Third. A hearing on impeachment by the House of Representatives is the only possible way by which the questions of the citizens of America can be answered and their confidence in government restored.

I. WHAT ACTIVITIES OR OMISSIONS AMOUNT TO IMPEACHABLE CONDUCT?

All of the literature concerning the Constitutional Convention demonstrates

that there is no evidence that any member of that convention expressed the opinion that impeachment was only intended to cover indictable offenses. That is the conclusion of the learned volume by Prof. Raoul Berger entitled "Impeachment: The Constitutional Problems"—Harvard University Press, 1973. Professor Berger states that—

One may fairly conclude that indictability was not the test of impeachment. . . .

The same author expands on this by asserting—

In sum, "high crimes and misdemeanors" without roots in the ordinary criminal law and which, as far as I could discover, had no relation to whether an indictment would lie in the particular circumstances. (Berger, at page 62.)

The House of Representatives, therefore, should not wait before commencing impeachment proceedings until some clear indictable offense on the part of the President becomes manifest. The Constitution makes it clear that the Founding Fathers separated impeachment from subsequent criminal prosecution. The words "high crimes and misdemeanors" do not presuppose conduct punishable by the general criminal law.

The report of the House Judiciary Committee recommending the impeachment of Judge English in 1926 was clear on this point:

. . . Although frequently debated, and the negative advocated by some high authorities, it is now, we believe, considered that impeachment is not confined alone to acts which are forbidden by the constitution or Federal statutes. The better sustained and modern view is that the provision for impeachment in the constitution applied not only to high crimes and misdemeanors as those words were understood in Common Law but also acts which are not defined as criminal and made subject to indictment, and also to those which affect the public welfare. (H. Rept. 653, 69th Congress, 1st Session, page 9–10.)

Indeed it is uncertain whether the constitutional provisions for impeachment set up a criminal proceeding at all. To be sure the impeachment provisions seem to point in the direction of criminality because they employ the language of the criminal law. At the same time article 3, section 2(3) of the constitution provides that—

The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury.

Similarly article 2, section 2(1) empowers the President to grant "pardon for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment." It is also significant that article 1, section 3 (7) distinguishes very clearly removal from office from the subsequent punishment which can be received after indictment.

Impeachment, therefore, should not be looked upon or compared with an indictment nor should the role of the House of Representatives in considering the impeachment of a President be deemed to be that of a grand jury. Perhaps the best definition of impeachment is taken from the classic work on jurisprudence of Justice Story. This classical source states that impeachment is—

. . . proceeding purely of a political nature. It is not so much designed to punish an offender as to secure the state against gross official misdemeanors. It touches neither his person nor his property, but simply divests him of his political capacity."

Impeachment is a noncriminal and nonpenal proceeding. Impeachment proceedings do not permit the person subject to them to claim double jeopardy if, in fact, he is tried for a crime subsequent to the impeachment.

From my review of virtually every legal and constitutional treatise ever written in American history on impeachment the term "removal from office" could be used as a synonym for "impeachment." Professor Berger notes in his definitive study of impeachment that the framers of the Constitution made clear the noncriminal aspects of the impeachment process but that—

A thorough-going attempt to clarify the non-penal aspect of removal would have required the framers to coin a fresh and different vocabulary—perhaps an insuperable task in all the circumstances.

The framers of the Constitution were steeped in English history. They feared that the executive branch of Government might be transformed into a monarchy. At the same time the authors of the Constitution desired to perpetuate the independence of the executive branch of Government. In order to maintain a system of checks against the executive, while not really threatening the independence of that branch of Government, the framers of the Constitution provided for impeachment which, it could be argued, is a narrow exception to the separation of powers.

The history of the Constitutional Convention makes it clear that, in debating impeachment, the framers were almost totally concerned with the powers of the President. The inclusion of the "Vice President and all civil officers," now in the Constitution, was not added until shortly before the convention adjourned.

Studies of the process by which the Constitution was written make clear that the framers furnished to the House of Representatives a norm for impeachment. That norm, adopted from English law, stated that impeachment can arise from a serious failing even though such conduct or failure to act would not be under English law an indictable, common law crime. At the same time the framers of the Constitution withheld from Congress the power to inflict criminal punishment. The framers adopted the words "high crimes and misdemeanors" because they knew that these words had a limited and technical meaning.

The framers of the Constitution clearly understood the potential abuse of the power of impeachment which it conferred on the House of Representatives. They understood that impeachment could become a very partisan weapon and that its existence could threaten Presidential independence. Nonetheless they chose to give to the House of Representatives the power of impeachment as a curb on Presidential conduct which would be less than criminal but more than tolerable.

I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that a hearing on the impeachment of the President is indicated.

II. DOES PRESIDENT NIXON'S CONDUCT JUSTIFY IMPEACHMENT?

In view of the fact that the Members of the House of Representatives act under the Constitution as the triers of fact in any impeachment proceedings it is not appropriate to set forth circumstances surrounding recent events in a way to suggest that the only possible inference from these circumstances is a conclusion that justifies impeachment. Consequently I raise questions that in my judgment the House should seek to answer. The list of questions is by no means complete or comprehensive. Nor is it appropriate to suggest that these questions will be resolved by the Senate Watergate Committee. Indeed, one can argue, based upon the questions asked by the Senate Watergate Committee, that the members of that panel may well be usurping the right to investigate the possibility of impeachment—a right granted by the Constituton exclusively to the House of Representatives.

The questions to which the House, in an impeachment proceeding, should address itself include the following:

First. Was there any justification for President Nixon authorizing 3,630 air strikes over Cambodia between March 1969 and May 1970? This period of 14 months of intensive bombing cost $140 million. Since the Congress knew nothing of the secret raids in Cambodia was this money obtained from the Congress under "false premises" and spent in an unconstitutional manner?

Was the President, furthermore, truthful with the American people when he stated to them on April 30, 1970, that "for 5 years neither the United States nor South Vietnam has moved against enemy sanctuaries—in Cambodia—because we did not wish to violate the territory of a neutral nation"?

Did the President, moreover, acquiesce in wrongdoing when the National Security Council, headed by Dr. Henry Kissinger, ordered the falsification of military records in order to prevent disclosure of the clandestine air war on Cambodia?

Second. Were impeachable offenses committed by the President in connection with the taping of all conversations which he made on the phone and all conversations that took place in various parts of the White House? If Mr. John Ehrlichman is accurate when he stated that he talked with Mr. L. Patrick Gray, then Director of the FBI, from a phone in the President's office it was a clear violation of Federal law since a phone was tapped without the permission of the sender or the receiver of the message.

Once again the answers to those questions with respect to the tapes may or may not be revealed in the Senate Water-

gate proceedings. But the House of Representatives is nonetheless not absolved from its obligation to investigate this matter insofar as it pertains to the question of impeachment—a subject over which the House has exclusive jurisdiction under the constitution.

Third. Every court that has ruled on the question of impoundment has decided against the administration. Nonetheless the impounding goes on. It was revealed on July 26, 1973 that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had withheld $1.1 billion over the past year in moneys authorized for major Federal health programs. By what right does a Federal agency refuse to spend more than a fifth of all of the expenditures appropriated by the Congress for the health services budget? Affected by this refusal to spend were Federal mental health programs, the National Heart and Lung Institute, and the National Cancer Institute—the last having been given priority by the President himself.

Fourth. The establishment of a supersecret security force within the White House itself is, of course, unprecedented in all of American history. The assumption by the President of the statutory tasks of the FBI and the CIA raise the most serious questions concerning the impeachment of a Chief Executive who in effect established a national police force accountable only to himself.

There are many other questions that could be raised concerning the legality, the constitutionality and the propriety of action and inaction by President Nixon.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Until the last few days I, like other Members of the House of Representatives, took refuge in the hope that somehow these questions would be resolved either in the courts or in the Senate Watergate Committee hearings. I am persuaded that Members of the House can no longer entertain such hopes. The legality of the conduct of the several dismissed top aides to the President may or may not be fully resolved by the Senate hearings or in the courts. But the question of the impeachment of the President can be resolved in no other place but the House of Representatives.

It will no longer do for Members of the House of Representatives to suggest that no serious question exists. Reliable national polls indicate that some 70 percent of the American people feel that the President was involved in some way in the coverup of the Watergate scandals. Almost one-fourth of the people in the Nation have expressed the opinion that the President should be removed from office.

If the House of Representatives is to be truly the House of the people we can no longer tell almost one-fourth of America's citizens that they must expect the Senate or the courts to determine whether or not the President has committed impeachable offenses. The determination of that question is a right and duty which the House has under the Constitution and a duty which the House may not delegate to any other body in America.

Months ago the House Committee on Banking and Currency had a vote as to whether they would investigate the then emerging scandals related to the Watergate. The committee in a closely divided vote decided not to investigate those activities at that time.

I think that the time has arrived when the Members of the House must seek to think the unthinkable and to search diligently into our convictions and our consciences and decide what is our duty under the constitution as we behold the unprecedented revelations which everyday become more incredible.

Not a few observers and students of the House of Representatives have stated that they feel that the House has been too timid in asserting its constitutional powers with respect to a declaration of war. Many commentators have also indicated that the House of Representatives has not been vigorous enough in the exercise of its oversight function with respect to Federal regulatory agencies, including the military. Many publicists, furthermore, have given their opinion that the House of Representatives not infrequently allows the Senate to erode the powers of the House.

I raise that central question with regard to the Senate Watergate proceedings. If the President is impeached by the House the Members of the Senate must sit as the jury of the impeachment sent to the Senate by the House. Inevitably, therefore, the Members of the Senate cannot and should not inquire into the existence of impeachable offenses on the part of the President. That role belongs exclusively to the House. I hope that the House of Representatives will overcome its understandable reluctance and confront the unpleasant but unavoidable fact that hearings on the impeachment of the President have now become our constitutional duty.

Finally, Members of the House of Representatives should recognize that under the constitution a proceeding with respect to his impeachment is the only way by which a President can vindicate himself. Col. George Mason made this point when he addressed the Framers of the Constitution meeting in Philadelphia. Colonel Mason recommended that the constitution provide "for the regular punishment of the Executive when his misconduct should deserve it." But Colonel Mason went on to state that the same procedure will provide "for his honorable acquittal when he should be unjustly accused." For Members of both political parties, therefore, the impeachment process should be looked upon as the one way by which the Executive will be removed from office or by which he will secure that "honorable acquittal" to which he is entitled if he has been "unjustly accused."

Impeachment should not be a partisan issue. Impeachment should be a question which Members of both political parties in the House of Representatives should be able to discuss. Nothing can be gained by denying the existence of this question and a great deal may be lost.

The one instance in which the House impeached a President—that of President Andrew Johnson in 1868—was in all probability a gross abuse of the impeachment process and an attempt to penalize the President for differing with the policy of the Congress. If impeachment is to become a real issue within this House every Member should resolve to avoid the excesses which stigmatized the impeachment proceedings a century ago. A decent regard for the design of the Founders of our Constitution suggests that all of the Members of Congress speak rationally, responsibly, and reasonably about those processes which we should discuss and develop if on the one hand we are to avoid the great mistakes which this House made a century ago and, on the other hand, we are to confront without blinking the fact that we alone as Members of the House have under the Constitution the duty to exercise the awesome power to impeach the President.

PHOSPHATES IN DETERGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, during the 91st and 92d Congresses, the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee conducted extensive investigations on the Government's actions, and nonaction, concerning phosphates in detergents. Our investigations were extensively reported by the Committee on Government Operations in its reports of April 14, 1970 (H. Rept. 91–1004, entitled "Phosphates in Detergents and the Eutrophication of America's Waters"), and March 15, 1972 (H. Rept. 92–918, entitled "Phosphates and Phosphate Substitutes in Detergents: Government Action and Public Confusion").

These studies and reports showed that phosphates in heavy duty household detergents are a principal source of the phosphorus which is destroying our lakes, deteriorating our fisheries, and impairing our ability to use and reuse numerous lakes and streams. Our reports recommended that the amount of phosphorus in detergents be reduced and eventually eliminated in the manufacture of household laundry detergents.

The administration, although admitting the deleterious effect of discharging high levels of phosphorus into our waters, his chosen to disregard our recommendations. Instead, the administration has asserted that it will favor the treatment of wastewaters to remove phosphorus prior to their discharge into waterways.

I certainly agree that we should strive to remove phosphorus from wastewaters in treatment plants. But it would be far more intelligent, and far less costly, to reduce the amount of phosphorus going into the wastewaters before expending large sums of money to

remove the phosphorus from the wastewaters.

The debate between the large soap and detergent companies, which want to continue manufacturing phosphate detergents, and the rest of the country, which wants to help preserve our waters from the eutrophication and deterioration of water quality caused by high levels of phosphate nutrients, has steadily continued. It is a subject of great public interest, because it involves the preservation of our Nation's waters, and the question whether we should expend millions and millions of dollars to construct or upgrade treatment plants to eliminate phosphorus from wastewater when the phosphorus could more readily be eliminated when the detergent is manufactured.

Recently, the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs published a brief report concerning its studies on this subject. The report, entitled "Laundry Detergents and Environmental Quality," was prepared by Prof. Richard S. Howe, and Messrs. John G. Morris and H. W. Poston. Professor Howe and Mr. Morris were formerly program director and deputy commissioner, respectively, of Chicago's Department of Environmental Control, and Mr. Poston is the present commissioner of that department.

The report found that the Chicago ordinances which, in February 1971, banned detergents with more than 8.7 percent phosphorus, and which on June 30, 1972, banned detergents containing any phosphates, resulted in a very substantial reduction in both the influent and effluent phosphorus concentrations in all four of the sewage treatment plants of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. These large reductions in phosphorus were accompanied by significant reductions in biological oxygen demand and suspended solids. To have achieved similar reductions by wastewater treatment would have cost the metropolitan sanitary district increased annual operating costs of some $27 million, including $9 million for handling increased volumes of sludge generated by chemical treatment, and additional capital costs for phosphate removal facilities exceeding $50 million.

The report also found that nonphosphate detergents were as effective as phosphate detergents in cleaning ability; were being favorably accepted by consumers; and caused substantially less corrosion of washing machines than phosphate detergents. The report found little or no evidence that phosphate detergents have greater germicidal and sanitizing capability than nonphosphate detergents. Although fabrics washed in carbonate-based detergents lose their flame-resistant properties more rapidly than when washed in phosphate-based detergents, the report pointed out that an occasional soak of the clothes in a vinegar rinse removes the calcium carbonate and reactivates the flame-resistant properties.

LITTLE COURAGE NEEDED ON HOUSING PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the President, in a blatant misuse of the power of the executive branch, slapped a freeze or moratorium on funds for low- and moderate-income housing programs.

This was a direct slap at the Congress and the committees which had authorized and funded the programs. Just last week, a district court judge ruled the moratorium illegal and I am hopeful that the appellate courts will uphold this opinion.

However, the legislative branch has its own responsibilities under the Constitution and it is up to the Congress to insist that the laws it passes are carried out by the Chief Executive. With this responsibility in mind, conferees from the House and the Senate Monday afternoon agreed on language which would require the President to carry out these programs as authorized by the Congress and to release the funds appropriated. This action is in keeping with the sentiment expressed by many Members of this House since the moratorium was announced in January. It translates the mimeographed news releases into specific congressional action.

Despite this, we have heard many threats of a Presidential veto of the extension of the housing programs because the Congress dared to say it means what it says about wanting these programs carried forward. I am sure that we will hear these threats repeated in all their glory when the conference report comes up later this week.

Mr. Speaker, I am the last to say I know what the President might do about a veto of housing, but the Congress does have a responsibility and I hope we have the courage to say we want laws we pass carried out. It would be sad if we cringe and hide under the desk and defeat housing legislation because we are afraid the President might be unhappy.

The conference report on House Joint Resolution 512 will give the House a clearcut chance to state whether it is really serious about housing for all Americans—low- and moderate-income families included.

The language adopted by the conference simply mandates the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to cease the suspension of Federal housing assistance programs. This would include such programs as FHA 235 and 236, rent supplements, college housing, public housing, and rehabilitation loans. The conference report also mandates the release of funds appropriated for rural housing programs. These are programs which the Congress has previously authorized and funded and the conference report simply reaffirms our demand that these programs be carried out.

SPACE HALL OF FAME— ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to inform the Congress that the city of Alamogordo, N. Mex., has announced its intentions to establish in this southwest New Mexico community an International Space Hall of Fame.

It is appropriate that southwest New Mexico, which played an important role in the pioneer development of the various U.S. rockets that make up space history, and continues today to contribute to the American space effort, should be the site of a shrine commemorating the world's space adventures.

The charter for the International Hall of Fame has been approved by the Governor of New Mexico and the Alamogordo city commission. At an early date, the plans for this project will be entered into the RECORD.

For the information of my colleagues, I insert a telegram from the Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce in the RECORD.

Congressman HAROLD RUNNELS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The City of Alamogordo announced to the world today that it will establish an International Space Hall of Fame, with an appropriate shrine to be supported by a historic foundation in this city.

The charter for this International Space Hall of Fame was announced by resolution of the Alamogordo City Commission, and a proclamation by Governor Bruce King of New Mexico.

Dr. Charles Stark Draper, President of the International Academy of Astronautics, has been consulted and offered the services of the Academy in selecting the nominees for the International Space Hall of Fame.

Dr. Draper is best known as the inventor of inertial test guidance systems for navigation of space vehicles.

The International Space Hall of Fame plans will be presented at the next meeting of the Academy at Baku, Russia, in October by Dr. Draper and by Dr. Ernst Steinhoff, a delegate from Alamogordo, New Mexico. The Academy was founded by distinguished pioneers of space research in 1961 for promotion of international cooperation and communication among space scientists of all nations.

A symposium of international space laboratories was held, under the auspices of the Academy, in nearby Cloudcroft, New Mexico in the fall of 1969.

The meeting coincided with the year of the dedication of the new Sacramento Peak Observatory telescope. Outstanding scientists from all over the world, attending the conference, were conducted on tours of facilities of the Tularosa Basin. The International Space Hall of Fame with associated history, exhibits and models will be a major tourist attraction in the Tularosa Basin.

The contributions of Holloman Air Force Base, White Sands Missile Range, the NASA Apollo Site and their early history of Wernher Von Braun and Associates leading to the first successful American orbital experiment and many other pioneer space contributions of the Tularosa Basin will be commemorated in this internal shrine of space history. Alamogordo is located on U.S. 54–70, between

El Paso, Texas and Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Historically, Alamogordo was located on the Old Santa Fe Trail and today is near Trinity Site, location of the first atomic fission explosion in July, 1945. Alamogordo is a thriving, bustling city of 25,000 people. Located nearby is the White Sands National Monument, the Lincoln National Forest and the Sacramento Mountains, the home of numerous mountain resorts.

ALAMOGORDO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED ON THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE BILL (H.R. 9130)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House plans to consider H.R. 9130, a bill to amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and to authorize a trans-Alaska oil and gas pipeline, and the somewhat similar, but considerably broader and different, bill (S. 1081) recently passed by the Senate. The prime objective of these bills is to overturn the February 9, 1973, decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, *The Wilderness Society* v. *Morton*, Nos. 72–1796, 72–1797, 72–1798—and their principal impetus is the asserted need to transport oil from the North Slope of Alaska in order to relieve the "energy crisis."

The fears of an impending energy crisis have been exacerbated and whipped up largely by the oil and gas industry. I question the validity of this "energy crisis" argument as a basis for the present headlong effort to rush construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline and to leave for more sedate study other alternatives which are certainly feasible. I think it is significant that the report of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (S. Rept. 93–207), which carefully analyzed many of the arguments pro and con as between the trans-Alaska and the trans-Canada routes, stated that the committee—

> Did not regard any one of the foregoing arguments or any group of them as conclusively in favor of either of the competing pipeline proposals. In some areas of debate the preponderance of evidence or analysis seems to favor one side or another . . . .

And decided to support the trans-Alaska pipeline primarily—

> Because it could be on stream two to six years earlier than a comparable overland pipeline across Canada.

These bills raise numerous and fundamental issues of national policy to which I shall advert in a moment. But their most fundamental characteristic is that they are far broader than need be to achieve what we are told is the basic purpose, namely, to allow construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline across Alaska from its North Slope to Valdez in order to permit transportation of oil by tanker from Valdez to domestic markets.

I shall now discuss some of the defects of H.R. 9130 and the amendments I propose to offer.

Title I of H.R. 9130 would amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act to give the Secretary of the Interior broad authority to grant pipeline rights-of-way in and across all of the public lands and forest reserves throughout Alaska and the United States. This proposal by the Department of the Interior simply aids and abets the greed of the oil industry in its efforts to use the Alaska pipeline and the energy crisis as the excuse for acquiring authority to devastate the forests and public lands of our Nation.

Please note, also, that the bill would not only authorize rights-of-way for pipelines, but also would encompass a wide variety of what the bill terms "related facilities." The bill's amended section 28(a) defines these related facilities to—

> Include but . . . not limited to valves, pump stations, supporting structures, bridges, monitoring and communication devices, surge and storage tanks, terminals, roads, and campsites.

It even provides that such facilities—

> need not necessarily be connected or contiguous to the pipe.

The use of the phrase "include but—not limited to" would appear to permit numerous other kinds of facilities even though they are not listed in the amended section 28(a).

I think it is a mistake to give such open-ended and unfettered authority to the Secretary to dispose of Federal lands. It may be argued, for example, that the phrase "include but—not limited to" would also authorize the use of large amounts of land for airports, whether or not they are connected or contiguous to the pipeline. On the one hand, it should be noted that H.R. 9130 as initially introduced on June 29 specifically named "airports," page 2, line 15, as indicated in the term "related facilities." That bill also included a reference to "airfield or airstrip" in section 203(d) of title II relating to the trans-Alaska pipeline, page 6, line 10. These references to "airport," "airfield," "airstrip" were deleted by the Public Lands Subcommittee when it reported the bill to the full Interior Committee on July 17, 1973, and the full committee concurred in such deletion. I now raise the question: Are airports included or not included? I therefore propose the following amendments:

I

An amendment to restrict the "related facilities" which may be included in a pipeline right-of-way under section 28 to those facilities specifically named in the statute.

AMENDMENT A

In section 1 of Title I of H.R. 9130, in the second sentence of the new paragraph (a) of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (p. 8, line 18), delete the phrase "but are not limited to".

In the event the House does not adopt the foregoing amendment A, I shall then propose the following amendment to make clear that airports and airstrips are not included within the phrase "related facilities":

ALTERNATIVE AMENDMENT B

In section 1 of Title I of the bill, in the second sentence of new paragraph (a) of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (p. 8, line 21), insert the phrase "but not airports or airstrips," immediately after "campsites,".

II

Even if the Congress decides to empower the Secretary of the Interior to allow oil and gas pipelines and all sorts of "related facilities" to proliferate amongst the open spaces of the unreserved public domain, it is a horse of a totally different color to permit such result in the lands which have been specifically reserved, such as those set aside for the national park system—for example, Yellowstone and Glen Canyon—the national wildlife refuge system—the desert game range and the Charles Sheldon Antelope Range—and the Wilderness System—Petrified Forest National Wilderness.

Section 28 of the 1920 Mineral Leasing Act specifies in its third proviso that "no right-of-way shall hereafter be granted over" public lands and forest preserves "for the transportation of oil or natural gas, except under and subject to" section 28. This means that only section 28 and the Interior Department's regulations cover rights-of-way for oil and gas pipelines. The Interior Department's present regulations are 43 CFR 2881 and the related regulations entitled "Rights-of-Way, Principles and Procedures." These regulations, particularly 43 CFR 2800.0–1, 2800.0–5(h), and 2802.1, would appear to indicate that section 28 now applies to parks, wildlife refuges and other reserved areas. Thus, the bill would enable rights-of-way grants of huge dimensions through the very kind of areas that Congress particularly intended to protect from such broad intrusions.

Accordingly, I propose the following amendment which would make section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 inapplicable to national parks, refuges, and so forth, unless the Secretary makes and publishes findings that the rights-of-way are in the public interest and meet the kinds of tests of environmental protection for such areas similar to the tests prescribed in the Federal Highway Act (23 U.S.C. 138) and sec. 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 1653). My amendment would not preclude oil and gas pipelines across those areas if the laws applicable to such areas authorize such pipelines. My amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT C

In section 1 of Title I of the bill in the new paragraph (c) of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (p. 9, line 6), insert the following after the letter (c):

"(1) No right-of-way or permit shall be granted by the Secretary in, across, under or through any area of the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge System or the National Wilderness System unless the laws providing for the establishment and administration of such areas specifically authorize such right-of-way or permit and unless the Secretary finds, and publishes such finding together with all other findings made by him under this section, that such right-of-way or permit is in accord with the public

interest, will not interfere with the uses and purposes to which the area is dedicated, and is consistent with the requirements of the statute permitting such right-of-way, and that if it harms the environment or any use or purpose to which the area is dedicated, there is no feasible and prudent alternative to such right-of-way or permit, and all possible measures to minimize the resulting harm have been taken or are planned; and (2)".

III

When H.R. 9130 was reported by the Public Lands Subcommittee to the full Interior Committee, it contained no provision for giving public notice of an application for a right-of-way or permit or for providing the public an opportunity to object either through written comments or at a public hearing. Accordingly, in the letter which nine other Members of Congress and I transmitted to the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, we urged that the bill be amended to provide for such public participation. The Interior Committee accepted our recommendation by including a new subsection (h), at page 11 directing the Secretary to establish procedures "including public hearings, where appropriate" to give Federal, State and local government agencies adequate notice and "opportunity to comment" upon right-of-way applications "filed after the date this subsection becomes effective." We appreciate the committee's action in adopting subsection (h). It is a welcome recognition of both the need for, and the public's right of, public participation in the Department's consideration of whether a right-of-way grant for oil and gas pipeline purposes should be made. However, I think it would be preferable that the act require public hearings whenever there is a request that public hearings be held. Accordingly, I propose the following amendment:

AMENDMENT D

In section 1 of Title I of the bill in the new paragraph (h) of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (p. 11, lines 11, 12), delete the phrase "where appropriate," and substitute the phrase "when deemed appropriate by the Secretary or upon request by any person,".

Subsection (h) applies only to "applications filed after the date this subsection becomes effective." Yet the Interior Department has stated that there are existing rights-of-way which violate section 28 as well as many pending applications for oil or gas pipelines, and that all of them must be scrutinized to determine whether they shall be approved. We think it impairs the public interest to deny the public and other government agencies the right to participate in the consideration of such applications and rights-of-way. Accordingly, I shall propose the following amendment:

AMENDMENT E

In section 1 of Title I of the bill in the new paragraph (h) of the Mineral Leasing Act (p. 11, line 14), delete the word "filed" and substitute the phrase "considered by the Secretary".

IV

The new subsection (g) requires the Secretary to notify the House and Senate Interior Committees whenever an application for a right-of-way is filed for a pipeline 24 or more inches in diameter. In our letter of July 16, nine other Members of Congress and I asked the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN MELCHER, whether the notification requirement would apply to "related facilities." He responded by letter of July 20—published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27, 1973, page 26416—that the subcommittee clearly intended the notification requirement to apply not only to a pipeline of 24 inches or more, but also to its related facilities. This appears to be confirmed by the fact that paragraph (a) of the bill—page 8, lines 12–13—refers to "the pipeline; that is, the pipe and its related facilities." Accordingly, in the light of subcommittee Chairman MELCHER'S assurance and the legislative history to which I have referred, I shall assume that the notification requirement is adequately stated in subparagraph (g) to apply to any application for a pipeline of 24 inches or more and also to any facilities related thereto.

For the reasons mentioned above, I believe that title I of H.R. 9130 as reported by the Interior Committee is an open-ended invitation for the oil and gas industry to rape the public lands, the national forests, and our reserved lands including our parks, recreation areas, monuments, and fish and wildlife refuges. Even with the amendments we here propose, we think that it would be preferable to defer title I for further study rather than be rushed into it under the asserted urgencies that are now being used to justify approval of the trans-Alaska pipeline.

V

Title II of H.R. 9130 would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant the right-of-way for the trans-Alaska pipeline without any further action under the National Environmental Policy Act, and without regard to any law other than section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act and the provisions of title II. Whatever the merits of the proposal to support immediate construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline, there are several deficiencies in title II which should be corrected. Therefore, I intend to propose the following amendments.

Section 203(c) authorizes the Secretary to include in the trans-Alaska pipeline rights-of-way and permits such terms and conditions as he believes would "mitigate" any adverse environmental impact. The word "mitigate" narrows the Secretary's obligation, which should be to prevent adverse environmental impacts as well as to "mitigate" those that have already occurred. When the nine Congressmen and I brought this matter to the attention of Subcommittee Chairman MELCHER, he responded as follows in his letter of July 20:

Regarding Title II and Section 203 and the use of the word "mitigate" rather than "prevent," this appears to be a matter of word choice and I would note that in Section 1(c) on Line 8 of the Committee print, the word "prevent" has been used in somewhat similar circumstances.

I welcome his response, of course, which constitutes persuasive legislative history as to the subcommittee's intention. However, because of the significant difference in meaning between the words "mitigate" and "prevent," I shall move to change the word "mitigate" to "prevent"—just as Chairman MELCHER's subcommittee amended subsection (c) by changing "minimize" to "prevent." My amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT F

"In the first sentence of subsection (c) in section 203, (p. 14, line 5), delete the word "mitigate" and substitute the word "prevent".

VI

Section 203(f) provides that notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any action or proceeding to which the United States or any of its agencies or employees is a party must be commenced "within 60 days" after the right-of-way or permit is issued. This extraordinary limitation on the right to sue on any matter would bar, not only opponents of the pipeline, but also the United States itself. Under this provision, the United States would, 60 days after issuance of the permit, be barred from bringing any suit on any controversy "involving any right-of-way, permit or other form of authorization granted with respect to the construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline." Even if it were desirable to bar an opponent of this pipeline, it passes understanding as to why that limitation should be applied to prevent the United States from litigating any controversy arising from or involving "any right-of-way, permit or other form of authorization granted with respect to the construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline." Accordingly, I propose the following amendment:

AMENDMENT G

"Amend the first sentence of section 203 (f), (p. 16, line 13), by inserting immediately after the word "proceeding" the following phrase:

", other than an action or proceeding brought by the United States,".

VII

Subsections 207 (a), (b), and (c) impose on the holder of the right-of-way strict liability for damages resulting from the holder's activities at any point along the pipeline, and from the discharge of oil from vessels carrying oil which had been transported through the pipeline. However, these subsections do not fully cover the matter of reimbursing the United States for costs incurred by the United States in removing pollutants. Thus, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which never envisaged spills from the trans-Alaska pipeline, but is nevertheless applicable to the matter of reimbursement for cleanup costs in removing oil spills in Alaska, imposes an $8 million limitation on the liability of an on-shore oil facility for the cost of cleaning up its oil spill. This limit could be wholly inadequate to pay for the cost to the United States of removing oil spilled from the pipeline. I, therefore, propose an amendment which would simply remove the dollar limitation for

damages resulting from, and for reimbursement of the costs for removal of, any spill of oil transported through the trans-Alaskan pipeline. The language of my amendment is drawn from 43 CFR 250.43, the Interior Department's regulation governing oil operations on the Outer Continental Shelf, which is not subject to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

AMENDMENT H

In Title II, at the end of section 207 (p. 20, line 17), insert the following new subsection (d)

"(d) If any area within or without the right-of-way granted by this Title is polluted by any operations conducted by or on behalf of the person granted such right-of-way, and such pollution damages or threatens to damage aquatic life, wildlife, or public or private property, the control and total removal of the pollutant, whatsoever found, proximately resulting therefrom shall be at the expense of such person including any administrative and other costs incurred by the Secretary or any other Federal agency. Upon failure of such person to control and remove said pollutant adequately the Secretary, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, or in cooperation with such person, or both, shall have the right to accomplish the control and removal at the expense of such person."

VIII

Secton 206 woud make any crude oil transported over rights-of-way granted pursuant to section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act, including crude oil from the trans-Alaska pipeline, subject to the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1969.

Therefore, section 206 would allow the oil companies to export the Alaska oil pumped through the trans-Alaska pipeline whenever the President finds that such exports are in the national interest, and such exports would continue unless the Congress within 60 calendar days after receiving the President's report of his findings passes a concurrent resolution of disapproval. This provision is wholly objectionable. The entire justification for the trans-Alaska pipeline is that the Alaska oil is needed to combat our Nation's oil shortage. Thus, Atlantic Richfield's advertisement in the Washington Post of July 10, 1973, stated:

What stands between our Nation's energy shortage and 10-billion barrels of Alaska oil?

The pipeline approval.

Proponents of the bill testified that the oil to be carried by the pipeline would not be exported. Yet, as Senator JACKSON said on the Senate floor on July 9, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 22798:

The industry and the administration have been evasive, legalistic and less than credible regarding the possibility of an oil surplus on the west coast of the United States, and regarding plans to export North Slope oil to Japan.

We believe that Congress should insist that the oil not be exported unless the Congress—not the President alone—has authorized such export by an amendment or later statute. Accordingly, I propose the following amendment:

AMENDMENT I

In section 206 (p. 18, lines 4–14), delete the two sentences of the *Provided* clause and substitute the following: "*Provided*, That no exports shall be made unless and until Congress adopts a concurrent resolution stating its agreement with the President's finding concerning the national interest."

IX

Subsections 203 (a) and (d) would elevate the pipeline and its associated facilities above virtually all other national policies. Subsection (a) directs the Secretary of the Interior to grant the rights-of-way and permits for the pipeline—

Without further action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, notwithstanding the compliance requirement of subsection 28(c), and notwithstanding the provisions of any law other than said section 28 and this title II.

In addition, subsection (d) precludes any judicial review under NEPA of any authorization for the pipeline and the parallel highway. These provisions would wipe out, so far as the pipeline is concerned, all the environmental laws of the United States. Not only NEPA, but at least the following 14 major statutes, and probably others, would be made inapplicable to the pipeline and its associated facilities:

Port and Waterways Safety Act; Jones Act; Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act; Clean Air Act; Federal Water Pollution Control Act; Oil Pollution Act of 1961; Wilderness Act; National Wildlife Refuge System Act; Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; Endangered Species Act; Department of Transportation Act, Section 12a; Federal Highway Act, Section 4(f); Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; Federal Power Act; and so forth.

If we adopt these provisions, we shall establish the precedent of legislatively waiving the National Environmental Policy Act—and all other environmental or protective laws—and we can expect every Member of Congress at some time to seek and expect similar legislative waiver of the NEPA—and other statutes—for his or her own projects. That precedent will spell severe problems for NEPA and further threaten our hopes for the preservation of our environment. I therefore propose the following amendment:

AMENDMENT J

(a) Section 203(a) (p. 13, lines 10–20) is revised to read as follows:

"Sec. 203(a). The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant, in accordance with the provisions of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended by Title I of this Act, such rights-of-way and permits as he finds necessary for the construction, operation and maintenance of a trans-Alaskan oil pipeline."

(b) Subsection 203(d) (p. 15, lines 13–22) is deleted.

We are all aware that the proponents of the bill are seeking to prohibit further environmental review under NEPA. Hence, if the foregoing amendment which would eliminate the prohibition against further NEPA review is not adopted, I shall then offer the following alternative amendment in order to preclude the wiping out, so far as the pipeline is concerned, of all other laws which may possibly affect the construction, operation and maintenance thereof:

ALTERNATIVE AMENDMENT K

In subsection 203(a) (p. 13, lines 17–18), the following words are deleted: "and notwithstanding the provisions of any law other than said section 28 of this title II,".

KEEP AN OLD FRIEND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, there is a popular adage in this country which states: "Down with the old, up with the new." The tendency of worshiping and revering the new at the expense of maintaining and renovating the old ofttimes presents a dilemma when the latter offers a more desirable alternative. There is a controversy surrounding an old and architecturally appealing library in my congressional district which is paradigmatic of this situation.

The Epiphany Library, located at East 23d Street in Manhattan, provides a vital service to its community. Not only is it the largest of the 5-day circulating branch libraries in New York but, with its turn-of-the-century Beaux-Arts revival architecture, it also has a pleasing visual impact on the neighborhood.

The city planned to tear down this building in order to erect a "new and improved," albeit a smaller, library. While it is certainly desirable to provide additional amenities for the users of the Epiphany, we should not destroy the old library, especially when it is technically feasible to renovate it at a cost less than the one estimated to construct the new library. Furthermore, should the Epiphany be demolished in order to make way for a new facility, the community would be "libraryless" for a protracted period of time.

As a Member of Congress I am particularly concerned about this problem since under the Library Services and Construction Act the Federal Government can fund the construction or renovation of public libraries. In the event that a particular library qualifies for such funding, as might be the case with the Epiphany, a decision to construct a new building when its renovation would be more desirable could result in the wasteful spending of Federal moneys.

The community planning board in whose district the Epiphany is located has devised a plan for the renovation of the library. But the board is faced with an intractable city rule which states that all renovated libraries in New York cannot exceed 7,500 square feet in total area. The remodeled Epiphany, including an addition to be built on an adjacent lot owned by the city, would be approximately 15,000 square feet.

The city administration to its credit has responded to this issue to the extent

that they have canceled the contract for the demolition of the library. I would hope, however, that the city would demonstrate enough flexibility to allow for the renovation of the Epiphany.

Clearly, when existing facilities are conducive to renovation and when such plans are carefully conceived, as is the case in this instance, it is foolish to arbitrarily close the door on such a possibility. There are times when the old does offer a better alternative than the new.

A GREAT MAN PASSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week, the world Jewish community lost one of its most prominent members when Louis Pincus died in Jerusalem at the age of 61.

The place of Mr. Pincus' death was particularly fitting, for he had been the chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive and the World Zionist Organization. As sad as death always is, it is somehow not as sad when one dies surrounded by those who love him in a land which he has helped build. Such was the case with Louis Pincus, for, more than almost any other individual, he is responsible for making the nation of Israel the fine, proud state she is today.

Louis Pincus was not a sabra—a native-born Israeli. He migrated to Israel in 1948, and devoted the remainder of his life to the Zionist movement. He personified the meaning of the word "Zionism"—total commitment to the belief that Israel is the spiritual and physical homeland of the Jewish people. Under his leadership, hundreds of millions of dollars were collected from Jews around the world to be used for the resettlement of immigrants to Israel.

It is hard to raise funds for charitable causes. No matter how worthy the motive, people always find a reason not to give of themselves, their time or their money. Louis Pincus found ways of transcending these reasons. For in Israel, and all that she represents, he found the means of uniting world Jewry in the pursuit of a single goal—the creation and strengthening of their homeland, Eretz Yisroel.

Louis Pincus was more than an indefatigable fundraiser and nation-builder. He was for 7 years the managing director of El Al, Israel's national airline. Under his guidance, El Al was set on the path toward becoming one of the world's finest airlines.

Mr. Pincus was active in Israeli politics as a member of Mapai, the Israeli Labor Party. But it was in a nonpolitical vein that he made his greatest contributions to the state. In 1971, he brought about the reconstitution of the Jewish Agency, an umbrella organization encompassing all the major Jewish organizations which were not participants in the World Zionist Organization. Mr. Pincus, as leader of both the WZO and the Jewish Agency, was in effect the leader of the Zionist movement in the Diaspora.

It was through his efforts that Jews scattered throughout the world could renew their ties with Israel. On the Passover festival, we utter a prayer which ends with the words, "Next year in Jerusalem." Through these words, many Jews express their longing to return to their homeland, and constant devotion to its survival. Louis Pincus made it possible for thousands of Jews the world over to make these words a reality, by providing them with the means to become part of the state of Israel. And for those who have not made aliyah, that is, who have not "gone up" to Israel, he has provided an organization through which they can express their devotion to Israel with their financial contributions.

Selflessness has virtually become a thing of the past in today's society. Those who care more about others than about themselves are a dying breed. With Louis Pincus' death, the world lost something rare, and it will be impossible to replace him.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, because of a longstanding commitment to participate in the Civil Rights luncheon program of the National Dental Association's convention in Detroit, Monday, July 30, I was unable to be on the floor during consideration of a rule for S. 1989, the Federal executive, legislative, and judicial salaries that same afternoon. If I had been here I would have voted for the bill with full confidence in the justification offered by its sponsors and advocates.

SERVICE—NOT LUXURY—NEEDED IN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in this time of both rampant inflation and outlandish Federal debts, the Federal Government should be making every effort to trim the fat and reduce budgets.

And with the prospect of increasing postal costs to the American public, the Postal Service should be especially aware of the need to reduce all unnecessary expenditures.

But, evidently, this is not the case.

Rather than improve service, the postal officials prefer to spend the tax dollar on plush items that make life a little easier to themselves. For instance, a $50,000 kitchen to be used once a month by the Board of Governors will save them the trouble of calling out for sandwiches. Hand-carved wooden doors, at a cost of $3,550, will certainly impress the many taxpayers who call upon the postal executives trying to get improved service.

A pantry in the Postmaster General's Office, which cost the taxpayers $5,280, I am confident will do little to help getting a letter delivered, but perhaps the Postmaster General can do a better job when he has got plenty of chips and dip to nibble on—hopefully, this pantry can help him improve his performance by $5,280 worth, but I doubt it.

Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers did not create this Nation and the Government for the benefit of the public officials. They created it for the benefit of the people and that is our only function—not to sit around dreaming up ways to add comfort. Evidently, some big shots around here think that the people are their servants—those big shots are wrong and I think we can do without them.

At this point, I place the following article in the RECORD which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post:

POSTAL SUITES BEAR STAMP OF LUXURY

(By Jack Anderson)

The Post Office is struggling so desperately to save money that it has cut back services and is planning to increase first-class postage to 10 cents. But the postal poobahs are sparing no expense to build splendiferous new offices for themselves.

They are moving their headquarters from an old Gothic building to the antiseptic environment of Washington's new L'Enfant Plaza. Postmaster General Ted Klassen's private office has already been installed, replete with a $5,280 pantry, $4,602 hand-woven African drapes that can be pulled by remote control and nearly $6,000 worth of other furnishings.

But Klassen's quarters will look positively tacky compared to the penthouse that is planned on the 11th floor. The entire floor will be used for board of governors meetings, and it will take a lot of 10-cent stamps to pay for the fancy fixtures.

The plans call for impressive, hand-carved wooden doors, emblazoned with the seal of the Postal Service, to greet the visitor as he steps off the elevator. It will cost the taxpayers $3,550 just to get past the door.

In the conference room, a gaudy chandelier will hang grandly over the monthly meetings. The cost: $3,718. If the poobahs should get hungry while discussing postal affairs, they won't have to walk down a flight to Klassen's 10th-floor pantry. A kitchen costing $50,000 is planned for the board of governors to use once a month.

The palatial plans also call for glass and marble topped tables, 20 conference chairs at $438.42 each, 52 dining chairs at $212.40 each, four settees at $749.43, six lounge chairs at $480 apiece, eight occasional chairs at $305.90 each and two sofas for $1,147.05. The carpeting will run $8,388.50.

Postal authorities assure us the penthouse area will also be used for press conferences and VIP visitors. Photo developing facilities are also planned for the 11th floor. As evidence of their magnanimity, the postal poobahs made their old furniture available for sale to rank-and-file employees at low prices.

Footnote: Klassen has also been criticized for exorbitant spending on official trips. His entourage paid $560 per night, for instance,

for the "Presidential Corridor" at the San Francisco Hilton last April during a regional postal conference. A spokesman said that calling the hotel cost exorbitant was "a gross distortion."

CHALLENGE TO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS

(MR. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1973, I announced that the Government Activities Subcommittee would undertake an investigation of the expenditure of large sums of Federal funds for improvements on private property in the name of Presidential security. Since that time, I have repeatedly attempted to obtain from the General Services Administration the pertinent facts and documents needed to make a full and fair evaluation of the facts. Despite repeated assurances of cooperation, it appears that a systematic effort is underway within the executive branch to prevent the subcommittee, the Congress, and the American people from learning the true facts in this matter.

I was informed yesterday by the Administrator of GSA that he had been instructed, following a 3-hour meeting at the White House on Sunday with Mr. Ron Ziegler and Mr. Leonard Garment, that no further information or materials would be made available to the subcommittee at this time. This decision by White House appointees contradicts an agreement the Administrator had made with me on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing arrogant contempt for the Congress and of the Constitution by White House appointees. This White House action is hampering a congressional committee from performing its legitimate function. Consequently, I have asked the chairman of the Government Operations Committee to issue subpenas for the needed documents and testimony. Congress cannot permit this assault on its constitutional authority to go unchallenged.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK BROOKS AT PRESS CONFERENCE, JULY 31, 1973

On July 12, 1973, I announced that the House Government Activities Subcommittee would undertake an investigation of the expenditure of large sums of federal funds for improvements on private property in the name of Presidential security. That investigation was begun following numerous charges in the press and after my own extensive preliminary evaluation of available information to determine whether further review by the Subcommittee was warranted.

The White House has now involved itself in this investigation and is seeking to block the Subcommittee from carrying out its Constitutional obligation to the Congress and the American people.

To fully evaluate all of the facts concerning this issue, I requested that the General Services Administration make available to the Subcommittee all pertinent facts and documents. Despite repeated assurances of GSA cooperation, it appears that a systematic effort is underway within the Executive Branch of the government to prevent the Government Activities Subcommittee, the Congress and the American people from learning how much of the taxpayers' money has been spent on improvements and operations at San Clemente and Key Biscayne,

In the early stages of the investigation, the Subcommittee was given 46 pages of generalized summary data reflecting over $1,880,000 in federal expenditures at San Clemente and Key Biscayne. We were told the back-up data for these figures was available for inspection in GSA's regional offices in San Francisco and Atlanta.

The volume of documents available in San Francisco was supposed to have included "several boxes" totaling approximately seven feet while that in Atlanta was described as "approximately 3 cubic yards." A Subcommittee investigator, who went to San Francisco at my direction, found only one small box of documents. I asked that those be copied and forwarded to the Subcommittee in Washington. Upon arrival in Washington, the documents had shrunk to one-half of a box. Likewise, the 3 cubic yards of documents in Atlanta required only half a box when copies were delivered to my office.

Furthermore, Subcommittee investigators have been denied all access to financial records in both Atlanta and San Francisco. In addition, GSA has yet to make available any figures concerning the office complex expenditures at San Clemente.

In an effort to resolve these problems, I met with the GSA Administrator, Mr. Arthur Sampson, in my office last Saturday morning. At that meeting Mr. Sampson agreed to supply the Subcommittee by this Friday all GSA documents relating directly or indirectly to work performed at San Clemente, Key Biscayne and Grand Cay for residences and office complexes. He further agreed to give Subcommittee staff investigators access to GSA files and financial data on Monday morning, July 30.

In fact, however, yesterday morning Subcommittee investigators were refused access to all information. Shortly thereafter Mr. Sampson requested another meeting with me. At that meeting yesterday afternoon, accompanied by a Secret Service official, Mr. Sampson informed me that he could not comply with his agreement made two days previously. He stated that pursuant to instructions from the White House, he could provide the Subcommittee with no further data until the White House released a comprehensive statement on these matters "in a few days."

According to Mr. Sampson, this reversal followed a 3-hour meeting at the White House on Sunday with Mr. Ziegler and Mr. Leonard Garment. The President was reported to be unaware of the meeting or the decision of Mr. Garment and Mr. Ziegler to withhold this information from the public and from a Congressional Committee.

Once again, this Administration has chosen to deny the right of the American people and the Congress to facts they have a right to know. Once again, we are witnessing arrogant contempt for the Congress and of the Constitution by White House appointees. This White House action is solely to hamper a Congressional Committee from performing its legitimate function in a fair and equitable and informed manner. The information for which I have asked consists of routine documents supporting federal government expenditures. The taxpayers and the Congress have a right to examine those documents. I know of no possible reason for legally denying them to the Subcommittee.

Since it is evident that the White House has directed the GSA not to cooperate with the Subcommittee, we have no choice but to seek subpoenas for the documents and the testimony we must have in order to fully and fairly determine whether present laws are being properly executed or whether additional legislation is needed.

I have asked Chairman Holifield of the Government Operations Committee, under his authority, to issue such subpoenas. Because of the sensitivity of the issue and in view of the numerous subpoenas of Executive Branch personnel already outstanding as a result of another investigation in the other body of Congress, the Chairman has announced that he will seek approval of the issuance of the subpoenas at a special meeting of the Government Operations Committee on Thursday.

I wish that this drastic action of using the subpoena power were not necessary as my Subcommittee has always had the fullest cooperation of the GSA and its officials and employees. However, I see no alternative now that the White House has assumed control of the decisions as to what information will be made available and when it will be forthcoming.

Presidential assistants should be aware by now that the public has a right, through its elected representatives, to know what the government is doing and for what purpose funds are being used. The Congress cannot permit this assault on its Constitutional authority to go unchallenged and, as Chairman of the Government Activities Subcommittee, I intend to exercise my Constitutional and legislative duty to my constituents and to the American people to the fullest possible extent.

INDONESIA HOLDS THE LINE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Indonesia is to be congratulated for the position it has taken with regard to its important peacekeeping role in Vietnam. This is the brightest spot in the work of the International Commission for Control and Supervision.

Canada has thrown up its hands and says it is withdrawing. The Communist-oriented nations have been far from cooperative and their zeal for the North Vietnam and Vietcong forces has made the job of the commission much more difficult. Nevertheless, Indonesia has renewed its determination to stick it out, no matter what the difficulties, in an effort to assure that the fragile peace in Southeast Asia is given every chance to succeed.

Admittedly the first efforts of the commission have met with very limited success. These efforts have been continuously handicapped by obstruction from Communist forces. In matters as important as peace, even limited success is better than no success at all. The Commission is now beginning the almost impossible task of trying to reach some kind of agreement on what territory belongs to whom. This is a matter of the utmost urgency and delicacy, and it will strain the patience of every government

involved in the discussions. This is but one of the problems remaining to the commission.

Indonesia is entitled to a full measure of appreciation from the free world. Long a friend of the democracies, and itself a survivor in the war against Communist tyranny, Indonesia has set for itself a course which can only bring credit to its people.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Indonesian Government sees in its role as a commission member an opportunity to perform a genuine service in the cause of peace in Asia and the world.

One can sense the pride with which the Indonesians approach the problems of this mission, and Americans who daily pray the peace will hold fast can only hope that the Indonesian Government and people will continue to provide the strength needed if the commission is to contribute to bringing real peace closer each day.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 8760

Mr. McFALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8760) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. Rept. No. 93-426)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8760) "making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 11, 26, 35, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 27, and 34, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named by said amendment insert "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,175,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,175,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,200,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$62,095,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,757,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36; That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$985,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 8, 12, 14, 21, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 44.

JOHN J. McFALL,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
(except amendment 25)
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE MAHON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JACK EDWARDS,
(except amendment 25)
E. A. CEDERBERG,
Managers on the Part of the House

ROBERT C. BYRD,
J. L. McCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
NORRIS COTTON,
TED STEVENS,
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8760) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1: Earmarks $275,000 for a study of the safety of natural gas pipeline distribution systems instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $24,475,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $24,300,000 as proposed by the House and $25,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Under the conference agreement the 10 requested additional civil rights positions and the 10 full-time staff assistants for the Department's Secretarial Representatives are denied.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $26,000,000 for transportation planning, research, and development instead of $25,500,000 as proposed by the House and $26,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $1,175,000 for grants-in-aid for natural gas pipeline safety instead of $875,000 as proposed by the House and $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are concerned that the Department has not submitted the requested report to indicate the personnel and funds needed to establish and maintain an effective gas pipeline safety program. It is expected that this report will be received not later than October 31, 1973.

COAST GUARD

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $545,400,000 for operating expenses instead of $544,400,000 as proposed by the House and $547,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional $1,000,000 provided over the House bill is to establish a three-helicopter force at Cordova, Alaska.

The conferees reiterate the positions expressed in both the House and Senate committee reports with respect to the importance of the Coast Guard's search and rescue operations. The conferees are desirous that adequate search and rescue capabilities are provided in those areas in which the Coast Guard has indicated that it will reopen SAR stations.

The conferees intend that the Loran-A program not be phased down during fiscal year 1974 and that funds becoming available through shortfalls in military personnel can be used for this purpose.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $75,500,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements instead of $74,500,000 as proposed by the House and $77,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to limit the availability of funds to June 30, 1976, instead of June 30, 1975, as proposed by the House and June 30, 1977, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to appropriate $25,000,000 for reserve training.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $3,500,000 for state boating safety assistance as proposed by the House instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $1,200,500,000 for operations instead of $1,193,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,206,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that if the Department of Transportation can demonstrate that adequate funds are not available for the airport security program, a supplemental request for this purpose will be considered.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $11,500,000 for engineering and development as proposed by the House instead of $13,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to allow the funds appropriated for facilities and equipment to remain available until June 30, 1976, instead of June 30, 1975, as proposed by the House.

The Committee of Conference directs that the FAA not decommission any existing Flight Service Stations during fiscal year 1974 until such time as automated systems are in place and satisfactorily operational.

The conferees reiterate the position expressed last year that the installation of an instrument landing system at Morristown, N.J., Airport is not intended and shall not be used as an argument for the expansion of that airport against the wishes of the communities concerned.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $62,095,000 for research, engineering, and development instead of $55,000,000 as proposed by the House and $66,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

In including $2,690,000 for the AEROSAT program, the Committee of Conference directs that a formal presentation be made by the Department of Transportation to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee prior to agreeing to any satellite program with foreign governments which will entail federal support.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to allow the funds appropriated for construction, National Capital Airports to remain available until June 30, 1976, instead of June 30, 1975, as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $12,800,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Provides that $7,500,000 of the amount appropriated for salaries and expenses is to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Provides that $23,600,000 of the amount provided for salaries and expenses is to remain available until expended as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $1,020,000 for highway beautification, administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $14,000,000 for rail crossings-demonstration projects instead of $10,000,00 as proposed by the House and $18,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Provides that $4,200,000 of the amount appropriated for rail crossings-demonstration projects shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate $6,000,000 for railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the $6,000,000 agreed to by the conferees, $1,700,000 is earmarked for Elko, Nevada; $600,000 is earmarked for Wheeling, West Virginia; $700,000 is earmarked for Lincoln, Nebraska; and $3,000,000 is unspecified. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,500,000 for territorial highways as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $5,000,000 for Darien Gap Highway as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes $4,000,000 appropriation proposed by the House for right-of-way revolving fund.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $44,757,000 for traffic and highway safety instead of $44,632,000 as proposed by the House and $49,757,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are concerned about the national driver register program. In providing a $125,000 increase over the House bill for this program, the conferees feel it is imperative that the individual's right to privacy not be compromised by this program. The conferees also feel that the appropriate legislative committees should closely monitor and review this program to ensure that it is not expanded beyond the intent of the Congress.

Amendment No. 26: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making $5,000,000 of the appropriation for traffic and highway safety contingent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $10,350,000 for railroad research as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate $8,900,000 for railroad safety instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to earmark $1,400,000 for additional safety inspectors.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to appropriate $1,500,000 for grants-in-aid for railroad safety.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $20,100,000 for high-speed ground transportation research and development instead of $17,100,000 as proposed by the House and $23,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The $3,000,000 increase over the House bill is for advanced systems research. The conferees are in agreement that all funds provided for advanced systems research should be used primarily for the 150 mile per hour TACV program.

The committee of conference denies without prejudice the $3,500,000 included by the Senate for retrofitting the Metroliner fleet. At such time as the on-going experimentation is completed and the total cost of the retrofitting is established, consideration will be given to appropriations requests for this purpose.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to rescind $9,100,000 previously appropriated for grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment to appropriate $102,100,000 for grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation instead of $115,500,000 as pro-

posed by the Senate. In addition to the budget request of $93,000,000, which includes $2,300,000 for Southern Montana service, the conference agreement would provide $9,100,000 for the following purposes:

Mexican service via St. Louis, Little Rock, and Dallas	$4,500,000
San Joaquin Valley between Oakland and Bakersfield	500,000
Washington, D.C.-Cumberland, Md., service	400,000
New Carrollton, Md. station	500,000
New York to Kansas City and Chicago to Florida routes	3,200,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $5,000,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making the appropriation for administrative expenses available until expended.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $35,050,000 for research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training instead of $29,600,000 as proposed by the House and $40,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The additional funds provided over the House bill are to be allocated as follows:

PRT research, development, and demonstrations	$4,000,000
Dial-a-ride	200,000
Service development	1,000,000
University research	250,000

The additional funds provided for the dial-a-ride program are to be used solely for analyses of the Haddonfield project to determine the applicability of this type service for other areas.

Amendment No. 37: Earmarks $32,300,000 of the appropriation for research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training for research, development, and demonstrations instead of $27,100,000 as proposed by the House and $37,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Earmarks $2,250,000 of the appropriation for research, development, and demonstrations and university research and training for university research and training, instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 39: Limits commitments for grants-in-aid for airport development to $300,000,000 instead of $280,000,000 as proposed by the House and $310,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Limits obligations for highway beautification to $50,000,000 instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House and $55,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Limits obligations for state and community highway safety and highway-related safety grants to $80,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $85,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Limits obligations for public lands highways to $10,000,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Limits commitments for urban mass transportation to $985,550,000 instead of $980,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The breakdown of the conference agreement is as follows:

Capital facilities grants	$872,000,000
Technical studies	37,600,000
Research	68,950,000
Administrative expenses	7,000,000

Amendment No. 44: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which will prevent the implementation of a program of aviation administrative user charges which are in excess of the levels in effect on January 1, 1973, or which did not exist as of January 1, 1973, until such program is reviewed and approved by the appropriate committees of the Congress. The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

CONFERENCE TOTALS—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1974 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1973 amount, the 1974 budget estimate, and the House and Senate bills follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	[1] $3,125,451,095
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	[2] 3,010,732,006
House bill, fiscal year 1974	[2] 2,753,231,006
Senate bill, fiscal year 1974	[2] 2,968,451,006
Conference agreement	[2] 2,898,446,006
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1973	−227,005,089
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1974	−112,286,000
House bill, fiscal year 1974	+145,215,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1974	−70,005,000

[1] Includes $131,181,000 advance fiscal year 1974 appropriation for Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

[2] Includes $90,360,000 advance fiscal year 1975 appropriation for Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

JOHN J. MCFALL,
SIDNEY R. YATES, Except Amendment 25
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE MAHON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
JACK EDWARDS, Except Amendment 25
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
NORRIS COTTON,
TED STEVENS,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROSE (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL) to pay respect of the North Carolina delegation in the House at the funeral services in Fayetteville of Mrs. Fannie M. Jones, mother of Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of necessarily absent.

Mr. O'BRIEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for balance of week, on account of surgical repair.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DENT, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK, for 1 hour, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOORHEAD of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter):

Mr. CRANE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDADE, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. FRENZEL, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. GUBSER, for 30 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter):

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DRINAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. PATMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RUNNELS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DINGELL, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. KOCH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PODELL, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. LEGGETT to include extraneous matter with his remarks made yesterday on H.R. 9286.

Mr. STRATTON to include extraneous matter with his remarks in the Committee of the Whole on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT) on funds for South Vietnam and Laos.

Mr. DANIELSON and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $992.75.

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 18¾ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $3,918.75.

Mr. GUBSER and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds five pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,045.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOORHEAD of California) and to include extraneous material):

Mr. LANDGREBE in 10 instances.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. SEBELIUS.
Mr. CARTER.
Mr. SYMMS in two instances.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. DICKINSON.
Mr. KING in three instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Illinois.
Mr. COLLIER in three instances.
Mr. CRONIN.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York.
Mr. HUBER.
Mr. KEMP in two instances.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.
Mr. RINALDO in six instances.
Mr. FRENZEL.
Mr. KEATING.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina) and to include extraneous material):

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. FISHER in three instances.
Mr. SYMINGTON.
Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. ROONEY of New York.
Mr. WALDIE in five instances.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. CHAPPELL.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. SIKES in five instances.
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
Mr. LITTON.
Mr. PREYER.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. REES in two instances.
Mr. BRASCO in six instances.
Mr. WRIGHT.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to establish a nonpartisan commission on Federal election reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3867. An act to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing for Federal acquisition of that part of the tribal lands described herein, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8947. An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.) the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, August 1, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1194. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Commission, covering fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 705(e) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1195. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on aircraft and airport noise, pursuant to section 5(a)(1) of Public Law 92–574; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1196. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of June 30, 1973, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1197. A letter from the Executive Director, Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States, transmitting part I of the report of the Commission, pursuant to Public Law 91–354, as amended (H. Doc. No. 93–137); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

RECIEVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

1198. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the opportunity for the Atomic Energy Commission to improve its procedures for making sure that containers used for transporting radioactive materials are safe; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7352. A bill to amend section 4082(c) of title 18, United States Code, to extend the limits of confinement of Federal prisoners; with amendment (Rept. No. 93–425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 514. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8351. A bill to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended, to provide financial assistance to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–419). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSPADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 515. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9130. A bill to amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and to authorize a trans-Alaska oil and gas pipeline, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–420). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 516. Resolution waiving points of order against H.R. 9590. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93–421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 517. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report on S. 502. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 94–422). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 518. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1264. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to Eisenhower College, in Seneca Falls, N.Y., out of proceeds from the sale of silver dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower (Rept. No. 93–423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.J. Res. 512 (Rept. No. 93–417). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 6370. (Rept. No. 93–418). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 6912 (Rept. No. 93–424). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McFALL: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 8760 (Rept. No. 93–426). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POAGE: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 1888 (Rept. No. 93–427). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 9698. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the interception of certain communications unless all parties to the intercepted communication consent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Ms. BURKE of California, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 9699. A bill to provide increased employment opportunity by executive agencies of the U.S. Government for persons unable to work standard working hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 9700. A bill to provide for the establishment of an American Folk Life Center in the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. YATES, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI):

H.R. 9701. A bill to strengthen and improve the protections and interests of particpants and beneficiaries of employee pension and welfare benefit plans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 9702. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen and reform certain provisions thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 9703. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Harter Act in order to provide a more effective remedy for owners, shippers, and receivers of property transported in interstate or foreign commerce to recover from surface transportation companies subject to the former act, damages sustained as the result of loss, damage, injury, or delay in transit to such property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 9704. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9705. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (200-mile limit) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9706. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to provide former members and their dependents medical and dental care in uniformed services facilities during the 60-day period after discharge or separation, and to make such persons eligible for post exchange and commissary privileges during such 60-day period; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BURKE of California:

H.R. 9707. A bill to amend section 611 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide control and abatement of aircraft noise and sonic boom; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax credit and deduction for purchase by the taxpayer of a catalytic converter a part of a new 1975 model light duty vehicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WARE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. WYATT, Mr. TREEN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 9709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for the use of a passenger automobile in a carpool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 9710. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional assistance to small employers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9711. A bill to provide an allowance for tools to eligible veterans pursuing apprenticeship training programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FULTON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MCFALL, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. VIGORITO and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 9712. A bill to establish a national program of Federal insurance against catastrophic disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mrs. BOGGS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK, and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 9713. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Clara Barton House National Historic Site in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 9714. A bill to establish a U.S. Fire Administration and a National Fire Academy in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of death, personal injury, and property damage from fire, to increase the effectiveness and coordination of fire prevention and control agencies at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9715. A bill to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9716. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the present limit on the number of days for which payments may be made thereunder for post-hospital extended care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9717. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 9718. A bill to provide effective relief from disruptive imports of nonrubber footwear in a manner that will be fair to producer, workers, and consumers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 9719. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the entry of horses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. GINN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROE, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. WARE, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YOUNG of Georgia):

H.R. 9720. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 to provide seminars as freshmen Members of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. THONE, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. LEGGETT, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. STUCKEY):

H.R. 9721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restrict the authority for inspection of income tax returns by, and the disclosure of information therein to, Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTON (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FULTON, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. RARICK, Mr. MEZVINSKY, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. HENDERSON, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H.R. 9722. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to strict the authority for inspection of income tax returns by, and the disclosure of information therein to, Federal agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MALLARY (for himself and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 9723. A bill to provide that pay adjustments for Members of Congress take effect in the Congress next following the Congress in which they are approved; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 9724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve small employers from the requirement of paying or depositing certain employment taxes more often than once each month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 9725. A bill to authorize the disposal of approximately 258,700 short tons of copper from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile and limit exports of copper and copper scrap; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 9726. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assure that the public is provided with safe drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 9727. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide more effectively for bilingual proceedings in certain district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9728. A bill to continue for 2 additional years the present method of provid-

ing benefits on account of black lung disease; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 9729. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act so as to enable airline employees to exchange days at regular rates of compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9730. A bill to provide that employees of States and political subdivisions thereof shall be subject to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9731. A bill to facilitate convenient Selective Service registration by having secondary schools make available registration forms to students; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H.R. 9732. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony certain lands in Washoe County, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9733. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law allowing prospecting and mining within important components of the National Park System, to prohibit prospecting and mining activities within such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9734. A bill to provide for disclosures designed to inform the Congress and the people about representations made to the executive branch in behalf of special interests; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9735. A bill to provide for disclosures designed to inform the Congress with respect to legislative measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9736. A bill to amend section 110 of title 28, United States Code, to provide a place for the holding of Federal District Court in Hackensack, N.J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9737. A bill to provide relief from shore damages attributable to high water levels in the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 9738. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, to provide an annuity for the dependents of persons who perform the service required under chapter 67, title 10, United States Code, and die before being granted pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. NICHOLS, and Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9739. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 9740. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to compile and keep current a mineral fuel reserves inventory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GINN:

H.R. 9741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to the feasibility of establishing the William Bartram Trail throughout Georgia as a national scenic trail; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 9742. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9743. A bill to improve the conduct and regulation of Federal election campaign activities and to provide public financing for such campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 9744. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act in order to provide that States may not have less standards with respect to marketing, labeling, packaging, and ingredient requirements than those made under the Federal Meat Inspection Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 9745. A bill to insure that no public funds be used for the purpose of transporting chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless it is the sense of Congress to do so; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 9746. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9747. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of the 130th anniversary of the death of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9748. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to make it clear that an individual who is not working because of a strike or other labor dispute will be considered unemployed for purposes of aid with respect to dependent children of unemployed fathers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. MCKAY):

H.R. 9749. A bill to insure that no public funds be used for the purpose of transporting chemical nerve agents to or from any military installation in the United States for storage or stockpiling purposes unless it is the sense of Congress to do so; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the insurance of loans and mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 694. Joint resolution to establish a nonpartisan commission on political campaign reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period of September 15, 1973, as "Johnny Horizon '76 Clean Up America Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUBER (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. TREEN):

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign affairs.

By Mr. HUBER (for himself, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEARD, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FREY, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, and Mr. MADIGAN):

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. WARE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ZION):

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H. Res. 513. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Res. 519. Resolution, an inquiry into the extent of the bombing of Cambodia and Laos, January 20, 1969 through April 30, 1970; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

287. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa, relative to nonvoting representation in the House of Representatives for the Territory of American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 9750. A bill for the relief of Imre Pallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 9751. A bill for the relief of Chris Gus Yiantsou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

REGISTRATIONS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1972:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Albert E. Abrahams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. American Association of Blood Banks, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 608, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Leonard Appel, Wilson, Woods & Villalon, 425 13th Street NW., Suite 1032, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Everett Terminal Co., Inc., Hewitt Avenue Marine Terminal, P.O. Box 1478, Everett, Wash. 98206.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, 222 Cedar Lane, Teaneck, N.J. 07666.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bottled Water Association, 1411 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90015.

A. Grace C. Baisinger, 2870 Arizona Terrace NW., Washingtin, D.C. 20016.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

A. Markham Ball, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc., 660 First Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Robert W. Barrie, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. T. Michael Barry, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Batzell & Nunn, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Independent Gasoline Marketers Council, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Michael Bennett, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Action for Legal Rights, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Berl Bernhard, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Berry & Gipson, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 670, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Atalanta Corp., 17 Varick Street, New York, N.Y. 10013.

A. Berry & Gipson, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 670, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Austrian Trade Delegate in the United States, 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Billig, Sher & Jones, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Steamship Conferences.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ad Hoc Coalition for Cemetery Care, 6216 South Stanford Way, Whittier, Calif. 90601.

A. S. G. Bishop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Boasberg, Hewes, Klores & Kass, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Communities in Action Together, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. D. A. Bobo, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Theodore H. Bernstein, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Boston Lawyers' Vietnam Committee, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

A. John Broadbent, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Recycled Paperboard Division of the American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Teresa A. Brooks, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 209, Baileys Cross Roads, Va. 22041.
B. American Osteopathic Hospital Association, 930 Busse Highway, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobile Home Manufacturers Association, 14650 Lee Road, Chantilly, Va. 22021.

A. Joseph D. Burke, Western Associates, P.O. Box 40032, Palisades Station, Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Harry W. Buzzerd, Jr., Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

A. Caren C. Calish, 3620 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 23, Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Capital Holding Corp., Commonwealth Building, Louisville, Ky., 40201.

A. Blue Carstenson, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. John L. Casey, 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Investment Counsel Association of America, Inc., 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. James Cassese, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.

A. C. Cavalieri, Suite 301, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Representation Services Institute, Inc., Suite 301, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Frank R. Cawley, Room 511, Wilson Plaza Building, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. Media General, Inc., 333 East Grace Street, Richmond, Va., 23219.

A. J. M. Chambers & Co., Inc., 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Satra Corp., 475 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. V. A. Clark, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert T. Cole, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. PPG Industries, Inc., 1 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Robert T. Cole, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. H. H. Robertson Co., 2 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. C. S. Coleman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Metal Raceway Systems Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Committee of Copyright Owners care of Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin, Krim & Ballon, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10022.

A. Committee of Publicly Owned Companies, 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
B. Action Industries, Cheswick, Pa., A.D.M. Industries, Elkhart, Ind.; Airpax Electronics, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

A. Harold B. Confer, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. Joan Claybrook, Room 305, 2000 P Street, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Connole & O'Connell, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., P.O. Box 576, Bellevue, Wash. 98009.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The State of Alaska.

A. Richard C. Creighton, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Frank Cummings, Gall, Lane & Powell, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers, 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. William Kay Daines, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Dealer Bank Association, P.O. Box 479, Wall Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Ada E. Deer, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 312, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Committee To Save the Menominee People and Forests, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Clairol, Inc., 345 Park Avenue, New York N.Y. 10022.

A. George W. Della III, 1115 Maryland National Bank Building, 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md. 21202.
B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas and Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

A. Daniel B. Denning, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., P.O. Box 576, Bellevue, Wash. 98009.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shipping Tieups Over Permanently, P.O. Box 4437, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Washington Citizens for World Trade, 101 West Fifteenth, P.O. Box 301, Olympia, Wash. 98507.

A. R. J. Devlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Edward V. Donahue, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Graphic Arts International Union, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Richard Morgan Downey, 2000 P Street NW., Room 305, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Room 305, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. David S. Dreyer, 4111 Backmeyer Road, Richmond, Ind. 47374.
B. Indiana Conservation Council, 2128 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. Wilbur B. Dronen, 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
B. Caterpillar Tractor Co., 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

A. Hugh G. Duffy, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Consumer Center for Legal Services, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William E. Duke, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.

A. Lesley Gerould Dunn, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Electric Industries Association, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John C. Ellis, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Emergency Committee for the American Offshore Service Industry, 2000 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex 77002.

A. Edward J. Farrell, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Farrow, P.O. Box 14228, Washington, D.C. 20044.
B. Labor-Management Committee for Fair Foreign Competition, 1499 Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, Calif. 94010.

A. Penelope S. Farthing, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Firstmark Morrison, Inc., 107 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y. 14202.

A. J. C. Fletcher, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, P.O. Box 89, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.

A. Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, care of C. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33877.

A. Fruzsina H. Fedlam, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Galland, Kharasch, Calkins, & Brown, 1054 31st St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Foss Launch & Tug. Co., 660 West Ewing Street, Seattle, Wash. 9811.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Glidden-Durkee, Division of SCM Corp., 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21224.

A. Godfrey Associates, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. George W. Gowen, 27th Floor, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. United States Lawn Tennis Association, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Graphic Arts International Union, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Harold H. Griffin, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerome R. Gulan, 1225 19th Street, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Hardaway Co., 11th Street and Third Avenue, Columbus, Ga. 39102.

A. James E. Hanson, Ron Ahern & Associates, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Puget Sound Tug & Barge Co., 1102 SW., Massachusetts Street, Seattle, Wash. 98134.

A. Lewis B. Hastings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Bruce R. Hawley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.

A. Richard Hinds, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Donald E. Hirsch, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.

A. Frank J. Holczman, Suite 405, 1828 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. GAC Corp., 7880 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla. 33152.

A. Henry W. Holling, 100 NE. Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
B. Caterpillar Tractor Co., 100 NE. Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

A. Edward R. Holloway, 724 14th Street NW., No. 338 Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mass Participation Lobbyists Association, 724 14th Street NW., No. 338, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Miles B. Hopkins, 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21224.
B. Glidden-Durkee, 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21224.

A. Douglass C. Horstman, 1612 K Street NW,. Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Northern Textile Association, Maytag Co.

A. Patrick J. Head, 1660 L. Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Ward & Company, Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.

A. David Ignatius, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Indiana Conservation Council, Inc., 2128 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. David M. Jenkins II, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio 44316.

A. Johns-Mansville Corp., Greenwood Plaza, Denver, Colo. 80217.

A. Rady A. Johnson, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

A. Robert S. Jones, 900 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.
B. Glidden-Durkee, 900 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

A. James P. Jontz, 2128 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

B. Indiana Conservation Council, 2128 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. Roger Kaplan, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Government Employees, Inc., 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass.

A. Milton M. Kaufmann.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006

A. R. I. Kilroy, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. James D. Kittelton, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 200 112th Avenue NE., Bellevue, Wash. 98004.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co.

A. Gene A. Knorr, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Arthur D. Koch, 603, 2020 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.

A. Phil Kugler, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Richard M. Lahn, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44113.

A. Lawyers Committee to End the War, One Wall Street, 25th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. William Lazarus, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Edward C. Leeson, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Richard J. Leighton, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55440.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Cable Corp., 730 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc., 660 First Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Edgar Lockwood, 1800 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. James P. Low, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Society of Association Executives, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Donald C. Lubick, 1800 One M & T Plaza, Buffalo, N.Y., 14203.
B. Firstmark Morrison, Inc., 107 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y. 14202.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Catholic Press Association, 432 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.

A. Mark H. Lynch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, 2000 P Street NW., Room 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Kenneth B. MacKenzie, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P. O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.

A. William J. Marschalk.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Edward Martone, 39 Eighth Street, North Arlington, N.J. 07032.

A. Massachusetts Lawyers' Vietnam Committee, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Craig Mathews, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Joint Government Liaison Committee, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank Mayo, 1809 23d Street, Manhattan Beach, Calif.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Artists Corp., 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. Francis O. McDermott, 1145 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Retired and Veteran Railway Employees, Inc.

A. Stephen J. McKenna, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. C. T. Bendorf, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. W. F. McKenna, 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90010.
B. First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Phoenix; Tuscon Federal Savings & Loan Association.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Harry McPherson, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

A. Louis L. Meier, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, United Engineering Center, 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. A. S. Mike Monroney, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Boothe Airside Systems, Inc., 555 East City Line, Bala Cynwyd, Pa. 19004.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Donald L. Morgan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Morin, Dickstein, Shapiro & Galligan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American International Reinsurance Co., Hamilton, Bermuda.

A. Morin, Dickstein, Shapiro & Galligan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for the Martin Report, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Morin, Dickstein, Shapiro & Galligan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Vance, Sanders & Co., Boston, Mass.; Federated Investors, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Fidelity Management & Research Co., Boston, Mass.

A. Gene P. Morrell, 1750 K Street NW., Suite 250, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lone Star Gas Co., 301 South Harwood, Dallas, Tex. 75201.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., 1460 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Industrial Parks, 1601 North Kent Street, Suite 912, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Thomas H. Mutchler.
B. International Paper Co., 1620 I Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., 675 Pinellas Point Drive South, St. Petersburg, Fla. 33705.

A. National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

A. National Building Granite Quarries Association, Inc., 202 South Second Street, Cold Spring, Minn.

A. National Committee To Save the Menominee, People and Forests, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 312, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. National Consumer Center for Legal Services, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.

A. National Convocation of Lawyers to End the War, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Blood Resources Association, 308 State Street, Albany, N.Y. 12210.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Wheat Users Committee, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bonnie Naradzay, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. E. J. Neal, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Stanley Nehmer, Suite 800, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Robert R. Nelson, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. R. Norton, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. James O'Dea, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Government Employees, Inc., 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass.

A. Bartley O'Hara, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Savings Banks Association of Massachusetts, 50 Congress Street, Boston, Mass. 02109.

A. Franz M. Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.

A. J. F. Otero, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Frederick Panzer, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert A. Parrish, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. E. L. Patton, 200 112th Avenue NE., Bellevue, Wash. 98004.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chippewa-Cree Tribe, Rocky Boy Route, Box Elder, Mont. 59521.

A. Patton, Boggs, & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Marcor, Inc., 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Warner Bros. Inc., 4000 Warner Boulevard, Burbank, Calif. 91505.

A. Ben F. Peake, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 608, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Blood Banks, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 608, Washington, D.C., 20036.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., c/o Jack J. Agliata, P.O. Box 17086, Denver, Colo. 80217.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Sr., P.O. Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, P.O. Box 89, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Sr., P.O. Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.
B. Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, c/o C. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33877.

A. R. B. Pike, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. S. Z. Placksin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Philip H. Potter, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. PPG Industries, Inc., One Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Arnold J. Prima, Jr., 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Pulp and Paper Machinery Manufacturers' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Room 910, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Carl L. Rechin, 900 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.
B. Glidden-Durkee, 900 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

A. Timothy J. Redmon, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

A. Diane Rennert, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Publishers.

A. Representation Services Institute, Inc., Suite 301, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert R. Rickett, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.

A. George Wesley Ritter, 3914 King Arthur Road, Annandale, Va. 22003.
B. Alton Box Board Co., Alton, Ill. 62002.

A. H. H. Robertson Co., Two Gateway Center, Pittsburg, Pa.

A. William L. Rodich, 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21224.
B. Glidden-Durkee, 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21224.

A. James A. Rooney, Suite 1207, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mead Data Central, 111 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio 45402.

A. Christine Root, 2332 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington D.C. 20002.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Iron and Steel Institute, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Ruth M. Saxe, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Kenneth I. Schaner, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc., 660 First Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Kenneth D. Schanzer, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stephen I. Schlossberg, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.

A. Milton W. Schober, 1775 K Street NW., Suite 220, Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Consumer Bankers Group.

A. Valerie Schulte, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Sydnee M. Schwartz, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Self-Determination for D.C., 2030 M Street NW., Room 300, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, Denver, Colo.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. James R. Sharp, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Fur Merchants Association, 224 West 30th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Silverstein & Mullens, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bristol-Myers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. James R. Smith, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502 Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. John M. Snow, 8401 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

A. Wilbur D. Sparks, 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. James M. Sprouse, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Sportsman's Paradise Homeowners Association, Route 2, Box 228, Blythe, Calif. 92225.

A. William M. Stephens, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mallinckrodt Chemical Works, P.O. Box 5439, St. Louis, Mo. 63160; Merck & Co., Inc., 126 East Lincoln Avenue, Rahway, N.J. 07065; S. B. Penick & Co., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y. 10007.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Pulp and Paper Machinery Manufacturers' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Room 910, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. J. Walter Thompson Co., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10017.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Independent Livestock Producers, c/o Herman Dinklage, Whitman, Nebr.

A. Sandra Kay Tilley, 2219 Lindbergh Boulevard, Springfield, Ill. 62704.
B. The Hope School, 50 Hazel Lane, Springfield, Ill. 62703.

A. Gerald Toppen, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Paul E. Trimble, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44113.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio, 44113.

A. United States Lawn Tennis Association, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Jack J. Valenti, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee of Copyright Owners, c/o Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin, Krim & Ballon, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022; Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Elizabeth Alderman Vinson, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Charls E. Walker, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Allied Chemical Corp., P.O. Box 1057R, Morristown, N.J. 07960.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Aluminum Co. of America, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., Bethlehem, Pa. 18016.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Motors Corp., General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Electric Corp., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Georgia Pacific Corp., 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Steel Corp., 2800 Grant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Procter and Gamble, Cincinnati, Ohio 45201.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Time, Inc., Time and Life Building, Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Union Camp Corp., 1600 Valley Road, Wayne, N.J. 07040.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N.Y. 10017.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash. 98401.

A. George R. Walker, 3901 Hawkins Point Road, Baltimore, Md. 21226.
B. Glidden-Durkee, 3901 Hawkins Point Road, Baltimore, Md. 21226.

A. John S. Walker, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Glidden-Durkee, 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21224.

A. Pamela R. Warner, 5500 North Kedzil, Chicago, Ill.
B. J. R. Carlson Labs, 5500 North Kedzil, Chicago, Ill.

A. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Janet H. Wegner, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Weisman, Celler, Spett, Modlin & Wertheimer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 910, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Lawrence N. Brandt & Co., 4201 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

A. Harry H. Westbay III, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 805, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. St. Regis Paper Co., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Alan J. Whitney, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Government Employees, Inc., 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass.

A. David Wilken, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Auto-Train Corp., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Williams & King, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Noranda Mines Ltd., P.O. Box 45, Commerce Court West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

A. Earl Wilson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

A. Kenneth David Wollack, Suite 720, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Suite 720, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Charles S. Yerrid, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

•All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1972 were received too late to be included or were not included in the the published reports for the third quarter.

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Ad Hoc Committee of Shipbuilders, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $22,531. E. (9) $15,000.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,528.12. E. (9) $8,528.12.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,092.89.

A. Gibson T. Ahlgren, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, P.O. Box 5800, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Randolf H. Aires, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $35.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suite 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Alderson, Catherwood, Ondov & Leonard, 105 East Oakland Avenue, Austin, Minn. 55912.
B. Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.
D. (6) $8,150. E. (9) 1,529.98.

A. Willis W. Alexander, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $4,818.10.

A. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,688.77.

A. Nicholas E. Allen, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle St., Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) 155.63.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. American Academy of Family Physicians, 1740 West 92d Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64114.
D. (6) $5,524.93. E. (9) $5,524.93.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $36,067.10. E. (9) $36,067.10.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $1,859.63. E. (9) $1,859.63.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $1,939.39. E. (9) $1,939.39.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $6,800.61. E. (9) $6,800.61.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
D. (6) $40,068. E. (9) $40,068.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $57,299.38.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $130,138.82. E. (9) $3,058.59.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $2,893.78. E. (9) $3,378.45.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Roslyn Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,174.71.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York N.Y. 10038.
B. Admiral Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.; Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., Hartford Conn.; Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., Chicago, Ill.,
D. (6) $34,848.88. E. (9) $34,848.88.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $11,024. E. (9) $10,300.75.

A. American Justice Association, Route 450, Box 498, Gambrills, Md. 21054.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Land Title Assoication, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $1,757.55.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
E. (9) $29,530.13.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
E. (9) $3,190.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.
E. (9) $1,351.75.

A. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $6,394.13. E. (9) $6,394.13.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
E. (9) $844.53.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $2,688.40 E. (9) $2,248.56.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (6) $10,671.

A. American Physical Therapy Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,430.82. E. (9) $7,430.82.

A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
E. (9) $9,724.96.

A. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,201,853.01. E. (9) $76,607.35.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 620, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $7,787.78. E.(9) $4,370.03.

A. American Surveys, Embassy Square, Suite 901, 2000 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Customs Brokers and Forwarders Association of America, Inc., One World Trade Center, Suite 1109, New York, N.Y. 10048.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $105.29.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $46.58.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $58,045.16.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Suite 828, Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $400.

A. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $102,043. E. (9) $2,668.45.

A. Ted E. Amick, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $750.

A. Donald E. Anderson.
B. National Cable Television Association, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,346.14. E. (9) $348.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,281. E. (9) $22.10.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence A. Arata.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $15,000.

A. John C. Archer, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $300.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,325. E. (9) $33.55.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp., 464 Ellis Street, Mountain View, Calif. 94040.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $75.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Floor Covering Group, 919 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery County, Md., Lawyers Association, c/o George Ballman, 3720 Farragut Street, Kensington, Md.
E. (9) $31.60.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $5.43.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Realty Committee, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $16.81.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Securities Industry Association, 20 Broad Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $18.47.

A. Judith A. Assmus, 1763 R Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1763 R Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $5,350.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
D. (6) $95. E. (9) $82.50.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Suite 607, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Association for the Advancement of Invention & Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza Building 1, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
D. (6) $4,835. E. (9) $3,741.92.

A. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,824.65. E. (9) $7,824.65.

A. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $73.47.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $385.

A. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va. 22207.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $1,000.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
E. (9) $4,166.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $301.

A. Nicholas R. Bach, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Paint & Coatings Association Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $4.

A. Donald L. Badders, 200 East Randolph Drive, No. 3101, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 200 East Randolph Drive, No. 3101, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $540.36. E. (9) $280.73.

A. Carl E. Bagge, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $2,526.91.

A. John C. Bagwell, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. George F. Bailey, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.

A. James F. Bailey, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $5,850. E. (9) $902.97

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) $324.51. E. (9) $10.

A. Donald F. Bale, 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. Boeing Co., P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $285.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

A. Thomas H. Barksdale, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,925. E. (9) $142.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Vincent Gerrard Barnett, Suite 400, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London EC3A 8ET, England.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $5,901.77.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. James C. Barr, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Federal Credit Unions, 1156 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $117.50.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Oreg. 97205.
B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Courthouse, Roseburg, Oreg. 97470.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. T. Michael Barry, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $83.86.

A. Weldon Barton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,969.41. E. (9) $163.02.

A. Lucius D. Battle, 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Batzell & Nunn, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Independent Gasoline Marketers Council, 1523 L. Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $298.45.

A. Batzell & Nunn, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Independent Terminal Operators Association, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $62.50.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Congress of Railway Unions.
D. (6) $579.57.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1125 15th Street NW., No. 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich 48214.
D. (6) $4,417.92. E. (9) $408.93.

A. John H. Beidler, 1125 15th Street NW., No. 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $6,481.74. E. (9) $414.88.

A. Page Belcher, Suite 870, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,000. E. $900.

A. Thomas S. Belford, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $199.98.

A. Thomas P. Bennett, 1735 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $3,576.15.

A. Berl Bernhard, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $269.08.

A. Meyer Bernstein, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $689.10.

A. Max N. Berry, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Meat Products Group, American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Berry & Gipson, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 670, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Atalanta Corp., 17 Varick Street, New York, N.Y. 10013.
D. (6) $3,450. E. (9) $166.24.

A. Berry & Gipson, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 670, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. East-West Trade Council, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $450.

A. Robert L. Bevan, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Laurel Hill Cemetery Association, Clayton, Mo. 63105.

A. Lydia Bitter, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $420. E. (9) $420.

A. Neal R. Bjornson, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Brent Blackwelder, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $875.

A. Richard W. Bliss, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $475.

A. Jerald Blizin, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $25.20.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $6,875.01. E. (9) $168.16.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross, Gottesman & Gordon, 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $6,875.01. E. (9) $74.88.

A. Boasberg, Hewes, Klores & Kass, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 602, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Action for Legal Rights, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $980.27.

A. Boasberg, Hewes, Klores & Kass, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 602, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Communities in Action Together, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,556.35.

A. Rebecca L. Bogard, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $168.

A. Frederick C. Bond III, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $41.76. E. (9) $43.10.

A. S. Lees Booth, 1000 16th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Consumer Finance Association, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $250.

A. Boston Lawyers' Vietnam Committee, 32d floor, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.
E. (9) $225.60.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
D. (6) $2,291.66. E. (9) $99.13.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1730 M Street N.W., Suite 609, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Albert D. Bourland, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 814, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,033.60.

A. Rodney A. Bower, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Edward L. Bowley, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,235.28. E. (9) $468.14.

A. George E. Bradley, 1341 G Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of USDA, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $25.

A. Wayne W. Bradley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Room 122, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. Charles G. Bragg, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $576.92. E. (9) $62.71.

A. Edward J. Brenner, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza 1, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. Association for the Advancement of Invention and Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza 1, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, The Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Wally Briscoe.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $16.50.

A. John Broadbent, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Recycled Paperboard Division of the American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $470. E. (9) $108.79.

A. John Broadbent, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. J. R. Timmins & Co., 37 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $375.

A. Michael D. Bromberg, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. David W. Broome, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $38.

A. Joe B. Browder, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $317.16.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $300.

A. Brown, Vlassis & Bain, 222 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. 85004.
B. Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Ariz. 86515.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Housing Producers, 10920 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 308, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Franchise Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Massachusetts Bankers Association, Inc., 125 High Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.
E. (9) $93.38.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobile Home Manufacturers Association, 14650 Lee Road, Chantilly, Va. 22021.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Ad-Hoc Housing Coalition, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Lawrence E. Bruce, Jr., 1125 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9). $2,005.

A. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. St. Paul Title Insurance Corp., 1650 West Big Beaver Road, Troy, Mich. 48084.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $27.32.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Philip N. Buckminster, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $480.56.

A. Robert D. Buehler, 1800 K Street, NW., Suite 929, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio 44318.
D. (6) $220.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.
D. (6) $33,823.46. E. (9) $1,199.95.

A. Phil Burnett, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $215.25. E. (9) $51.48.

A. George Burnham IV, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Steel Corp., 600 Grant Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
E. (9) $294.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Phelps Dodge Corp., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $235.55.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa. 18901.
E. (9) $221.81.

A. Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace and New National Priorities, 901 North Howard Street, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
D. (6) $2,184. E. (9) $3,705.09.

A. Harry W. Buzzerd, Jr., 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $5.50.

A. Charles S. Caldwell, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,157.67. E. (9) $190.95.

A. David W. Calfee III, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,474.40. E. (9) $8.70.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, N.Y.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $321.92.

A. Charles Argyll Campbell, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $270.40.

A. Charles O. Campbell, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Capital Holding Corp., Commonwealth Building, Louisville, Ky. 40201.
E. (9) $100.

A. Marvin Caplan.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,316.75. E. (9) $175.58.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Room 505, The Farraqut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E. C. 3, England.
D. (6) $13,225. E. (9) $2,459.05.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Norval E. Carey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $375.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11232.
B. Seafarers International Union.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,272.80.

A. Elizabeth S. Carpenter, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York City, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $20.

A. L. C. Carpenter, 201 South Seventh Street, Columbia, Mo.
B. Midcontinent Farmers Association.
D. (6) $5,299.32. E. (9) $1,588.55.

A. John R. Carson, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. South African Sugar Association, P.O. Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
E. (9) $7,454.92.

A. James B. Cash, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $79.45.

A. James Cassese, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Frank R. Cawley, 511 Wilson Plaza Building, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. Agricultural Publishers Association, 511 Wilson Plaza Building, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $200.46.

A. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., 400 World Center Building, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $1,771.29.

A. J. M. Chambers & Co., Inc., 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Cordage Institute, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
D. (6) $937.50.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Swaziland Sugar Association, P.O. Box 445, Mbabane, Swaziland.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $1,981.41.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,411.

A. William C. Chapman, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,785.66.

A. Lowell T. Christison, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $43,631.81. E. (9) $423.69.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $43,631.81. E. (9) $536.90.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $122.33.

A. Kimball Clark, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $36.63.

A. Richard W. Clark, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $186.85.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., 60604.

A. Clark, West, Keller, Sanders & Ginsberg, 2424 First National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex., 75202.
B. National Music Publishers' Association, Inc., 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $500.

A. Joan Claybrook, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. Jacob Clayman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $738.40.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, P.O. Box 6, Pittsburg, Kans. 66762.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Interbank Card Association, Suite 3600, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $25.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036
B. Lehman Bros., Inc., 1 William Street, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $1,100.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
E. (9) $2000.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 1075 Central Park Avenue, Suite 224, Scarsdale, N.Y. 10533.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $568.30.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Brands, Inc., 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $105.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky. 40201.
E. (9) $105.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Liggett & Myers, Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020.
E. (9) $105.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lorillard, Division of Loews Theatres, Inc., 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $105.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Philip Morris, Inc., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $105.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C., 27102.
E. (9) $105.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass. McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwaine & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Basketball Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. Larry D. Cline, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $40.02.

A. Coalition Against Strip Mining, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $1,639.07.

A. Grover C. Cobb, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $200.

A. John M. Coffey, Suite 870, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Page Belcher, Suite 870, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. David Cohen, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $146.89.

A. Jerry Cohen, 470 Totten Pond Road, Waltham, Mass. 02154.
B. Ruetgerswerke Aktiengesellschaft, Frankfurt am Main, West Germany.

A. Timothy A. Colcord, 1620 I Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National BankAmericard, Inc., 555 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94126.
D. (6) $7,291.66. E. (9) $8,071.59.

A. R. Michael Cole, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20036.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $73.

A. Robert E. Cole, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $500.

A. Robert T. Cole, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. PPG Industries, Inc., 1 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
E. (9) $100.

A. Robert T. Cole, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. H. H. Robertson Co., 2 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $100.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $25,185.67.

A. Coles & Goertner, 100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent U.S. Tanker Owners Committee, 1612 K Street NW., Suite 510, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $134.96.

A. William J. Colley, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $1,300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cylinder Manufacturers Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $40.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $475.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Tool & Stainless Steel Industry Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $525.

A. James F. Collins, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 50 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $125.

A. Paul G. Collins, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I.
B. The Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $68.75.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.,

---

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,150. E. (9) $7,497.14.

A. Committee of Copyright Owners, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45,218.14. E. (9) $27,363.25.

A. Committee on Strikes in Transportation, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89.32. E (9) $89.32.

A. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $946,290.67. E. (9) $233,825.07.

A. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $10,244.08.

A. Communities in Action Together, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Suite 403, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,193.38. E. (9) $18,363.09.

A. Computer Industry Association, Inc., 16255 Ventura Boulevard, Encino, Calif. 91316.
D. (6) $84,218.35. E. (9) $20,913.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Academy of Actuaries, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E.(9) $142.90.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, 1285 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $200.

A. Congress of Railway Unions, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $7,296.78. E. (9) $14,295.20.

A. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,139.51. E. (9) $1,139.51.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Texaco Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $55.30.

A. Connecticut Bankers Association, 100 Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Conn. 06103.

A. Robert J. Conner Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $240.

A. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., 4 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa., 15222.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill., 60611.
B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. Jack T. Conway, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,812.50.

A. Charles F. Cook, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,075.

A. Cook & Franke, 660 East Madison Street, Milwaukee, Wis., 53202.
B. M. & I. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $305.36.

A. Howard Lee Cook, Jr., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $800.

A. Eileen D. Cooke, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $598.80.

A. J. Milton Cooper, Suite 1100, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Converse Rubber Co., Malden, Mass., Uniroyal, Inc., Naugatuck, Conn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $173.15.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1025 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, Canada.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturing Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $127.38.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $402.94.

A. Cooperative League of the USA, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $745.

A. Darrell Coover, 1625 I Street NW., No. 812, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 2600 River Road, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $193.

A. James T. Corcoran, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 308, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $87.50.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y. 14830.

A. Bertram Robert Cottine, 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Health Research Group, 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $4.40.

A. Robert M. Coultas, Suite 508, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Council for the Advancement of the Psychological Professions & Sciences, 1725 I Street NW., Suite 606, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $47,083. E. (9) $4,584.55.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $854.56. E. (9) $854.56.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300.

A. Roger C. Courtney, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $313.10. E. (9) $324.15.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
E. (9) $299.80.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. MGIC Investment Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 43201.
D. (6) $3,900.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Association of Industrial Parks.
E. (9) $2.60.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The State of Alaska.
E. (9) $12,995.09.

A. Eugene S. Cowen, 9024 Willow Valley Drive, Potomac, Md. 20854.
B. American Broadcasting Co., 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $33. E. (9) $33.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue, P.O. Box 1906, Shawnee Mission, Kans. 66222.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $65.

A. Robert W. Crawford, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of General Merchandise Chains, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $9,999.99. E. (9) $2,684.82.

A. W. J. Crawford, P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Hubert M. Crean, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Richard C. Creighton, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. H. C. Crotty.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.

A. Jack A. Crowder, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28281.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $46.20.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1 Farragut Square South, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Canned & Cooked Meat Importers' Association, c/o Deltec International, Ltd., 2801 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla. 33134.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $164.53.

A. William E. Cumberland, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $538. E. (9) $1,506.

A. Frank Cummings, Gall, Lane & Powell, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $500.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,250. E. (9) $2,837.50.

A. William Kay Daines, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $70.

A. Thomas A. Daly, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) $87.26. E. (9) $4.75.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Japan Lumber Importers Association, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $170.20.

A. Benjamin G. Danis, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Danzansky, Dickey, Tydings, Quint & Gordon, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $4,672.50. E. (9) $4,540.90.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $1,719. E. (9) $13.79.

A. Philip J. Daugherty.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $3,239. E. (9) $118.50.

A. Larry C. Davenport, 33 Thrush Road, Sterling, Va. 22170.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, P.O. Box 201, Chantilly, Va. 22021.
D. (6) $5,375.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $168.24.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Bankers Life and Casualty Co., 4444 Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60630.
E. (9) $97.37.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
E. (9) $97.97.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. The Myron Stratton Home, P.O. Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill. 60609.
D. (6) $162.50. E. (9) $102.99.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $6,400. E. (9) $612.19.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
E. (9) $97.99.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. United Insurance Co. of America, One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
E. (9) $97.37.

A. Fred E. Davis, 1133 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $475.

A. R. Hilton Davis, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Walter L. Davis, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $750.

A. Charles W. Day, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $292.

A. J. Edward Day, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. J. Edward Day, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Electronic Industries Association, Consumer Electronics Group, 2001 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) 207.28.

A. DeHart and Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Kansas City Southern Industries, Inc., 114 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $17.20.

A. DeHart and Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $447.50. E. (9) $24.70.

A. Delta Group, Ltd., 2535 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. National Committee for Effective No-Fault, 2535 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
D. (6) $4,300. E. (9) $100.

A. Vincent A. Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $1,930.

A. Ray Denison, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $556.52.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., P.O. Box 576, Bellevue, Wash. 98009.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, One Lincoln Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., One Liberty Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10006.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. S.T.O.P. (Shipping Tieups Over Permanently), Post Office Box 4437, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Washington Citizens for World Trade, 101 West 15th, Post Office Box 301, Olympia, Wash. 98507.

A. C. H. DeVaney, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D.(6) $2,281. E. (9) $122.80.

A. R. Daniel Devlin, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
E. (9) $195.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
D. (6) $1,640. E. (9) $744.96.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 1990 M Street NW., Suite 350, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,029.28. E. (9) $146.44.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Post Office Box 338, Sacramento, Calif. 95802.
D. (6) $2,291.31. E. (9) $135.60.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Marysville Dam Committee, Post Office Drawer B., Marysville, Calif. 95901.
D. (6) $306.50. E. (9) $11.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, Post Office Box 815, West Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,460.35. E. (9) $50.35.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky. 41076.
D. (6) $49,573.61. E. (9) $49,573.61.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $3,500.

A. William H. Dodds, 1115 15th Street NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $5,539.92. E. (9) $1,068.46.

A. Patrice M. Doherty, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28281.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $75.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $209.25. E. (9) $106.14.

A. Edward V. Donahue, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Graphic Arts International Union, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,788. E. (9) $1,788.

A. Jack Donahue, 1725 I Street NW., Suite 606, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Council for the Advancement of the Psychological Professions and Sciences, 1725 I Street NW., Suite 606, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,002. E. (9) $488.11.

A. Leo J. Donahue, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Gary W. Donnelly, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $36.08.

A. James A. Dorsch, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $740. E. (9) $196.65.

A. C. L. Dorson, Suite 529, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Suite 529, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $3,316.51. E. (9) $279.

A. Richard Morgan Downey, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $200.

A. F. Raymond Downs, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1104, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

A. Harry J. Doyle, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $620.06. E. (9) $642.40.

A. Robert H. Doyle, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $4,031.25.

A. Wilbur B. Dronen, 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
B. Caterpillar Tractor Co., 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill., 61602.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $303.50.

A. Dean W. Drulias, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $335.52. E. (9) $434.80.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $120.00. E. (9) $120.00.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $4,004. E. (9) $2,587.10.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,475. E. (9) 100.

A. Hugh G. Duffy, 1750 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Consumer Center for Legal Services, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $4,900.

A. Norman Duncan, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $90.45.

A. R. Michael Duncan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. R. Michael Duncan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Pauline B. Dunckel, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Suite 900, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Suite 900, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Louise C. Dunlap, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $76.16.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Bruce Dunton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) $3,285.00. E. (9) $100.00.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $385.

A. J. Frederick Durr, Rural Route No. 2, Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, c/o J. Frederick Durr, Rural Route No. 2, Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
E. (9) $113.70.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,175.

A. Robert E. Early, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Roy W. Easley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20036.
D. (6) $31.71.

A. East-West Trade Council, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $418.53.

A. Arthur B. Edgeworth, Jr., 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Hallett D. Edson, 956 North Monroe Street., Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. E. Neel Edwards, Jr., 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Federation of Independent Business.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $270.87.

A J. Rodney Edwards, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
E. (9) $52.74.

A. Macon T. Edwards, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $700.50. E. (9) $36.93.

A. Charles E. Ehrhart, 1800 K Street NW., No. 924, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $124.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., 1600 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Janice Eichhorn, 512A 6th Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Self-Determination for D.C., 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $152.99.

A. Harmon L. Elder, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $205.91.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Ruth Bowdey Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $2,853.87.

A. John C. Ellis, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Roy Elson, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $633.31.

A. Emergency Committee for the American Offshore Service Industry, 2000 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
E. (9) $3,159.46.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. David C. Scott, Allis-Chalmers, Milwaukee, Wis. 35201; Ian McGragor, American Metal Climax, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020; A. W. Clausen, Bank of America, Bank of America Center, San Francisco, Calif. 94120., et al.
D. (6) $5,032.50. E. (9) $3,699.61.

A. Richard W. Emory, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $2.92.

A. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
E. (9) $789.

A. Gertrude Engel, 2450 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Bob Hoffman, York Barbell Co., York, Pa. 17405.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $232.65.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,587.

A. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $28,695.80. E. (9) $26,687.53.

A. Glenn R. Erickson, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $250.

A. Russell G. Ernest, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1014, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Exxon Corp., 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $26.

A. Robert R. Fahs, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Cargill, Inc., 1200 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $27.50.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washintgon, D.C.
D. (6) $6,292. E. (9) $279.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $67,069.28. E. (9) $33,137.83.

A. Robert C. Farrow, 1707 H Street NW., Suite 607, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Labor-Management Committee for Fair Foreign Competition, 1499 Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, Calif. 94010.
D. (6) $240.

A. Penelope S. Farthing, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $175.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $4,500.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1500/1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, British Columbia, Canada.
D. (6) $4,746.87. E. (9) $250.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 321 Bloor Street, East, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $73.

A. Francis S. Filbey, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,056.74.

A. Matthew P. Fink, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $3.

A. Thomas W. Fink, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $585. E. (9) $25.40.

A. James W. Finley, 1015 18th Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Crown Zellerbach Corp., 1 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.

A. Firearms Lobby of America, 319 Fifth Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $9,185.50. E. (9) $9,595.15.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1221 Massachustts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $6,838.75. E. (9) $154.10.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $42.34.

A. Carl J. Fleps, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Greyhound Corp., Greyhound Tower, Phoenix, Ariz. 85077.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $34.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, P.O. Box 89, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.
E. (9) $350.

A. Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, care of C. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33877.

A. John F. Fochtman, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $800.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.
B. Minnesota Railroads Association.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $539.22.

A. James W. Foristel, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $800.

A. John S. Forsythe, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 2006.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $30.

A. David H. Foster.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $237.50.

A. John G. Fox, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007.
D. (6) $82.

A. Donald A. Frederick, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $656.25. E. (9) $2.75.

A. Robert M. Frederick, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. James O. Freeman, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $22.

R. Benjamin W. Fridge, 1900 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,235.54.

A. Susan Fridy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $117.76.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Spring, Ariz.
D. (6) $117. E. (9) $12.95.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Ariz.
E. (9) $419.75.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.
D. (6) $400.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Oglala Sioux Tribe, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 120, Route 1, Scottsdale, Ariz.
D. (6) $62.50.

A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, Box 268–A, Irving, N.Y. 14081.
D. (6) $1,570.
A. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Kampelman, 600 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Tuscarora Indian Nation, Lewiston, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 10005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $6.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $56,338. E. (9) $16,262.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10015.
D. (6) $765.00. E. (9) $3,397.30.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $300.

A. David C. Fullarton, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $750.

A. James E. Gaffigan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $184.60. E. (9) $28.80.

A. Robert E. Gallamore, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,518.75.

A. Peter N. Gammelgard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Nicole Gara, 1735 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $6,028.45. E. (9) $29.61.

A. John W. Gardner, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,284.27.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va., 22209.
E. (9) $870.

A. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $1,625.

A. Donald A. Giampaoli, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. William T. Gibb III, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Wayne Gibbens, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $139.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
E. (9) $148.71.

A. Dave Givens, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37201.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Horace D. Godfrey, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Florida and Louisiana sugar cane producers and processors.
D. (6) $1,115. E. (9) $167.84.

A. James T. Godfrey, 415 Kennebec Street, No. 603, Oxon Hill, Md.
B. American Physicists Association, P.O. Box 19343, Washington, D.C.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 614, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J. 07470.
D. (6) $132. E. (9) $223.75.

A. Vance V. Goodfellow, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $259.65.

A. Frederick D. Goss, 2100 M. Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $387.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48226.

A. Government Employes Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $13,826.61. E. (9) $6,420.21.

A. Donald E. Graham, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,585. E. (9) $47.51.

A. Graphic Arts International Union, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,788. E. (9) $1,788.

A. Warren Graves, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $1,005.04.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. James A. Gray, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
D. (6) $12,132.33. E. (9) $253.83.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $272. E. (9) $113.79.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho 83702.
B. Union Pacific Railroad, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
E. (9) $1,245.27.

A. William G. Greif, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Bristol-Meyers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fred J. Greiner, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Milk Industry Foundation, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $382.97.

A. James J. Gudinas, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Kenneth J. Guido, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $549.99.

A. Jerome R. Gulan, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Matthew Hale, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $400.

A. J. G. Hall, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,797.08.

A. Keith Halliday, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Business Roundtable, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $15.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Hardaway Co., 11th Street and Third Avenue, Columbus, Ga. 39102.
E. (9) $100.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 1500 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Transportation Association of America.
D. (6) $30.75. E. (9) $20.

A. Lloyd M. Hampton, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,106.24. E. (9) $25.34.

A. Donald K. Hanes, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $587.50. E. (9) $41.49.

A. James E. Hanson, Ron Ahern & Associates, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Puget Sound Tug & Barge Co., 1102 Southwest Massachusetts Street, Seattle, Wash. 98134.
D. (6) $60.

A. Robert B Harding, 1801 K Street NW., No. 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Southern California Edison Co., P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, Calif. 91770.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $125.56.

A. E. J. Hardy, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) 523.94.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $491.88.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $44.75.

A. John Harper, 1140 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $209.25. S. (9) $156.78.

A. Otto R. Harrison, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $51.70.

A. William C. Hart, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 20 Montchanin Road, Wilmington, Del. 19807.
D. (6) $2,352. E. (9) $4,559.68.

A. Rita M. Hartz, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,630.40. E. (9) $1,052.49.

A. Clifford J. Harvison, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Sidney G. Hawkes, 800 17th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Mead Corp., 118 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio 45402.
D. (6) $650. E. (9) $380.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $465. E. (9) $8.59.

A. Carl F. Hawver, 1000 16th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Consumer Finance Association, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $225.

A. Robert T. Hayden, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, Five Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $3,168.59. E. (9) $673.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, DC.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,281. E. (9) $71.35.

A. Patrick J. Head, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $650.

A. Health Research Group, 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $235.85. E. (9) $235.85.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $18.50.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Heilman, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $4,178.76.

A. Spencer H. Heine, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $400.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $963.70.

A. Ross E. Heller, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $2,200.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $716.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $335.15.

A. Andrew I. Hickey, Jr., 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $9,500. E. (9) $550.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50309.
B. Iowa Railway Association, 720 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50309.

A. J. Thomas Higginbotham, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Consumer Bankers Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,200.69.

A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $2,000.

A. James J. Hill, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Richard Hinds, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Harry R. Hinton, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $480.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1801 K Street NW., Ninth Floor, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $195.

A. Leo D. Hochstetter.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Glen D. Hofer, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dale Curtis Hogue, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Specialty Equipment Manufacturers Association, 11001 East Valley Mall, Suite 204, El Monte, Calif. 91734.
E. (9) $300.

A. Thomas W. Holland, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $616.08. E. (9) $67.27.

A. Henry W. Holling, 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
B. Caterpillar Tractor Co., 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $800.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $3,178. E. (9) $10,593.

A. John W. Holton, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1750. E. (9) $83.85.

A. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.
E. (9) $9,679.98.

A. C. T. Hoversten, 209 West 53d Street, Western Springs, Ill. 60558.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Bedford Park, Argo, Ill. 60501.

A. Thomas Howarth, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,428.15. E. (9) $1,428.15.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Allstate Insurance Companies, Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $8,848.23. E. (9) $110.84.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ashland Oil Inc., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., No. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Improvement Association, Inc., Ohio Valley.

A. David J. Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Recreational Vehicle Inst., Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $49.90.
A. Richard M. Hunt, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
D. (6) $562.

A. James L. Huntley, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,483.23. E. (9) $1,209.29.

A. David R. Ignatius, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $80.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,909.43. E. (9) $8,909.43.

A. Timothy H. Ingram, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Council for a Livable World.
D. (6) $4,999.98.

A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $34.80.

A. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $6,138.89. E. (9) $540.

A. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $4,568.36.

A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $8,239.54.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $16,878.15.

A. International Union, United Automobile Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Street, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $101,320. E. (9) $101,320.

A. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,353.75.

A. Investment Counsel Association of America, Inc., 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $884.75.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.
D. (6) $8,468.59. E. (9) $13,157.75.

A. Ronald A. Jacks, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Reinsurance Association of America, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $100.

A. Chas. E. Jackson & Associates, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $76.54.

A. Robert L. James, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 920, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bank of America N.T. and S.A., Bank of America Plaza, San Francisco, Calif. 94137.

A. Philip F. Jehle, 300 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Smith Kline Corp., 1500 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.
E. (9) $988.22.

A. David M. Jenkins II, 1800 K Street NW, Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio 44316.

A. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morristown, N.J. 07960.

A. Anita Johnson, 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Health Research Group, 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $60.

A. Charles E. Johnson, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019.
E. (9) $204.66.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $975.

A. Jess Johnson, Jr., Suite 300, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., 1 Shell Plaza, P.O. Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $500.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,674.43. E. (9) $334.41.

A. Charles N. Jolly, 1775 K Street NW., Suite 315, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Miles Laboratories, Inc., 1127 Myrtle Street, Elkhart, Ind. 46514.
E. (9) $3,388.98.

A. Allan R. Jones, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $405.05.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $108. E. (9) $45.

A. H. Daniel Jones III, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28281.
D. (6) $80. E. (9) $40.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $34.65.

A. Oliver H. Jones, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $719. E. (9) $9,168.

A. Ronald K. Jones, 8209 Carrleigh Parkway, Springfield, Va. 22152.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, P.O. Box 201, Chantilly, Va. 22021.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $95.63.

A. Carl D. Jordan, 408 East Maple Street, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $80.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20006.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $2.50.

A. Roger P. Kaplan, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Government Employees, Inc., 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass. 02127.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $50.

A. Gerald M. Katz, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $2.92.

A. Carleton R. Kear, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $170.

A. William J. Keating, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Patricia Keefer, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $80.

A. John G. Keller, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.O., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $25.83.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $7,916.64. E. (9) $4,625.73.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. George Kelm, One First National Plaza No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. The Myron Stratton Home, P.O. Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.

A. E. G. Kendall, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala. 36104.

A. I. L. Kenen 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $833.32.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio. 45840.
E. (9) $473.90.

A. Jeremiah J. Kenney, Jr., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Union Carbide Corp., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $30.95.

A. Kenyon & Kenyon, Reilly, Carr & Chapin, 59 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10038.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz., 85364; Emma Giambald, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz., 85364; George Hallingby, 4104 Chestnut Drive East, Forest Hills, Holiday, Fla. 33589.
E. (9) $25.

A. Thomas P. Kerester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
D. (6) $925. E. (9) $200.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $65.

A. Walter G. Kimmel, 1715 25th Street, Rock Island, Ill. 61201.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $470.39.

A. Charles L. King., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $132.

A. Gibson Kingren, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $703.75.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) ($785.38.

A. Kirkland, Ellis & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Walter A. Kischefsky, 5408 Rickenbacker Avenue, No. 302, Alexandria, Va., 22304.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
D. (6) $421.60. E. (9) $110.40.

A. James D. Kittelton, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
D. (6) $6,791.67. E. (9) $158.80.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $700.

A. Douglas E. Kliever, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. James Kmetz, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $6,883.80. E. (9) $164.94.

A. Paul R. Knapp, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill. 60049.
D. (6) $875.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $725.

A. Philip M. Knox, Jr., 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Joseph L. Koach, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur D. Koch, Room 603, 2020 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.
D. (6) $324. E. (9) $20.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $69.40.

A. Horace R. Kornegay, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $175.

A. Paul A. Korody, Jr., 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $500.

A. Kenneth S. Kovack, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, Five Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $4,467.75. E. (9) $1,524.62.

A. Lawrence E. Kreider, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. William J. Kuhfuss, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Lloyd R. Kuhn, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,092. E. (9) $1,378.04.

A. Norman G. Kurland, 2027 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $2,555.07.

A. James S. Krzyminski, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,710. E. (9) $161.23.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $4,235. E. (9) $4,922.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $13,443.45.

A. Richard M. Lahn, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $875.01. E. (9) $3.60.

A. Nick L. Laird, Suite 300, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., One Shell Plaza, Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $500.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44113.

A. A. M. Lampley, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $200.

A. Karl S. Landstrom, 510 North Edison Street, Arlington, Va. 22203.
B. Sportsman's Paradise Homeowners Association, Route 2, Box 228, Blythe, Calif. 92225.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $118.57.

A. Asger F. Langlykke, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society for Microbiology, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. James J. LaPenta, Jr., 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $480.95.

A. Clifford C. LaPlante, 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. The Boeing Co., Post Office Box 3707, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $175.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 270, Washington, D.C. 20044.
B. American Trucking Association, 1616 P Street, Washington. D.C.
D. (6) $3,525.

A. Robert B. Laurents, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va. 22150.
B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $2,700.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $125.

A. Lawyers Committee to End the War, One Wall Street, 25th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $11,558. E. (9) $4,135.27.

A. William Lazarus, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $70.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert W. Lee, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The John Birch Society, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass. 02178.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $591. E. (9) $1,278.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Gilbert LeKander, 910 17th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Montana Power Co., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701; Washington Water Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash. 99210.
D. (6) $450.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) $624.92.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, Wilner & Scheiner, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55440.
D. (6) $4,560. E. (9) $224.67.

A. S. R. Levering, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,207.

A. Harry LeVine, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $45.

A. Charles R. Lewis, P.O. Box 7, Charleston, W. Va. 25321.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association.
D. (6) $5,000.01. E. (9) $107.66.

A. J. Stanly Lewis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,031.20.

A. Robert G. Lewis.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union) P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $5,538.43. E. (9) $197.27.

A. Ronald L. Leymeister, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $451.32.

A. Herbert Liebenson, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Russell B. Light, 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. Boeing Co., P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $175.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc.
D. (6) $16.80. E. (9) $6.48.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
B. National Maritime Compensation Com-

mittee, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
B. Pacific Rim Trade Association, 222 Southwest Harrison Street, Suite GA-2, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
D. (6) $2,650. E. (9) $341.53.

A. John E. Linster, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis.
B. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
D. (6) $500.

A. Charles B. Lipsen.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,653.86. E. (9) $510.

A. Zel E Lipsen, Suite 1100, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 30036.
D. (6) $422. E. (9) $80.36.

A. Edgar Lockwood, 1800 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Laurence London, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $300.

A. Sheldon I. London, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
D. (6) $800.

A. Philip J. Loree, 25 Broadway, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $600.

A. James F. Lovett, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $200.

A. James P. Low, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Society of Association Executives, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Otto Lowe, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 30th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Catholic Press Association, 432 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $10.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $20.

A. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill. 60049.
E. (9) $1,550.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lund Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ebasint International Inc., One Penn Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10001.

A. Lund Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morristown, N.J. 07960.

A. Lund Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Menswear Retailers of America, Room 390, National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $600.

A. Lusk-Evans Ltd., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 940, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

A. James H. Lynch, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,002.20. E. (9) $182.29.

A. Mark H. Lynch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Printing Industries of America, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $1,461.11.

A. Kenneth B. MacKenzie, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $400.

A. Thomas J. Mader, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $32.90.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andre Maisonpierre, 666 11th Street, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $520.

A. Management Communications, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Council on Foundations, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $30.50.

A. Management Communications, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Potters Industries, Inc., Industrial Road, Post Office Box 14, Carlstadt, N.J. 07072.
D. (6) $140.

A. Management Communications, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Recycled Paperboard Division of the American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $3.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Coal Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,217.60. E. (9) $137.10.

A. Mike Manatos, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1104, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45202.
D. (6) $66.13. E. (9) $314.82.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $153.

A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. J. Eugene Marans, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

A. Ralph J. Marlatt, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $930.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $252. E. (9) $3.90.

A. J. Paull Marshall, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $258.02. E. (9) $271.35.

A. Richard B. Martinez, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $937.30. E. (9) $956.70.

A. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $2.92.

A. Mike Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Japanese Trade Committee, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mike Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Nisei Lobby, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Mike Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, P.O. Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
D. (6) $500.

A. Guy B. Maseritz, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul J. Mason, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,499.91. E. (9) $900.

A. Massachusetts Lawyers' Vietnam Committee, 32d Floor, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.

A. P. H. Mathews, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $498.80. E. (9) $306.43.

A. John J. L. Matson, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the U.S., Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $400.

A. Barry D. Matsumoto, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 22 Peace Plaza, Suite 203, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
D. (6) $200.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Ocean Industries Association, 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $208. E. (9) $109.

A. Robert A. Matthews, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) $312.46.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,312. E. (9) $83.08.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Brass & Bronze Ingot Institute, 300 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 410, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL–CIO), 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill. 60657.
D. (6) $5,780. E. (9) $680.

A. Mayer, Brown & Platt, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
B. L. M. Williams and Clayton Burch families, c/o Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., Trustee, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60693.

A. William J. McAuliffe, Jr., 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C.
B. American Land Title Association, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Michael J. McCabe, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Michael J. McCabe, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Allstate Insurance Cos., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Government Employes Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $3,522.61.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., P.O. Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga. 30301.
E. (9) $122.04.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf & Western Industries, Inc., One Gulf & Western Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10023.
E. (9) $241.91.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Magnavox Co., 1700 Magnavox Way, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $206.98.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., North Perry & Jefferson Streets, Montgomery, Ala. 36103.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Alfred P. Slaner, 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., 3308 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La. 70110.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C 20036.
B. United Artists Corp., 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. John L. McCormick, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $30.

A. E. L. McCulloch, 819 Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.
D. (6) $284.60. E. (9) $81.50.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $428.65. E. (9) $118.80.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $483.32.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont. 59701.
E. (9) $213.41.

A. Robert M. McElwaine.
B. American Imported Automobile Dealers Association, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $5,800.

A. Robert E. McGarrah, Jr., 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Health Research Group, 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Raymond McGlaughlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.
D. (6) $7,080.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $98.04.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $447.45.

A. Clifford G. McIntire, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $5.25.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $681.67.

A. W. F. McKenna, 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90010.
B. First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Phoenix; Tucson Federal Savings and Loan Association.
E. (9) –$34.12.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $279.79.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, Suite 609, 1400 North Uhle Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. National Headquarters, Marine Corps League, 933 North Kenmore Street, Suite 317, Arlington, Va. 22201.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 1400 North Uhle Street, Suite 609, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the USA, P.O. Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex. 28298.
D. (6) $2,362.50. E. (9) $3,745.31.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H. Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $200.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $215. E. (9) $190.25.

A. C. W. McMillan, Suite 1015, National Press Building, 14th and F Streets, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. McNutt, Dudley, Easterwood & Losch, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $7,000. E. $1,291.79.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., 1660 L. Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. George G. Mead, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $260.32.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $10,880.

A. Louis L. Meier, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Civil Engineers, United Engineering Center, 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $166. E. (9) 163.97.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. R. Otto Meletzke, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $8.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $18,750. E. (9) $1,403.31.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,020.75. E. (9) $338.60.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. George F. Meyer, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $392.

A. M. & I. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
D. (6) $1,235. E. (9) $500.05.
A. James G. Michaux, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
D. (6) $500.

A. A. Stanley Miller, 910 16th Street NW., Room 302, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $100.

A. Anne Miller, Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $28.66.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Capital Holding Corp., Commonwealth Building, Louisville, Ky. 40201.
E. (9) $100.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $114.29.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $27.91.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Texasgulf, Inc., New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $259.43.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, Union Pacific Building, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68179.
B. Nebraska Railroad Legislative Committee, Union Pacific Building, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Neb. 68179.
D. (6) $6,049.98. E. (9) $991.04.

A. Joe D. Miller, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $875.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Maytag Co., Northern Textile Association, National Parking Association, Hormel Co.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $250.

A. Luman G. Miller, 620 Southwest Fifth Avenue Building, Suite 912, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 620 Southwest Fifth Avenue Building, Suite 912, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
E. (9) $439.60.

A. Jack Mills, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc. 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, P.O. Box 201, 14650 Lee Road, Chantilly, Va. 22021.
D. (6) $3,095.63. E. (9) $3,095.63.

A. John S. Monagan, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Connecticut Bankers Association, 100 Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Conn. 06103.

A. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $1,450.

A. G. Merrill Moody, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $106.99. E. (9) $51.35.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,667. E. (9) $57.

A. O. William Moody, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,500. E (9) $905.40.

A. Donald L. Morgan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Donald L. Morgan, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Clearly, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The American Humane Association, P.O. Box 1266, Denver, Colo. 80201.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Gene P. Morrell, 1750 K Street NW., Suite 250, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lone Star Gas Co., 301 South Harwood, Dallas Tex. 75201.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $660.

A. James M. Morris, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $2,500. E. $1,282.48.

A. Jack Moskowit, 2030 M. Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $162.67.

A. Lynne E. Mote, 1133 15th Street NW., Suite 503, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr., 66102.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. John J. Motley.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Boulevard., 15th and New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,720. E (9) $510.

A. William G. Mullen, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
E. (9) $223.28.

A. John J. Murphy, 416 Shoreham Building, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. Richard W. Murphy, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J. 07065.
D. (6) $500.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., 516 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $230. E. (9) $302.61.

A. NBA Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
E. (9) $562.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,037.50. E. (9) $128.23.

A. John J. Nangle, 1625 I Street, NW., Suite 812, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 2600 River Road, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $586.

A. Bonnie Naradzay, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $87.50.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
D. (6) $82.50.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Suite 711, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,075. E. (9) $5,763.16.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. National Air Carrier Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $875.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $561.30. E. (9) $1,276.60.

A. National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., 675 Pinellas Point Drive South, St. Petersburg, Fla. 33705.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $159.31.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) $38,143.50. E. (9) $10,311.16.

A. National Association of Electric Co., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010. Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,521.42. E. (9) $7,592.08.

A. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, c/o J. Frederick Durr, R.R. No. 2, Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
D. (6) $1,664.04. E. (9) $1,664.04.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300. (9) $300.

A. National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, 666 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $1,230.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
E. (9) $19,992.99.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,744,382.66. E. (9) $38,025.05.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2511 East 46th Street, Suite H, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $4,114.76. E. (9) $4,114.76.

A. National Association of Realtors, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $11,027.20.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $30,912.07. E. (9) $5,847.27.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $627,444.91. E. (9) $4,605.21.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $463,558. E. (9) $3,340.63.

A. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
D. (6) $1,688.77. E. (9) $1,688.77.

A. National Committee for Effective No-Fault, 2535 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
D. (6) $4,050. E. (9) $4,300.

A. National Consumer Center for Legal Services, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $11,750. E. (9) $5,200.

A. National Consumer Finance Association, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $1,402.42.

A. National Convocation of Lawyers To End the War, 32d Floor, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.
D. (6) $935. E. (9) $407.27.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $20,776.89. E. (9) $20,776.89.

A. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $264.25. E. (9) $30.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 337 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $1,650.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $30,382.28. E. (9) $33,895.75.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Blood Resources Association, 308 State Street, Albany, N.Y. 12210.
E. (9) $99.23.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Cenco, Inc., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $114.16.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $833.33. E. (9) $53.19.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Elba Systems Corp., 5909 East 38th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $29.39.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Wheat Users Committee, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,666.66. E. (9) $137.62.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30326.
E. (9) $9,835.39.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $337,947.07. E (9) $24,104.79.

A. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $15.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $124,149.91. E. (9) $11,470.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $982.

A. National Institute of Locker and Freezer Provisioners, 224 East High Street, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022.
D. (6) $1,095.74. E. (9) $371.27.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $14,994.26. E. (9) $494.79.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,791.31. E. (9) $25,791.31.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68107.
D. (6) $8,238.91. E. (9) $8,238.91.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $4,686.16.

A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street, NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,080. E. (9) $800.

A. National Realty Committee, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $820.99. E. (9) $820.99.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,060. E. (9) $1,458.

A. National Sharecroppers Fund, 1145 19th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $22,945.91. E. (9) $8,791.41.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $14,043.83

A. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $183,520. E. (9) $5,002.67.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,048.47. E. (9) $3,597.02.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
E. (9) $3,337.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $561.90. E. (9) $561.90.

A. Alexander W. Neale, Jr., 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,395. E. (9) $27.90.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1801 K Street NW., No. 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Southern California Edison Co., P.O. Box 800, Rosemead, Calif. 91770.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $184.76.

A. Allen Neece, Jr., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300.

A. Frances E. Neely, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,090.

A. Stanley Nehmer, Suite 800, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $500.

A. George Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $541.39.

A. J. T. Nelson, Gibson Island, Md. 21056.
B. Household Finance Corp., Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $76.50.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, Suite 307, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1200 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $232.95.

A. Robert B. Neville, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $156.71.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,656.25. E. (9) $191.05.

A. E. J. Newbould, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Clay Pipe Institute, 350 West Terra Cotta Avenue, Crystal Lake, Ill. 60014.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $10.

A. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $13,620.

A. Richard Ney, Watergate South, 700 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Academy of Family Physicians, 1740 West 92d Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64114.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,112.30.

A. Charles E. Nichols, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $685.35.

A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa. 18332.
B. Northern Helex Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) $2,325. E. (9) $735.40.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,810.92. E. (9) $679.39.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
B. Profit Sharing Council of America, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1225 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $145.59.

A. Robert B. Norris, 1000 16th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Consumer Finance Association, 1000 16th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $570.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,215.16.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
D. (6) $650.

A. W. Brice O'Brien, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $825.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 465 L'Enfant Plaza West SW., Suite 2900, Washington, D.C. 20024.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $143.50.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Suite 2900, IDS Tower, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Room 110, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $198.84.

A. Lawrence J. O'Connor, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Standard Oil Co., Midland Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.
E. (9) $603.25.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $300.

A. James O'Dea, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Government Employees, Inc., 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass. 02127.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $95.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Philippine Sugar Institute, Box 978, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $250.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y., 10003.
D. (6) $4,349.98. E. (9) $2,411.75.

A. Bartley O'Hara, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $4,999.98.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Savings Bank Association of Massachusetts, 50 Congress Street, Boston, Mass. 02109.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
E. (9) $148.71.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Edward W. Oliver, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Roy E. Olson, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $63.80.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (OPEDA), 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,730.26. E. (9) $1,944.49.

A. John L. Oshinski, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, Five Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $4,562.50. E. (9) $630.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,475.

A. Juris Padegs, 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Investment Counsel Association of America, Inc., 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Norman Paige, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Edward Panarello, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,424.74. E. (9) $1,179.86.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Corp., P.O. Box 576, Bellevue, Wash.
D. (6) $10,760.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Imported Automobile Dealers Association, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,800.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Boating Industry Associations, 401 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601; National Association of Engine & Boat Manufacturers, 537 Steamboat Road, Greenwich, Conn. 06830.
D. (6) $480.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Central American Sugar Council, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $160.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc., 140 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Snowmobile Industry Association, 5100 Edina Industrial Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Marcor, Inc., 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $270.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Moody's Investors Service, Inc., 99 Church Street, New York, N.Y. 10008.
D. (6) $300.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Nestle Co., 100 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, N.Y. 10605.
D. (6) $160.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. New Process Co., 220 Hickory Street, Warren, Pa. 16365.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $307.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Tax Corporation of America, 2441 Honolulu Avenue, Montrose, Calif. 91020.

A. Paul Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Armco Steel Corp., 703 Curtis Street, Middletown, Ohio 45042.
D. (6) $6,200. E. (9) $449.81.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Warner Bros., Inc., 4000 Warner Boulevard, Burbank, Calif. 91505.
E. (9) $391.16.

A. John J. Pecoraro, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 1750 New York Avenue NW,. Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,556,28.

A. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
E. (9) $6,955.

A. D. V. Pensabene, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.

A. J. C. Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., P.O. Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Sr., P.O. Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, P.O. Box 20155, Orlando, Fla. 32814; Florida Citrus Mutual, P.O. Box 89, Lakeland, Fla.; Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, c/o C. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33877.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $37.05.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,103.50. E. (9) $422.86.

A. Richard W. Peterson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500.

A. Ann E. Petty, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

A. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $375.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. John P. Philbin, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $86.06.

A. Daphne Philos, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $2,065.11.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,333.33. E. (9) $161.13.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., P.O. Box 10425, Lubbock, Tex. 79408.
D. (6) $104,066.58. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Political Action Comml. for Engineers and Scientists, Suite 1100, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $22.58.

A. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $4,672.50.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $70.75.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Counsel Association of America, Inc., 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $874. E. (9) $10.75.

A. Richard M. Powell, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.
B. International Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. William I. Powell, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $975.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $161.55.

A. William C. Prather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $312.60.

A. Jerry C. Pritchett, 5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. Mechanical Contractors Association of America, Inc., 5530 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 750, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $348. E. (9) $348.

A. PROD, Inc., Suite 511, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. Profit Sharing Council of America, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $195.60. E. (9) $195.60.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Thomas H. Quinn, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,666.50. E. (9) $338.56.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 8, Box 238, Annapolis, Md. 21401.
B. Associated Retail Bakers of America, 735 West Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill. 60613.
D. (6) $117. E. (9) 32.76.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $2,072.53.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $414.96.

A. Raymond Raedy, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89.30. E. (9) $33.15.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,692. E. (9) $10,692.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $2,000.

A. D. Michael Rappoport, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $142.50. E. (9) $90.41.

A. Timothy J. Redmon, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $18.28. E. (9) $30.

A. Dwight C. Reed, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $471.16. E. (9) $30.

A. Davd J. Reedy, 6S430 Huntington Circle East, Naperville, Ill. 60515.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Bedford Park, Argo, Ill. 60501.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 602 Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $600.

A. Robert S. Reese, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. W. W. Renfroe, 69 Wilkinson Street, Capitol Plaza, Frankfort, Ky. 40601.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, 69 Wilkinson Street, Capitol Plaza, Frankfort, Ky. 40601.
E. (9) 856.72.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,973.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, Suite 529, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $16,553.52. E. (9) $10,067.53.

A. James J. Reynolds, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $142.37.

A. William L. Reynolds, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $55.

A. Austin T. Rhoads.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $429.07.

A. Maxwell E. Rich, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $625.

A. Mark Richardson, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $250.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.
B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

A. Robert R. Rickett, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert R. Rickett, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Rosalie Riechman, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1213 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.
D. (6) $1,575.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Stark Ritchie, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $116.44.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Thomas G. Roderick, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Co., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $750.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 793, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017.
D. (6) $750.

A. Walter E. Rogers, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John F. Rolph III, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500.

A. James A. Rooney, Suite 1207, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mead Data Central, Inc., 111 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio 45402.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $125.

A. Christine Root, 2332 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $1,398.

A. Rouse & O'Rourke, Lawyers Building, 231 East Vermijo Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80903.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V. Balderas 36, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.
E. (9) $859.13.

A. Robert J. Routier, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $175.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, Suite 1009, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Deltona Corp., 3250 SW. Third Avenue, Miami, Fla. 33129.
D. (6) $1,539.66.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio 44316.

A. Albert R. Russell, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $4,458.46. E. (9) $473.88.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., No. 514, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $1,609.63.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $882.38.

A. Ella Marice Ryan, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $8.45.

A. William Ryan, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $198.15.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 500 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Shell Oil Co., Mobil Oil Corp., Los Angeles.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum and Tayler; 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson Street, Muncie, Ind.

A. Carl K. Sadler, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $6,039.60. E. (9) $8,149.42.

A. Ruth M. Saxe, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $237.48.

A. Kenneth D. Schanzer 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $833.32. E. (9) $191.98.

A. Eric P. Schellin, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $800.

A. Jacques T. Schlenger, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $2.92.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Liquor Stores Association, Inc., Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $40.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington D.C. Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $555. E. (9) $70.

A. Valerie Schulte, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,975.

A. Donald H. Schwab, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,821.88. E. (9) $28.85.

A. John W. Scott, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1209, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Jefferson Pilot Corp., P.O. Box 21008, Greensboro, N.C. 27402.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1209, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Earl W. Sears, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn., 38112.
D. (6) $535.50. E. (9) $33.11.

A. Self-Determination for D.C., 2030 M Street NW., Room 300, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,460. E. (9) $5,451.02.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 802, Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $25.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Newspaper Association, 491 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
E. (9) $153.43.

A. J. Richard Sewell, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $500.

A. Robert L. Shafer, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pfizer Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $560. E. (9) $185.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius and Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Albright Title & Trust Co., 100 North Main Street, Newkirk, Okla. 74647; American Title Insurance Co., 150 Southeast Third Avenue, Miami, Fla. 33131; Chelsea Title & Guaranty Co., 1300 Bacharach Boulevard, Atlantic City, N.J., et al.
D. (6) $2,066.15. E. (9) $199.27.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius and Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $53.51.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius and Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Independent Groceries' Alliance, 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606; National Institutional Food Distributors Associates, Inc., 300 Interstate North, Suite 800, Atlanta, Ga. 30339; Topco Associates, Inc., 7711 Grosse Point Road, Skokie, Ill. 60076, et al.
D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $1,201.69.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius and Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $120.10.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Doubleday and Co., Inc., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, Five Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $5,995.75. E. (9) $3,787.23.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,175.

A. W. Lee Shield, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $160.

A. Edward L. Shields, 666 11th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,110.

A. Harvey A. Shipman, 1725 K Street, NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Penn Central Transportation Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $1,356.13.

A. Lucien J. Sichel, 1730 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Ill. 60064.

A. David Silver, 1775 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Talmadge E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $301.97.

A. Talmadge E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $93.55.

A. Lana H. Sims, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C. 29201.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 1003 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C. 29201.
D. (6) $39.35. E. (9) $126.95.

A. Julian H. Singman, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO, 17 Battery Place, Suite 1530, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Carstens Slack, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla. 74004.

A. William L. Slayton, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Stephen Slipher, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,062.50. (9) $27.

A. Smathers and Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Horse Council, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $2,832.91.

A. Smathers and Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,250. E. $91.40.

A. Donald E. Smiley, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $416.48.

A. Arthur J. Smith, 1700 K Street NW., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., P.O. Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $500.

A. Everard H. Smith, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $283.10.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $20.65.

A. James R. Smith, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Robert William Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $187. E. (9) $149.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 2511 East 46th Street, Suite H, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $104.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $3,281.67. E. (9) $1,311.80.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1100 17th Street NW., Suite 306, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $649.95.

A. John M. Snow, 8401 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. National Association of Furniture Manufacturers, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $30.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,265.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $350.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, P.O. Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C. 20007.
D. (6) $12,653.22. E. (9) $4,001.67.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, One East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev. 89501.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, One East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $25.

A. Shelby E. Southard, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $730.

A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $2,199.12. E. (9) $11.83.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William C. Spence, Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Columbia Gulf Transmission Co., Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $665. E. (9) $579.37.

A. Sportsman's Paradise Homeowners Association, care of Charles R. Patriquin, 10612 Dalerose Avenue, Inglewood, Calif. 90304.
E. (9) $569.80.

A. James M. Sprouse, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Squibb Corp., 40 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019.
E. (9) $223.

A. John M. Stackhouse, Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Lynn Stalbaum, 400 World Center Building, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., Room 400, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $103.60.

A. The Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $603.25.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $350.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. William M. Stephens, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $55.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Robert College of Istanbul, Turkey, 305 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $160. E. (9) $4.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wynne A. Stevens, Jr., 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $870.

A. Edward T. Stevenson, 2021 K Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Southern Furniture Manufacturers Association, P.O. Box 951, High Point, N.C. 27261.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $3,250.

A. Travis B. Stewart, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Hoffman-La Roche, Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J. 07110.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $50.

A. Edward W. Stimpson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Footwear Group, American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Japan Iron & Steel Exporters Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $6,039.35. E. (9) $347.35.

A. William M. Stover, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $6,070. E. (9) $594.53.

A. John D. Stringer, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,560.

A. Michael E. Strother, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $27.01.

A. Norman Strunk, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $200.08.

A. Walter B. Stults, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Co., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $4,380.

A. Sullivan, Beauregard, Meyers & Clarkson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $1,660.45.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $575.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Estate of Margaret Solomon, c/o Franklin C. Latcham, One Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $26.74.

A. Glenn A. Swanson, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Suite 905, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn. 56378.
D. (6) $11,805. E. (9) $2,191.88.

A. Irving W. Swanson, 1155 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 128 C Street NE., Suite 61, Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. American Lung Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. David A. Sweeney, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. John R. Sweeney, Solar Building, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., 701 East Third Street, Bethlehem, Pa. 18016.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $330.55.

A. Ronald E. Sweet, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $20.

A. Russell A. Swindell, P.O. Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, P.O. Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.
D. (6) $307.68. E. (9) $318.96.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $200.

A. Charles C. Talley, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va. 22901.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. David Tarr, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $197.49.

A. Tax Reform Research Group, 733 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $436.50. E. (9) $436.50.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1720 I Street NW., Suite No. 400, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill., 60666.
E. (9) $151.54.

A. Richard M. Tempero, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $343.74.

A. L. D. Tharp, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., Suite 600, 634 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hart Metals, Inc., Tamaqua, Pa. 18252.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., Suite 600, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. REA Express, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Joseph F. Thomas, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $3,362.03.

A. Walter Thompson Co., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Independent Livestock Producers, c/o Herman Dinklage, Whitman, Nebr.
D. (6) $8,340. E. (9) $2,454.71.

A. William D. Thompson, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,446.19.

A. Cyrus C. Tichenor III, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va. 23220.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $1,964.13.

A. Paul J. Tierney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Transportation Association of America.
E. (9) $43.96.

A. J. R. Timmins & Co., 37 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $1,662.

A. Patrick F. Tobin, 1341 G Street NW., Room 304, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,510.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $249.90.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, No. 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $513.94. E. (9) $145.98.

A. Christine Topping, 220 Maryland Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Bipartisan Committee for American Voters Overseas, c/o Ms. Christine Topping, 220 Maryland Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $3,142.26.

A. John P. Tracey.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $50.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,688. E. (9) $64.14.

A. Paul B. Trimble, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44113.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 1411 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $76.95.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
D. (6) $792. E. (9) $265.

A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $147.40. E. (9) $23.41.

A. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $12,513.82.

A. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $14,095.50.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $280.20.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $47,294.72.

A. Universal Development Consultants, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $70.

A. Jack J. Valenti, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,263.08.

A. Lois Van Volkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va. 22302.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $12. E. (9) $3.75.

A. John A. Vance, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
D. (6) $548.75. E. (9) $311.81.

A. John W. Vardaman, Jr., 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Individual members of the San Antonio Conservation Society v. Texas Highway Department.

A. Venable, Baetjer & Howard, 1800 Mercantile Bank & Trust Building, 2 Hopkins Plaza, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
B. Maryland State Fair & Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21093.
E. (9) $2.92.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Insurance Association, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $295.50. E. (9) $84.30.

A. L. T. Vice, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Suite 1204, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $185.

A. Robert E. Vinson, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $38.75.

A. Donn L. Waage, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $157.25. E. (9) $73.90.

A. E. F. Waldrop, Jr., 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Suite 212, Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $94.94. E. (9) $15.83.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Allied Chemical Corp., P.O. Box 1057R, Morristown, N.J. 07960.
E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Aluminum Co. of America, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $238.10.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bethlehem Steel Corp., Bethlehem, Pa. 18016.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $238.10. E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Electric Co., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $238.10. E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Motors Corp., General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., 900 SW., Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $238.10.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Steel Corp., 2800 Grant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219.
E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Procter and Gamble, Cincinnati, Ohio 45201.
D. (6) $238.10.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Time, Inc., Time & Life Building, Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Union Camp Corp., 1600 Valley Road, Wayne, N.J. 07040.
E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Union Carbide Corp., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $5.13.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash. 98401.
E. (9) $5.13.

A. Lionel L. Wallenrod, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Jack A. Waller, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,869.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America; Solidarity House; 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $5,650.68. E. (9) $1,355.16.

A. Charles S. Walsh.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $127.50. E. (9) $15.

A. William A. Walton, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, Eighth and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans. 66612.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 800 Merchants National Bank Building, Eighth and Jackson Streets, Topeka, Kans. 66612.

A. Richard D. Warden, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $4,988.52. E. (9) $441.21.

A. Jack Ware, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,160. E. (9) $400.

A. Pamela R. Warner, 5500 North Kedzie, Chicago, Ill.
B. J. R. Carlson Labs, 5500 North Kedzie, Chicago, Ill.

A. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $14,967.37. E. (9) $11,790.89.

A. Washington Research Project, Action Council, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $4,175.27.

A. George B. Watts, 1155 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300.

A. Ray Wax, care of J. Frederick Durr, Rural Route 2, Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, care of J. Frederick Durr, Rural Route 2, Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
E. (9) $30.50.

A. Henry B. Weaver, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Clyde M. Webber, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $11,142.60. E. (9) $1,661.51.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., Suite 1200, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul S. Weller, Jr., 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,599.99. E. (9) $243.73.

A. Fred M. Wertheimer, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,600. E. (9) $77.

A. Terrell M. Wertz, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,850. E. (9) $176.34.

A. Harry H. Westbay III, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 805, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. St. Regis Paper Co., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $150.

A. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, P.O. Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
E. (9) $500.

A. Clyde A. Wheeler, Jr., 1800 K Street NW., Suite 820, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Sun Oil Co., 240 Radnor-Chester Road, St. Davids, Pa. 19087.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $1,785.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Fertilizer Institute, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $25.

A. Wheeler, Van Sickle, Day & Anderson, 25 West Main Street, Madison, Wis. 53703.
B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
D. (6) $635. E. (9) $194.69.

A. John C. White, Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. White, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio 45840.
E. (9) $614.84.

A. Robert L. White, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Douglas Whitack II, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1005, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Zale Corp., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $250.

A. Alan J. Whitney, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Government Employees, Inc., 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass. 02127.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $750.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $6,742.62.

A. Richard J. Wiechmann, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,268.70.

A. David Wilken, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $26.40.

A. Williams, Connolly & Califano, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Individual members of the San Antonio Conservation Society v. Texas Highway Department, No. 67–72A.

A. Francis G. Williams.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Harding de C. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Auto-Train Corp., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $10.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Bankers Association of Puerto Rico, c/o Wender, Murase & White, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $5.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., P.O. Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.
E. (9) $400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. IU International Management Corp., 1501 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council for Health Care Services, 407 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ward Industries, Inc., P.O. Box 849, Conway, Ark. 72032.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 2130 LeRoy Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists, 6840 Eastern Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20012.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $89.27.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $665. E. (9) $9.27.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Basketball Association, 1700 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $944.49. E. (9) $146.27.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Oil Investment Institute, 2500 Dunstan, Houston, Tex. 77005.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 06520.
E. (9) $69.40.

A. John A. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Sharecroppers Fund, 1145 19th Street NW., Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $22,945.91. E. (9) $8,791.41.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La. 71106.
B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $55.

A. R. J. Winchester, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex., 77002.

B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,700.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Peter L. Wolff, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $9,693.60. E. (9) $3,604.25.

A. Kenneth David Wollack, 1341 G Street NW, Suite 720, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $785.

A. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1213 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa., 19107.
D. (6) $8,025.09. E. (9) $9,827.92.

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $150.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Cos., Inc., 9665 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif. 90212.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,340. E. (9) $281.

A. George M. Worden, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $28.

A. V. T. Worthington, 1500 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va. 22207.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, Box 7116, Arlington, Va. 22207.

A. Wyatt, Saltzstein, Minton & Howard, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Business Press, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $1,900. E. (9) $141.66.

A. Gerald L. Wykoff, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., 1675 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. California Canners and Growers, 3100 Ferry Building, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
D. (6) $750.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Copyright Owners Negotiating Committee, c/o Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin, Krim & Ballon, 477 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Embassy of the Government of the Republic of Korea, 2320 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Petersen Publishing Co., 8490 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90069.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles S. Yerrid, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $285.36. E. (9) $395.46.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. First National City Bank, 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) 114.62.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington,D.C.
D. (6) $7,150. E. (9) $395.17.

A. Albert H. Zinkand.
B. Getty Oil Co., 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charles O. Zuver, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $149.33.

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1973:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.
2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Actors Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Ad Hoc Committee for an Effective Investment Tax Credit, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $659.03. E. (9) $659.03.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $2,094.47.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., Suit 409, ARBA Building, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. George Alderson, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $29,467.26. E. (9) $29,467.26.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $6,868.02. E. (9) $6,868.02.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Rosyln Street, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,243.50.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
B. Admiral Insurance Co., Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., Aetna Fire Underwriters Insurance Co., et al.
D. (6) $34,848.88. E. (9) $34,848.88.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. 46206.
D. (6) $67,766.91. E. (9) $45,743.70.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.
D. (6) $47,925.45. E. (9) $47,925.45.

A. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 620, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $1,114.30. E. (9) $2,545.18.

A. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,665. E. (9) $1,595.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, Suite 718, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. CITC Industries, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $36.25.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery County, Md., Lawyers Association, c/o George Ballman, 3720 Farragut Street, Kensington, Md.
D. (6) $1,333. E. (9) $116.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $13,739. E. (9) $1,346.81.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. State Farm Mutual Insurance Co., 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill. 61701.
D. (6) $581. E. (9) $24.

A. Judith A. Assmus, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Box 7116, Arlington, Va. 22207.

A. Gary D. Avery, 900 17 Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10015.
D. (6) $84. E. (9) $40.79.

A. Baker & McKenzie, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., P.O. Box 718, Dallas, Tex 75221.
D. (6) $4,173.

A. Peter M. Balitsaris, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,656.25. E. (9) $475.43.

A. James C. Barr, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Federal Credit Unions, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $117.50.

A. Ross Bass Assoicates, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Record Industry Association of America, 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Davis M. Batson, 1155 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. C. Thomas Bendorf, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of Trial Lawyers of America.
D. (6) $3,403.17. E. (9) $1,903.17.

A. Berl Bernhard, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $73.76.

A. Richard W. Bliss, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $475.

A. Boston Lawyers' Vietnam Committee, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $1,658.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO–CLC, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $6,333.

A. Cyril F. Brickfield, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $169.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $20,498.89. E. (9) $20,498.89.

A. David R. Brower, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. W. F. Broxterman, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,744.58. E. (9) $70.35.

A. Marguerite E. Bryan, 400 First Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, District No. 1, Pacific Coast District, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $40.61.

A. Philip N. Buckminster, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $155.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. College of American Pathologists, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $227.44.

A. J. J. Burke, Jr., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont. 59701.
E. (9) $233.25.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,011.

A. Paul M. Butler, Jr., 53 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. Citicorp Leasing International, Inc., 399 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $375.14.

A. Paul M. Butler, Jr., 53 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. Schlumberger Ltd., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $1,158.72.

A. Paul M. Butler, Jr., 53 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. White, Weld & Co. Inc., One Liberty Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10006.
E. (9) $205.80.

A. Norval E. Carey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $375.

A. Charles R. Carlisle, Suite 903, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lead-Zinc Producers Committee.
D. (6) $2,115. E. (9) $2,702.02.

A. James Cassese, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., 400 World Center Building, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $1,513.32.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Dental Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $57.50 E. (9) $6.13.

A. Joan Claybrook, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Congress Watch, Room 305, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Coalition Against Strip Mining, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,583.12.

A. Carl A. S. Coan, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,125. E. (9) 889.80.

A. Colson & Shapiro, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American International Reinsurance Co., Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Colson & Shapiro, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for the Martin Report, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $301.32.

A. Colson & Shapiro, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Vance, Sanders & Co., Boston, Mass.; Federated Investors, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Fidelity Management & Research Co., Boston, Mass.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $250.

A. Consulting Engineers Council/US, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,840. E (9) $6,450.

A. Charles F. Cook, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,075.

A. Harry N. Cook, Suite 200, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The National Waterways Conference, Inc.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y. 14830.
D. (6) $200.

A. Council of AFL–CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. John A. Couture, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,687.50. E(9)$278.18.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 17 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $6,311.82. E. (9) $675.19.

A. William E. Cumberland, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mortgage Banks Association of America, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $538. E. (9) $2,122.

A. David H. Dabney, 724 14th Street, NW., No. 338, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mass Participation Lobbyists Association, 724 14th Street NW., No. 338, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. William Kay Daines, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $70.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $226.99.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Japan Lumber Importers Association, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $105.51.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Office Machine Dealers Association, 2510 Dempster Street, Des Plaines, Ill. 60016.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $106.07.

A. Richard C. Darling, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $640. E. (9) $552.32.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Opticians Association of America, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Air Transport Association, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Plaintiffs Trial Attorneys for Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Inc., 910 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United States Brewers Association, Inc., 1750 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $15,000.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Dealer Bank Association, P.O. Box 479, Wall Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. George W. Della III, 1115 Maryland National Bank Building, 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md. 21202.
B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $193.

A. Steven P. Doehler, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,582.50.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) $1,475. E. (9) $100.

A. Hugh G. Duffy, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Consumer Center for Legal Services, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. Bruce Dunton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) $3,285. E. (9) $100.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,175.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1.18. E. (9) $36.94.

A. Charles Ehrhart, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $132.18.

A. Janice Eichhorn, 512A Sixth Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Self-Determination for D.C., 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $40.70.

A. Frank Ellis Associates, Suite 400, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $219.51.

A. D. A. Ellsworth, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill., 60018.
D. (6) $5,790. E. (9) $1,803.54.

A. Roy Elson, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $551.25.

A. Glenn R. Erickson, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $250.

A. Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Penelope S. Farthing, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $175.

A. Edward R. Fellows, Jr., 1200 17th Street, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Fensterwald & Ohlhausen, 910 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,695.23.

A. Francis C. Fini, 2020 Brooks Drive, Apt. 618, Suitland, Md. 20031.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, 6101 28th Avenue SE., Marlow Heights, Md. 20031.

A. Firearms Lobby of America, 325 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $6,646.95.

A. Ronald C. Frankis, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,279.32. E. (9) $110.85.

A. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $7,600. E. (9) $7,600.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Institute for Government Assisted Housing, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $900.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Frosh, Lane & Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Section 23 Leased Housing Association, Suite 707, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $450.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Council of Independent Laboratories, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Council of Professional Services Firms in Free Enterprise, 1100 Glendon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $500.

A. Edward A. Garmatz, 2210 Lake Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21213.
B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

A. Thomas R. Garrett, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Leo J. Gehrig, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill 60611.
D. (6) $1,722.82. E. (9) $397.10.

A. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. George W. Gephart, Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.
B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

A. Louis Gerber, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,740.63.

A. Jack Golodner, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Jack Golodner, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Council of AFL–CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.
A. Graphic Arts International Union, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,527. E. (9) $1,714.

A. Jerome R. Gulan, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. James M. Hacking, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $89.93.

A. Hubert D. Hagen, Suite 1800, 500 North Broadway, St. Louis, Mo. 63102.
B. Arch Mineral Corp., Suite 1800, 500 North Broadway, St. Louis, Mo. 63102.
D. (6) $880. E. (9) $1,408.52.

A. William E. Hardman, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.
B. National Tool, Die and Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

A. Donald L. Harlow, 310 Riley Street, Falls Church, Va. 22046.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 6101 28th Avenue SE., Marlow Heights, Md. 20031.

A. Richard A. Henneges, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 135 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $108.72.

A. Saunders C. Hillyer, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Cordova District Fisheries Union, Box 399, Cordova, Alaska 99574.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Thomas W. Holland, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $923.12. E. (9) $91.60.

A. Douglass C. Horstman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Northern Textile Association, Maytag Co.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $125.

A. Valerie C. Howard, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $100.

A. Peter W. Hughes, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $103.77.

A. Gerald W. Hyland, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,152.31. E. (9) $83.44.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Institute for Government Assisted Housing, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. Raymond M. Jacobson, 1819 H Street NW., No. 550, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1750 Old Meadow Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $975.

A. Janice C. Johnson, 1611 North Kent Street, Rosslyn Plaza, Suite 803–A, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 1611 North Kent Street, Suite 803–A, Rosslyn Plaza, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $120.

A. Ardon B. Judd, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., 1100 Connecticut Avenue.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $11.50.

A. Milton M. Kaufmann.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,260.

A. James J. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $5,294.40. E. (9) $2,071.66.

A. Kennedy & Leighton, 888 17th Street, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Gibson Kingren, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $564.75.

A. Peter M. Kirby, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $590.60.

A. Kirkland, Ellis & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7.25.

A. Lawrence E. Kreider, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015, 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Laurence F. Lane, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $340.62.

A. William Lazarus, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $70.

A. Charles W. Lee, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Room 211, Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $25.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 2401 Crow Canyon Road, San Ramon, Calif.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $21,796.57. E. (9) $14,172.96.

A. Zel E. Lipsen, Suite 1100, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Edgar Lockwood, 1800 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. Patrick Logue, 1030 15th Street NW., No. 408, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.
D. (6) $3,712.62.

A. Clarence T. Lundquist, 4822 Tilden Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Menswear Retails of America, Room 390, National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $600.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, Eleventh and L Building, Saramento, Calif. 95814.
E. (9) $1,465.17.

A. Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Suite 601, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $8.40.

A. Elizabeth Mallory, Box 718, Union Station, Endicott, N.Y. 13760.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $941.04.

A. Ben J. Man, 400 First Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Marine Engineers' District No. 1, Pacific Coast District, Beneficial Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $1,638. E. (9) $215.24.

A. Dallace E. Marable.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $750.

A. Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, District No. 1, Pacific Coast District, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004
E. (9) $4,855.38.

A. Massachusetts Lawyers' Vietnam Committee, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $585.

A. Albert E. May, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $95. E. (9) $16.62.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1636 Champa Street, Denver, Colo. 80201.
D. (6) $2,035. E. (9) $227.50.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Artists Corp., 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $725.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Retired & Veteran Railway Employees, Inc., P.O. Box 6069, Kansas City, Kans. 66106.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. Stephen J. McKenna, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. C. Thomas Bendorf, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006
D. (6) $1,500.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $255.02.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $120.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $240.99.

A. Clinton R. Miller, 121 Second Street NE., Suite 5, Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 211 West Colorado Boulevard, Monrovia, Calif.
D. (6) $4,325. E. (9) $70.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Maytag Co., Northern Textile Association, National Parking Association, Hormel Co.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $250.

A. Lester F. Miller, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $354. E. (9) $7.

A. John G. Mohay, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $350.01.

A. A. S. Mike Monroney, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Osage Tribal Council, Pawhuska, Okla. 74056.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The American Humane Association, P.O. Box 1266, Denver, Colo. 80201.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John Morgan, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $621.24.

A. John J. Motley.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 1921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $275.

A. Richard E. Murphy, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Service Employees International Union, AFL–CIO, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., 1460 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $150.33.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Industrial Parks, 1601 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $212.50.

A. George E. Myers, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $971.57. E. (9) $139.35.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $692.67. E. (9) $1,182.94.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $14,854.93. E. (9) $15,771.32.

A. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $35,352.56. E. (9) $35,778.68.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $30.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boulevards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $19,932.04.

A. National Association of School Bus Contract Operators, 4616 Lawn Court, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) $2,427.11.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $941.04.

A. National Consumer Center for Legal Services, 1750 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $3,400. E. (9) $1,200.

A. National Convocation of Lawyers to End the War, 18 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $540.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,814.13 E. (9) $2,196.43.

A. National League of Insured Savings Association's, 1200 17th Street, NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $171,765.28 E. (9) $440.02.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68107.
D. (6) $8,238.91. E. (9) $8,238.91.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $825.

A. National Rural Housing Coalition, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,465.82. E. (9) $3,425.55.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,330. E. (9) $4,827.

A. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $12,014.69 E. (9) $14,037.08.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,182.97. E. (9) $7,025.38.

A. Alexander W. Neale, Jr., 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Conference of State Bank Supervisors, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,395. E. (9) $18.85.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $227.20.

A. W. Brice O'Brien, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $825.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Suite 2900, IDS Tower, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $201.51.

A. Claude E. Olmstead, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $354. E. (9) $12.

A. Layton Olson, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $125.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $58.75.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,475.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa. 19035.
B. Campbell Soup Company, Campbell Place, Camden, N.J. 08101.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.
B. Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control & Conservation Association, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

A. Carol Ames Parker, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Alaska Federation of Natives, 1689 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.
D. (6) $500.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 707, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, Suite 707, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Toyota Motor Sales, J.S.A., Inc., 2055 West 190th Street, Torrance, Calif. 90504.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,942.36.

A. Political Action Committee for Engineers and Scientists, Suite 1100, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. William I. Powell, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Wahington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $975.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Rial M. Rainwater, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $354. E. (9) $10.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., P.O. Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Department of Tourism, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666.

A. William W. Rayner, 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Macmillan, Inc., 1701 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $8.40.

A. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., One East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $350,150.67. E. (9) $33,080.92.

A. John T. Regitts, Jr., Rural Delivery No. 2 Boonton Avenue, Boonton, N.J. 07005.

A. William L. Reynolds, 1200 17th Street, NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $60.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.
B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.

A. John Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $703.13. E. (9) $54.82.

A. Kenneth Roberson, 2 Dubonnet Road, Valley Stream, N.Y. 11581.
B. Meat Importers Council of America, Inc., 708 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $80. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,437.50. E. (9) $134.41.

A. Ann M. Roosevelt, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Christine Root, 2332 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. The Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $600.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Iron and Steel Institute, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $468.72.

A. Jerome D. Schaller, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., 3M Center, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.
E. (9) $2,105.58.

A. Valerie Schulte, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,150.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. The Section 23 Leased Housing Association, Suite 707, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $450.

A. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich. 48207.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz. 85364; Emma (Adams) Giambald, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz. 85364; George Hallingby, 4104 Chestnut Drive East, Forest Hills, Holiday, Fla. 33589; *et al.*
E. (9) $148.

A. Self-Determination for D.C., 2030 M Street NW., (3d floor), Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,742.75. E. (6) $5,112.47.

A. Leo Seybold, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $1,479. E. (9) $195.40.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,175.

A. Norman R. Sherlock, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $865. E. (9) $635.24.

A. A. Z. Shows, Suite 904, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Watergate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $3,193. E. (9) $5,197.39.

A. Talmage E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $521.74.

A. Julian H. Singman, 724 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Longshoremen's Association, AFL–CIO, 17 Battery Place, Suite 1530, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Hall Sisson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $2,795.32.

A. Jonathan W. Sloat, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Arthur V. Smyth, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash. 98401.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, One East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev. 89501.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, One East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev. 89501.
E. (9) $451.42.

A. Shelby E. Southard, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $725.

A. William C. Spence, P.O. Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Columbia Gulf Transmission Co., P.O. Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $266. E. (9) $234.84.

A. Larry N. Spiller, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Consulting Engineers Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $50.

A. Lynn Stalbaum, 400 World Center Building, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., Room 400, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,102.50. E. (9) $106.96.

A. J. Gilbert Stallings, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William M. Stephens, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $55.

A. Edward W. Stimpson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1215, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Footwear Group, American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Japan Iron & Steel Exporters' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $575.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Credit Co., P.O. Box 4081, Atlanta, Ga. 30302.
E. (9) $35.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 128 C Street NE., Suite 61, Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. National Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John P. Tracey.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $50.

A. J. P. Trainor, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $651.48.

A. W. M. Trevarrow, 601 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich. 48232.
D. (6) $5,025.18. E. (9) $128.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94108.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $235.59.

A. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,747.21. E. (9) $1,747.21.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 916 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
E. (9) $2,956.01.

A. Bruce E. Vogelsinger, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Consulting Engineers Council/US, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $50.

A. Wald, Harkrader & Ross, 1320 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

A. DeMelt E. Walker, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $864.04. E. (9) $44.

A. James A. Warren, 5500 Friendship Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. REA Express, Inc., 219 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $75.

A. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,161.08. E. (9) $5,219.31.

A. Washington Research Project, Action Council, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
E. (9) $4,661.72.

A. Clyde M. Webber, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $12,908.70. E. (9) $1,612.71.

A. Harry H. Westbay III, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 805, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. St. Regis Paper Co., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $150.

A. Edwin M. Wheeler, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Fertilizer Institute, 1015 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $25.

A. Robert Y. Wheeler, Box 185, Tilden, Tex., 78072.
B. Ernest G. Herman, 9538 Brighton Way, Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210.

A. Thomas E. Wheeler, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $48. E. (9) $280.

A. Leonard M. Wickliffe, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
D. (6) $3,126. E. (9) $7,400.84.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $129.35.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $743.09.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bonneville International Corp., 136 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $64.70.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
E. (9) $62.65.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. College Placement Council, Inc., 65 East Elizabeth Street, Bethlehem, Pa.
E. (9) $6.80.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $249.35.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Estate of Albert W. Small, c/o Mrs. Albert W. Small, 5803 Green Tree Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. (9) $0.70.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Hoopa Valley Tribe, P.O. Box 817, Hoopa, Calif.
E. (9) $133.56.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.S. 20006.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $265.26.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, New Town, N. Dak.
E. (9) $189.19.

A. Harry D. Williams, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 204–05, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ashland Oil, Inc., P.O. Box 391, Ashland, Ky. 41101.
D. (6) $250.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17 Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Bankers Association of Puerto Rico, c/o Wender, Murase & White, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., P.O. Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.
E. (9) $400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102.
E. (9) $400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council for Health Care Services, 407 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ward Industries, Inc., P.O. Box 849, Conway, Ark. 72032.
E. (9) $400.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Dealer Bank Association, P.O. Box 479, Wall Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Kenneth Wollack, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $750.

A. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1213 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.
D. (6) $5,129.74. E. (9) $9,304.55.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $5,343.75. E. (9) $874.60.

A. V. T. Worthington, 1500 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va 22207.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, Box 7116, Arlington, Va., 22207.

A. John L. Zorack, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $1,415. E. (9) $475.55.

SENATE—*Wednesday, August 1, 1973*

The Senate met at 10 a.m., and was called to order by Hon. FRANK E. MOSS, a Senator from the State of Utah.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, whose word declares "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 14: 34) be gracious and merciful to us in this time of testing. Keep us as a nation under Thy providence knowing also that we are under Thy judgment. Make us to remember that the ways of the Lord are true and righteous altogether and with what judgment we judge we shall be judged. Strengthen us here that we may walk in the way of Thy statutes and fulfill the mission which in Thy providence has been given to us.

We pray in His name who came not to destroy but to fulfill the law. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. FRANK E. Moss, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MOSS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 31, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with New Reports.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with New Reports, will be stated.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.