Reached in Kifissia, Greece, by telephone, Metaxa, a Greek citizen, refused to answer questions about why he contributed to the American political campaign.

"Send me a letter on official stationery and I will ask my lawyer what I can answer you," said Metaxa.

The letter was sent on Oct. 4, but no answer has been received.

Though it is not presently known whether Pappas brought foreign contributions to the CRP from abroad, he made seven round trips by plane between April 27 and Dec. 13, 1972, from Athens to Washington on CRP business. In addition, Pappas was in Paris and Switzerland on CRP business only a week before the 1972 election in America.

Hart believes that political contributions from foreign sources should be prohibited by law.

"I tend to think they should (because) the test of a candidate's viability to run ought to rest on support from domestic sources alone," he said.

From information provided him by The News, Hart has posed a series of questions to be explored by Acting Atty. Gen. Robert Bork and by Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats of the GAO.

Staats is overall director of the GAO's watchdog Office of Federal Elections.

After advising Bork and Staats about the defense contract to Vardinoyiannis, Hart asked them to recommend "what changes in law would be required, if any, to prohibit such contributions (to American political campaigns from foreign sources) in the future?"

Specifically, Hart asked why Section 611 of the U.S. Criminal Code does not already cover cases such as the one involving Vardinoyiannis.

That's the section prohibiting contractors with the federal government from contributing to federal political campaigns. The penalty is a maximum of five years in prison or a fine of $5,000, or both.

Section 601 also makes it illegal to knowingly solicit contributions from contractors, which could bear directly on fund-raisers such as Papas, if he solicited such funds for the CRP.

Hart said that depending on the answers he gets from the Justice Department and GAO, he might pass on the information to newly-appointed Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski and to the Senate Watergate Committee.

Concerned that large loopholes in the law could allow international businesses to secretly make illegal corporate donations through foreign sources to U.S. political candidates, Hart also said he might refer the matter for study to the Senate subcommittee on multinational corporations.

ORGANIZED LABOR LAUNCHES DRIVE FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, once again, as has occurred so often in our history, the Nation's workers are providing the cutting edge of our national conscience. Recognizing that the President has in large measure forfeited his right to national leadership, the AFL–CIO has launched a nationwide campaign for the impeachment of President Nixon. As Members of the body to which this campaign will be addressed in the days and weeks ahead, we all should carefully consider the reasons which underlie this call by our Nation's largest labor union body. I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of my colleagues, the AFL–CIO position on why Richard M. Nixon must be impeached—now:

WHY RICHARD M. NIXON MUST BE IMPEACHED—NOW

On October 22, the AFL–CIO at its convention unanimously adopted a resoultion calling for the resignation of President Richard M. Nixon.

The resolution said that Mr. Nixon's resignation was necessary for the restoration of our badly battered democratic institutions.

If Mr. Nixon does not resign, the resolution said, "we call upon the House of Representatives forthwith to initiate impeachment proceedings against him."

Since then, Mr. Nixon has announced that he does not intend to resign.

The AFL–CIO therefore calls for his immediate impeachment.

As we said in the convention resolution, "Impeachment is not a prospect we contemplate with pleasure. No decent American can derive any partisan satisfaction whatever from the misfortune of his nation. And surely the American labor movement is not interested in aiding any reckless attacks on the Presidency. We are especially concerned about the office of the Presidency in these times of grave danger on the international front.

"But the cause of peace and freedom in the world cannot survive a discredited Presidency. Our allies' best hope—mankind's best hope—lies in the strength of our democratic institutions.

"Justice must be done, the risks of not doing it being more than democracy can safely bear."

Richard M. Nixon must be impeached—now—because:

He has caused an erosion of public confidence in our democratic system of government.

He instituted in the name of national security a plan which violated civil liberties through domestic political surveillance, espionage, wiretapping, burglary, eavesdropping, opening of mail, and military spying on civilians.

He created a special and personal secret police, answerable only to the White House, to operate totally outside the constraints of law.

He and his subordinates interfered with the freedom of the press—which our Constitution guarantees—by means of wiretaps, FBI investigations, and threats of punitive action.

He secretly recorded conversations in his office without advising participants in those conversations that they were being recorded. He then sought to deny the evidence on those tapes to the courts.

He has violated the Constitution of the United States and his sworn obligation to see that the laws "be faithfully executed."

He has used the office of the Presidency to attempt to put himself above the law.

He has consistently lied to the American people.

He has, by his actions and through the actions of his subordinates—for which he has accepted responsibility—brought dishonor on the office of the Presidency.

He has repeatedly promised the American people full revelation of the facts in the Watergate affair—and he has repeatedly sought to keep those facts from the public, from the courts, from the Congress, and from the special prosecutor.

He has used the office of the Presidency for personal enrichment.

He secretly curtailed the FBI investigation of the Watergate break-in.

He involved the CIA in the coverup of the Watergate affair.

He sought to suppress—and for a time did suppress—the facts of the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist from the judge in the Ellsberg trial.

He interfered with the administration of justice by offering this judge the directorship of the FBI.

He intervened in the antitrust suit against International Telephone and Telegraph to impose a settlement agreeable to the corporation, after which the corporation agreed to underwrite $400,000 of the cost of the 1972 Republican National Convention.

He and his subordinates sought to use the power of the White House, the Justice Department, the Internal Revenue Service, the Securities and Exchange Commission and other government agencies to punish a list of political enemies.

Officials of his campaign committee and his personal attorney extorted illegal campaign contributions from corporations which were dependent on maintaining the good will of the government.

Officials of his campaign committee received large campaign contributions from the dairy industry, which was seeking and later received lucrative dairy price support increases and dairy import concessions.

Until Richard Nixon is removed from office, we will not be able to get Watergate behind us. We will not be able to proceed with sober and constructive solutions to our economic and social problems at home or to the dangers of war in the world.

The first step in the impeachment process already has been taken: resolutions calling for the impeachment of the President have been introduced in the House of Representatives and referred to the House Judiciary Committee. The next step is for the committee to investigate. If it recommends impeachment, the committee sends to the House floor a resolution and articles of impeachment which specify the charges against the President.

If the House by majority vote approves the articles of impeachment, they are sent to the Senate for trial. If two-thirds of the Senate, with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding, find the President guilty of any of the charges, he is removed from office.

What is now necessary is that the House of Representatives and the House Judiciary Committee be made aware of the need for urgency in voting the impeachment of the President. Toward this end, each union member should now write his Congressman AND Chairman Peter Rodino of the House Judiciary Committee—at the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515—and urge their support of impeachment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, November 12, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

With righteousness shall the Lord judge the world and the people with equity.—Psalms 98:9.

Eternal Father of our spirits, we thank Thee for the refreshment of sleep and the restoration of soul our rest provides

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

that with renewed strength we may meet the challenging tasks of this new day.

Amid all the labors of these hours keep our hearts with Thee as we act on behalf of our beloved land facing national and international problems which tax our spirits to the utmost. Give to us and to all America the realization that whatever the future holds of marvel or surprise, goodness and truth, justice and mercy abide and that in Thee and in Thee alone is the strength of our Nation and the future of our world.

During these weeks which try men's souls save us from fear, deliver us from futility and make us worthy of these times which cry aloud for wisdom, integrity, and character.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2641. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the district court of the United States of certain civil actions brought by the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, and for other purposes; and

S. 2645. An act to amend Public Law 93-60 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in order to get this place warmed up, 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. 573]

Alexander	Culver	Jarman
Andrews, N.C.	Davis, Ga.	Jones, N.C.
Archer	Davis, Wis.	Jones, Tenn.
Ashley	de la Garza	Jordan
Baker	Dellenback	Karth
Beard	Dellums	Keating
Bevill	Downing	Kluczynski
Biaggi	Dulski	Lehman
Blackburn	Flood	Lent
Blatnik	Flynt	Macdonald
Bolling	Fuqua	Mathias, Calif.
Brooks	Gray	Matsunaga
Buchanan	Green, Oreg.	McCormack
Burke, Calif.	Griffiths	McEwen
Chappell	Hammer-schmidt	McKay
Chisholm	Hanley	Mills, Ark.
Clancy	Hanna	Minshall, Ohio
Clark	Hays	Mitchell, Md.
Clausen, Don H.	Heinz	Moakley
Conte	Hosmer	Mosher
Conyers	Huber	Murphy, N.Y.
Crane	Hudnut	Nix
Patman	Ruth	O'Hara
Podell	Ryan	Waldie
Powell, Ohio	Slack	Walsh
Price, Tex.	St Germain	Whitten
Rangel	Staggers	Williams
Reid	Stephens	Wolff
Roberts	Stokes	Wright
Rodino	Symington	Young, Ill.
Roncallo, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.	Young, S.C.
Rosenthal	Thornton	Young, Tex.
Rostenkowski	Ullman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 335 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1081, AMENDING SECTION 28 OF THE MINERAL LEASING ACT OF 1920, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1081) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way across Federal lands where the use of such rights-of-way is in the public interest and the applicant for the right-of-way demonstrates the financial and technical capability to use the right-of-way in a manner which will protect the environment, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it my understanding that Members will be protected if there is a motion to recommit the conference report pending the waiving of the reading of the report?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise that that comes after the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of November 7, 1973.)

Mr. MELCHER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the joint statement contains many detailed comments and explanations about specific provisions of the bill recommended by the conferees. I hope the Members have read the joint statement carefully.

The conference report was signed by all of the conferees from both the House and the Senate and represents many hours of work and reflects a genuine effort to compromise differences without sacrificing basic provisions in both the Senate bill and the House amendment. We wanted a strong bill, and I believe we have it.

With respect to the general law governing oil and gas rights-of-way, all of the statutory guidelines in the House amendment were retained and some additional guidelines from the Senate bill were added.

With respect to the trans-Alaska pipeline, the provisions of the House amendment and the Senate bill were very similar and a merger of the two was easy.

With respect to the provisions of the Senate bill that do not relate directly to oil and gas pipelines, the most controversial ones involve stripper wells, the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to enforce its own orders directly rather than through the Attorney General, and the authority of the independent regulatory agencies to collect the information they need in order to carry out their regulatory functions without hindrance from the Office of Management and Budget.

Under the conference report the Comptroller General will review requests for information to prevent duplication but will have no authority to determine whether the agency needs information.

Mr. Speaker, there is a question today that confronts the House as to whether or not we want to move the trans-Alaska pipeline bill to the President's desk. If there is a motion to recommit that would interfere with that, it is interfering with solving the problem of getting the bill finally on the President's desk.

There will be arguments made, I suppose, that the House conferees agreeing to the Senate language dealing with the Federal Trade Commission and the provision limiting the authority of the Office of Management and Budget are somehow not compatible with this bill. These are relevant matters to assist regulatory agencies to carry out their duties.

I would say to the House that the larger issue is to move the bill so that we can have a start on the construction of the pipeline and get moving on tapping the Alaskan vast crude oil supplies.

I think that is the issue facing the House today, and I urge all of the Members of the House to vote for the conference report as it is.

The campaign launched by the National Chamber of Commerce and industrial giants against the FTC provision in attempts to convince small business that they would be better served by the deletion of the FTC provision in this bill would be parallel if Goliath had been able to talk David into using a small pebble in a sling or better yet had conned David into throwing away his sling and meeting in hand-to-hand combat. The FTC provision would broaden the authority of the Commission to investigate conglomerate business and would add muscle to their traditional role of eliminating unfair competitive prac-

tices that stifle, strangle or eliminate small business operations.

The Office of Management and Budget's screening of questionnaires by regulatory agencies has delayed in many instances the regulatory agencies' ability to gather the information that they seek. These questionnaires in general are directed at big businesses and do not involve middle or small-sized businesses. Certainly the overwhelming majority of small businesses across the country are not involved in the questionnaires that are sent out by the regulatory agencies.

Very few of the requests to the Office of Management and Budget for clearance of questionnaires come from the independent regulatory commissions. Most of the clearance requests come from agencies of the executive branch. Under the provisions of S. 1081, OMB would continue its control over those executive branch agency questionnaires.

Senator METCALF has made available to me the data just provided him by the regulatory commissions on their experience with OMB questionnaire clearance. It shows the following:

REGULATORY REQUESTS FOR OMB CLEARANCE OF QUESTIONNAIRES PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REPORTS ACT

Agency	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969
(1) CAB (as of Oct. 3, 1973)	11	19	18	7	17
(2) FCC (as of Nov. 1, 1973)	10	12	18	14	17
(3) FPC (as of Oct. 29, 1973)	4	11	6	5	1
(4) FMC (as of Oct. 30, 1973)	1	1	0	1	0
(5) FTC (as of Sept. 13, 1973)	24	40	19	27	17
(6) ICC (as of Oct. 4, 1973)	2	6	5	3	3
(7) SEC (as of Oct. 4, 1973)	1	5	7	15	52
Total	53	94	73	72	107

Mr. Speaker, I shall elaborate briefly on the responses of the agencies.

CAB—None of its questionnaires were modified, delayed, or disapproved during any of these 5 years.

FCC—Fifteen of its questionnaires were modified during the 5 years. Nine of the 15 dealt with equal employment opportunity and employment. Three dealt with ownership of broadcast companies and CATV systems.

FMC—None of its four requests, made over a 5-year period, were disapproved or changed.

FPC—None of its questionnaires were disapproved outright. Several, reported the FPC, were suspended, and others were returned to the FPC after OMB consulted with industry advisers and other respondents. Then FPC revised them, after which they were usually approved by OMB. The figures listed above for FPC do not include routine extension of previously approved reporting forms.

ICC—OMB held up clearance of one of its forms, dealing with freight car ownership. The Association of American Railroads proposed changes which were accepted by the ICC and OMB.

SEC—The Securities and Exchange Commission reported only minor modifications to forms it proposed.

FTC—During the 5-year period 29 FTC forms were modified. Many of the modified questionnaires dealt with mergers, the enemy industry, questionable advertising, financial reporting of large companies, and the concentration of economic power. Those are big business matters, areas in which large companies used their influence with OMB's advisory committees to keep agencies from asking legitimate questions which the large companies do not want to answer. The issue is not the burden on small business—relatively few questions are asked of small businesses by the independent regulatory commissions. The issue is—shall we free the independent regulatory commissions from the control of OMB and its cozy corporate colleagues.

Although the hearings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not cover these subjects of the FTC, OMB, and stripper wells in detail, the need for these provisions is well documented in our committee files and in voluminous correspondence from all sectors of the public. Moreover, I have been in touch with the standing committees of the House that would normally handle these subjects, and I believe there is a general consensus that the modified Senate provisions recommended by the conferees are appropriate for inclusion in S. 1081. These provisions are an important part of the package compromise that the conference committee regarded as necessary in order to complete action on the pipeline bill.

While these provisions could have been left for consideration by separate bills, the conferees regarded them as essential to the prompt enactment of a trans-Alaska pipeline bill, which is sorely needed, and to a general revision of the oil and gas pipeline legislation. Moreover, most of the conferees regarded these provisions as fully justified on their merits.

The Federal Trade Commission provision has been questioned because the authority of the Commission to represent itself in court will take away from the Attorney General the right to prevent the Commission from harassing the business community by unnecessary and unwarranted litigation and the issuance of subpenas for records. The short answer to that objection is that Congress has established the Federal Trade Commission as an independent regulatory agency to investigate and enforce the laws under its jurisdiction, and that the Attorney General is interfering with the Commission's legitimate activities. Congress never intended that the Attorney General would supervise the Commission and in effect veto its investigative and law enforcement activities. If the Commission should abuse its authority, corrective action should be taken by Congress, and not by the Attorney General.

Another answer to this objection is that there is no basis for a finding or assumption that the Federal Trade Commission will harass the business community. Congress expects the Commission to exercise its statutory authority in a responsible manner, and no evidence to the contrary has been offered. The charge is unsubstantiated speculation.

One of the objections to the amendment to the Federal Reporting Services Act is that the Office of Management and Budget needs the authority to control the information gathering activities of the independent regulatory agencies in order to protect the business community from unreasonable requests and unreasonable expense.

A short answer to that objection is that Congress requires regulatory agencies to act responsibly in the public interest without unduly burdening business, but Congress also expects the regulatory agencies to collect the information they need in order to carry out their statutory responsibilities. Congress did not expect the Office of Management and Budget to be an omniscient authority to decide what the agencies need. Again, any abuse of discretion by the agencies should be corrected by Congress rather than by a superexecutive in the executive branch.

I would like to address briefly the question of the relevance of sections 408 and 409 to the Alaskan pipeline measure. These provisions are in every way as relevant to a rational overall energy policy as the pipeline measure itself.

Within the past 6 to 8 months every Member of this Congress has received desperate pleas from the small independent businessman at every level of the petroleum industry. This past summer hundreds of independent gasoline marketers perished as a result of the petroleum shortage. This was a truly tragic event because the majority of these marketers up to the time of the shortage were efficient and profitable firms. And more important to all of us consumers, they were a consistent source of price competition in an industry that has a chronic tendency to behave like a cartel.

This winter hundreds of independent heating oil distributors may face the same fate. The demise of any significant number of these firms could have quite drastic consequences, since major oil companies do not have the present capability to take over their distribution functions.

In these circumstances the Alaskan pipeline bill is a welcome measure. It will, at least to some extent, alleviate the oil shortage. But it will not prevent the further cartelization of the petroleum industry. It will not prevent the shortage from being manipulated in order to drive out the independent refiners and marketers.

Of course, there are some who will say that these concerns for competition are outdated or at best irrelevant in times of drastic shortage. But this is nonsense. All that is necessary is to recall the classic objections to monopoly and monopolistic practices. They reduce output; they encourage inefficiency, and they raise prices. These, of course, are matters of even greater concern in times of extreme shortage. The shortage only makes monopoly and monopolistic practices all the more intolerable.

Competition can only be maintained by vigorous, informed, and intelligent application of the antitrust laws. And the agency which has developed the greatest expertise and shown consistent concern for competition in the energy area is the Federal Trade Commission. This was just recognized by this Congress when it appropriated a million dollars to enable the FTC to conduct a major study of the energy industry.

It is, therefore, wholly proper that, as part of our efforts to deal with the en-

ergy problem, we remove the unnecessary procedural roadblocks that hamper the FTC in acting in a quick and effective manner. And we must not only remove the roadblocks to quick adjudication of antitrust violations but also those which prevent the quick handling of the investigative tasks assigned by the Congress.

The disaster that befell the independent gasoline marketers this past spring is dramatic of why the FTC needs additional powers to enable it to act quickly. In fact, it was this event that gave a new sense of urgency to the effort to give the Commission the power to seek injunctions. As the gasoline shortage forced hundreds of independent refiners and marketers to close their doors or drastically curtail their business, the profits, prices, and market shares of the major oil companies soared.

Even the most blatant evidence that the shortage had been manipulated by the majors would have done the independents little good. There was simply no way that the Commission could have acted in time. The fact that the Commission can take an action that may in number of years stop the anticompetitive practices is small consolation to the man whose business is being destroyed today. For many small businessmen in the petroleum industry, it is already too late. But the lesson should not be repeated.

The FTC provision could very well be the best protection that we could assure small business people to avoid unfair competitive practices from conglomerate interests. The trend of conglomerates swallowing smaller businesses is by itself a long range policy that could eliminate competition in many areas and in many industries and businesses.

FTC officials have made comments on this subject.

The Federal Trade Commision has to exercise it powers as a friend of the small businessman.

ANTITRUST—GENERAL

Over the years the Federal Trade Commission has been particularly concerned with the welfare of the small businessman. Many of the Commission's specific statutory enforcement missions have as a major objective the protection and maintenance of a competitive climate in which opportunities for small businessmen to compete are preserved and fostered. The Commission has acted on behalf of the small businessman in a number of areas:

The Commission has challenged mergers which would have resulted in high industry concentration and high barriers to entry which would have made it more difficult for smaller competitors to compete in particular markets. The Commission has always been concerned about small independent businessmen being gobbled up by the large and dominant firms in a particular industry.

Similarly, in the area of industry concentration, the Commission also has been concerned lest one firm or a small number of firms become so large as to achieve a dominant share of a particular market through predatory or anticompetitive business practices, to the detriment of small independent businesses who must compete with them.

Finally, the Commission is on the lookout for predatory and anticompetitive practices which violate the specific statutes enforced by the Commission. For example, in the franchising area the Commission has acted against franchisors who coerced their franchisees—who often are small independent businessmen—to purchase unwanted products as a condition of keeping their franchise The Commission also has proceeded prices or allowances not available to their suppliers to grant them discriminatory prices or allowances not available to their smaller competitors. Such abusive actions are a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act and also of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Robinson-Patman Act was enacted to provide equality of business opportunity for all businesses, small and large, and to protect small, independent businesses from the predatory activities of large buyers. The Supreme Court has noted:

> The Robinson-Patman Act was enacted . . . to curb and prohibit all devices by which large buyers gained discriminatory preferences over smaller ones by virtue of their greater purchasing power. *F.T.C.* v. *Henry Brock & Co.*, 363 U.S. 166.

In enforcing its statutory responsibilities the Federal Trade Commission thus has been in the forefront protecting the rights of small businessmen, and the proposed amendments will enable the Commission to do this job more effectively.

ANTITRUST—SPECIFIC EXAMPLES FROM CURRENT ACTIVITIES

We need only look at a number of current complaints filed by the Commission and several recent decisions handed down by the Commission to see that current Commission activities will have a very positive impact as far as the small businessman is concerned.

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY CASE

Perhaps the most significant complaint recently filed by the Commission is against eight major integrated oil companies, Exxon Corp., et al., docket 8934. The Commission's complaint charges that the respondent companies have combined to monopolize refining and have maintained monopoly power over refining.

This case is of tremendous significance to gasoline station operators who often are independent small businessmen. The complaint alleges for example that the eight companies have followed a common course of action in refusing to sell gasoline to independent marketers. One alleged effect is that the gasoline shortage has fallen with particular severity where independent refiners and marketers are primarily located. As a result many small independent marketers have been forced to close retail outlets and significantly curtail operations.

If the Commission's case is successful one expected effect is that entry barriers will be lowered and it will be easier for small independent marketers to compete with the large integrated oil companies.

TBA CASES

Another Commission action designed to benefit gasoline station operators is its case against Phillips Petroleum. The Commission's complaint in this matter alleges that Phillips' lease agreements with its dealers allow Phillips to arbitrarily cancel dealers on 10 days written notice. This cancellation provision enables the company to coerce its dealers to purchase Phillips' tires, batteries, and accessories—TBA—and to require stated minimum gasoline purchases. As a result, the complaint alleges that Phillips' dealers are coerced into contracts depriving them of control of their business operations and their choice of suppliers. If the Commission's action is successful, dealers will be protected against arbitrary cancellations and requirements that they deal exclusively in Phillips' TBA. The Phillips case is a continuation of a long series of Commission cases in the TBA area designed to protect station operators from being coerced into purchasing unwanted lines.

FRANCHISING

Also significant are the Commission's activities in the franchising area. For example, the Commission recently ruled that the Chock Full O'Nuts Corp. illegally restrained competition by requiring its franchisees to purchase various food items from Chock Full O'Nuts. The Commission's order will give the company's franchisees greater freedom in selecting their own suppliers and controlling their own purchases. The Commission also obtained a consent order involving related restrictions on franchisees in its action against the Tastee-Freez Co. These orders can be expected to have an important impact on franchisees, who usually are small businessmen.

SHOPPING CENTER CASES

Another area of Commission activity which will benefit the small businessman is the Commission's program in the shopping center area. The Commission has proceeded against anticompetitive lease provisions which give major tenants, usually large department store chains, the right to veto other tenants. The Commission has recently received many complaints from small independent businesses who were denied access to major regional shopping centers because of such restrictive lease provisions. It is the Commission's objective to eliminate such lease provisions and benefit small competitors through selective litigation and establishing important legal precedent regarding shopping centers.

XEROX

Other Commission actions if successful also may benefit the small businessman significantly. For example, one of the purposes of the Commission's suit against Xerox for alleged monopolization of the office copier market is to lower the cost of copiers. This will benefit businesses small and large as well as consumers.

RECIPROCITY CASES

The Commission's activities in the area of reciprocity also will aid small businesses to compete with large conglomerate firms which have in the past attempted to use their purchasing leverage in one market to generate sales for products sold in other markets. Small independent firms without such purchasing power were put at an unfair disadvantage. Illustrative is an order recently obtained by the Commission

against the Southland Corp., which bans reciprocal dealing in the future. The Commission's complaint in this matter alleged that the company used the purchasing leverage of its 7-Eleven stores to obtain sales for its chemical division.

CONSUMER PROTECTION—GENERAL

Many Federal Trade Commission activities are aimed at encouraging competition by providing information in the marketplace. Whenever a large competitor, for example, the manufacturer of a major brand, attains an unfair advantage through advertising over smaller competitors, the Commission's actions to remove false and deceptive claims from that advertising, and to require comparative material information, directly aiding the small businessman.

A good example is the FTC's action in the three cases involving analgesic advertising. The complaints charge the manufacturers of Anacin, Bayer Aspirin, Bufferin, Excedrin, and Vanquish with: First, exaggerated claims of superiority; second, unfounded "mood claims"; third, misuse of scientific tests and studies; fourth, misuse of medical endorsements; and fifth, failure to disclose names of common ingredients. The FTC effort is directed at the largest companies. To the extent that FTC action alters the behavior of these large companies, smaller businessmen can more effectively function in the market.

CONSUMER PROTECTION—SPECIFIC EXAMPLES FROM CURRENT ACTIVITIES

PROPOSED RULE ON FRANCHISING

The enormous growth of franchising in the American economy can be attributed to the fact that many Americans still seek the opportunity to become self-employed small businessmen. According to the Department of Commerce in its report "Franchising in the Economy 1971–73," franchise sales of goods and services are expected to reach a record level of $156 billion in 1973 and will involve over 466,000 business establishments including over 80,000 franchisors and 385,000 franchisees. Retail franchising in 1973 is expected to account for about 30 percent of all retail sales in the United States.

Franchising is perceived as a way to attain self-employment by reducing the risk of failure frequently associated with starting a small business. The risk is reduced by the services and expertise provided by the franchisor.

It is important to note that franchisees or prospective franchisees are consumers who are in need of protection and assistance from public agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission. They are not sophisticated businessmen accustomed to dealing with complex contract matters or financial statements. Rather, they are small businessmen and businesswomen who will invest or have invested their savings and have incurred debt to purchase a franchise.

Prof. U. B. Ozanne and Shelby D. Hunt, of the University of Wisconsin, in their study entitled "The Economic Effects of Franchising," point out that the characteristics of the typical franchisee are persons of commendable energy but with limited financial resources. They can scarcely afford expensive legal or financial review of franchisor prospectuses during negotiation for the purchase of a franchise. It is this group which needs some help from agencies like the Federal Trade Commission.

While franchise ventures fail for a variety of reasons, such failures all too frequently occur because the franchisee does not have sufficient facts upon which to make a sound evaluation of the franchise prior to entering into the agreement, or because he does not fully understand the terms of the franchise agreement with its investment requirements, fees, sometimes oppressive cancellation clauses, and various other restrictions. Franchisees have come to the realization that the franchise agreement can be used by the franchisor as an instrument of abuse.

In order to put the prospective small businessman in the best position to invest and thereafter to operate successfully, the proposed rule would (1) require the franchisor to provide certain vital information which a prospective franchisee should have before him in analyzing whether a particular franchise arrangement is best for him, and (2) provide additional protection to investors, such as the provisions relating to cooling off, and the prohibition of the use of waiver of rights and defense clauses after the franchise agreement has been entered into.

BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM

Sellers of business opportunities are a significant factor in encouraging the growth of small businesses in this country. Each year millions of Americans, many of whom are socially and economically disadvantaged and many of whom are possessed of such advantages, invest in opportunities to increase their earning power. The former invest in opportunities that are, by and large, virtually worthless while the latter invest in opportunities that are of some potential worth for future earnings but which may be unduly risky. High-pressure sales techniques involving misrepresentations as to earning potential and failure to disclose kinds of risk have resulted in substantial economic loss to small businessmen.

Several cases are aimed at the relatively small segment of this industry which sells virtually worthless business opportunities to low-income victims for sums ranging from $1,000 to $5,000 and ignores all laws until it is caught. Given the "fly-by-night" character of such firms and their general lack of stability, FTC's effort is targeted to secure significant relief. That relief includes affirmative disclosure of earnings, prospective restitution, and 10-day cooling-off periods. Examples of these cases are Koscot Interplanetary, Inc., et al., which is presently in litigation and Bestline, in which the staff is seeking civil penalties for violation of a final order.

In addition, the FTC has often taken enforcement action designed to protect the honest small businessman from his less ethical competitors. For example, the Commission recently moved against a number of carpet dealers which the Commission had reason to believe were using techniques such as "bait and switch" ads and deceptive pricing claims to lure customers away from honest advertisers. To do this more systematically, a comprehensive program has been initiated under which similar operations at the local and regional levels will be subject to scrutiny and action where warranted. The Commission's regional offices have been instructed to take action as soon as possible.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to assure Members of the House that I have inquired into a rumor which has concerned some Members that the Alaska pipeline matter was being investigated by the Watergate special prosecutor.

When this rumor first reached me, I wrote Assistant Attorney General Henry Peterson whether there was any truth in it. He assured me no such inquiry was underway.

I include in the RECORD my letter of inquiry to him and his reply:

OCTOBER 26, 1973.

Hon. HENRY E. PETERSEN,
Assistant Attorney General,
U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PETERSEN: This is an inquiry whether the Justice Department knows of or is investigating reports of any impropriety connected with the proposed Alaskan pipeline. As you know, the Alaska pipeline bill has passed both the House and the Senate and has been in conference for several weeks. The conference concluded their meetings last week and we are preparing the report of the members.

I have had inquiries from reporters whether the special prosecutor or grand jury is looking into some matter in connection with the pipeline.

As Chairman of the conference I wish to be certain before we act on the report in the House that there has been no cause to believe some impropriety may have occurred in connection with the proposed pipeline or pipeline bill. If anything has been brought to the attention of the Justice Department, Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, or members of his staff, we need to know of it.

It is possible that the Conference Report will be considered in the House next Thursday. I would appreciate a reply from you prior to that time.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN MELCHER,
Chairman of the Conference Committee.

OCTOBER 26, 1973.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MELCHER: In response to your inquiry of October 26 as to whether the Department of Justice or the Special Prosecutor's Force is investigating any alleged impropriety in connection with the proposed Alaskan pipeline, this is to advise you that there is no such investigation. Indeed, to my knowledge, there has been only one complaint which on preliminary examination of the complainant was considered to be without support.

Sincerely,

HENRY PETERSEN,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the full committee (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have come here today to determine whether you want to have a pipeline in Alaska or not.

I know there has been a good bit of misinformation about what this conference report will do, but, Mr. Speaker, the need for final action on the bill is

urgent in order that the trans-Alaskan pipeline may be constructed without further delay.

Construction has been delayed for years by litigation, and our national interest now requires a clear-cut and unequivocal policy decision taken by Congress. This bill is a decision by Congress that the trans-Alaska pipeline shall be built at the earliest possible time. That decision is binding on the Federal courts and on the executive branch. Every effort has been made to forestall further litigation designed to thwart the will of the Congress.

The conference committee met many times, and it has produced a good compromise that preserves substantially all of the House amendment, which was in the nature of a substitute for the provisions of the Senate bill. A compromise, however, involves concessions by both sides, and the final product truly represents a melding of the Senate and House provisions.

The guidelines governing the grant of oil and gas pipeline rights-of-way across Federal lands spell out in statutory form policies that formerly were left to administrative determination.

The mandatory directions with respect to the trans-Alaska pipeline makes the congressional policy clear beyond any reasonable doubt.

Some of the provisions of the Senate bill that are not directly related to oil and gas pipeline rights-of-way were accepted by the conferees, with modifications, after careful examination of their merit. The most controversial of those provisions relate to the right of the Federal Trade Commission to represent itself in court—now, what is wrong with that, allowing an agency of the Government after it asks the Justice Department to take proper measures to get into court, if they do not do it, why should not that agency be able to go directly to the courts?

Plus the right of all independent regulatory agencies to collect facts they need without prior approval of the Office of Management and Budget. While these subjects could have been left for treatment in separate legislation, they were a part of the Senate bill as it came to the House, and they are a part of a carefully tailored compromise package. In my opinion, that package should be accepted. A rejection of any part of the conference report will reject the entire report, and the urgently needed pipeline legislation will be imperiled.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be approved.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) knows, I have a great confidence in his recommendations. I know that the gentleman has studied this matter very carefully, but I believe that a number of us in the House have had a considerable number of communications from our constituents in our respective States and districts who are quite concerned about the possibility of additional Federal regulations, particularly over small businesses in our areas.

Would the gentleman from Florida tell us how much additional Federal regulations would be possible for the average business under this measure as agreed upon by the conferee?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. SIKES, that in my humble opinion there will be no great impact on small business. A great deal of thought has gone into this piece of legislation. I believe the gentleman from Florida knows who is in the situation here of trying to defeat this legislation, because this may cost them some money. The American people are entitled to know, and they should be protected, and agencies of the Federal Government should have the right to go into the courts and correct these things if necessary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. If I understand the answer given by the gentleman from Florida correctly, he feels there would be additional regulatory effect only on a very few major business concerns which are directly involved in the program; is that correct?

Mr. HALEY. That is correct. They have that right now. The only thing that this is going to take away from is if the Department of Justice does not move in a reasonable time, that agency can go into the courts and assert its rights and bring forth the facts.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am afraid the gentleman is a little bit mixed up here in his answer to the gentleman. He talks about the FTC Amendment, and I believe the gentleman from Florida was addressing himself to the amendment in regard to reporting businesses which would be affected.

Mr. Speaker, every business in the United States, from the pop and mom store up to A.T. & T. and all other corporations would be affected. I am sorry to differ with the gentleman, but that is the actual fact with regard to this amendment. It would affect small business and every business in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. CRAIG HOSMER, ranking member-designate of the Committee on Interior, in support of the pending motion to recommit be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in general support of the conference report authorizing construction of the trans-Alaskan pipeline and updating our laws dealing with rights-of-way for oil and gas pipelines across Federal lands. But as much as I support the pipeline, I am unable to support it today as it has been intermixed with matter which, under these rules, would be nongermane.

I support a motion to recommit the conference report with instructions to delete the provisions extraneous to the pipeline issue. In doing so I trust and hope the other body will respond to these instructions and permit the Nation to get on with this sorely needed project promptly.

This country is in desperate need of the petroleum resources lying under Alaska's North Slope. The construction of this pipeline would provide no immediate relief for our substantial short-term energy crises. But it is a step in the right direction. It is tragic to think that, but for a small group of short-sighted people who doggedly roadblocked the pipeline, our country could already be using these much needed oil reserves. Had construction of the pipeline started in 1969 we would not now be thinking of closing schools, living in cold homes, and of unemployment resulting from lack of fuel for our factories.

The potential flow of oil from Alaska is upward of 2 million barrels per day. What does this mean in terms of the current Middle Eastern oil cutoff? In 1972, this country was importing slightly over 4 percent or 700,000 barrels per day of our domestic consumption from the Arab world. By country, this breaks down as follows:

	Barrels per day
Saudi Arabia	189,600
Iran	141,800
Libya	122,600
Algeria	92,500
United Arab Emirates	73,400
Kuwait	44,800
Bahrain	14,800
Egypt	8,400
Other Arab	12,000
Total	699,900

The figures for 1973 show that our imports from the Middle East and North Africa moved up to more than 8 percent of domestic consumption. While there is no breakdown immediately available, the U.S. Bureau of Mines estimates, for the first half of calendar year 1973, that we were filling our oil supply needs as follows:

	Percent
Domestic sources	74.3
Canada	8.9
Middle East and North Africa	8.1
Caribbean	2.1
Rest of the world	5.9
Total	100.0

There has been no need to subject this country to the oil blackmail of the Arab world. The importance of the North Slope oil seems rather elementary.

Despite the facts of this simple arithmetic there are those xenophobic few who will continue to fight construction of the trans-Alaskan oil pipeline by fair means and foul. I can understand the logic of those who want to build a pipeline to bring oil to the Midwest, but such a pipeline is further down the road. The conference has authorized and requested the President to proceed with negotiations with Canada on this matter. Further, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to determine the feasibility of a line through Canada.

What I cannot understand is the faulty logic of those who would relish the thought of winning the battle to leave the oil under the North Slope. To preserve the 7,680 acres that would be occupied by the pipeline seems an inordinate price to pay for fuel rationing, cold homes, cold schools, and blackmail by the Arab world.

I am certain we can be assured of added litigation to try to delay further the building of this much needed pipeline. We can also be assured of continual harassment as construction proceeds. We can only hope the intent of the Congress is clear in that we will direct this pipeline to be constructed and completed without further action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. In the event the intent is not clear the conference report has spelled out the way such litigation is to be handled. There is incorporated a modified version of the House-passed language expediting the litigation to the Supreme Court.

If this pipeline can be started next spring, and we, as a nation, undertake reasonable energy conservation measures we can effectively weather the current fuel shortages. But this petroleum problem is only one aspect of the much broader problem we are facing in our energy policy. Perhaps this slow first step on the trans-Alaskan oid pipeline will cause us to take the subsequent steps needed to effectively use atomic energy powerplants, oil shales, deepwater ports, and our large coal reserves. The great hue and cry to preserve the environment has helped bring us to the point where we cannot travel to enjoy what we preserve, where soon we will have to close businesses and factories for lack of fuel, where we cannot adequately heat or light our homes and schools, where we have allowed those to whom we have given aid and made wealthy bring this great Nation to the brink of major crisis.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the House my specific differences with the report of the conference. The House has never adequately considered such matters as confirmation of the Director of the Energy Policy Office (sec. 404), it has not considered it at all, the same is true as to confirmation of the head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration (sec. 405), the expansion of the authority of the Federal Trade Commission (sec. 408) or the authority it is proposed to transfer from OMB to GAO over collection of information sought by the independent Federal regulatory agencies (sec. 409). A conference report dealing with oil and gas pipeline is no place to try to enact such sweeping legislation. The provisions relating to the Federal Trade Commission and the reporting services for business information were amendments adopted on the floor of the other body and pertain to the economic, security, and welfare of the people of this great Nation. Propositions of this magnitude, which take the form of floor amendments, without full considerate and deliberate attention cannot be allowed.

If the House allows this urgently needed pipeline to be held hostage by the other body, we are, in effect, allowing the House to be blackmailed and this pipeline to be held hostage. This House passed a bill dealing with oil and gas pipeline rights-of-way and authorizing the immediate construction of an Alaskan pipeline. If we pass this conference report as it stands we will accede to this blackmail and will truly become a second-class body.

Mr. Speaker, I recall these words spoken by the great Winston Churchill:

If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, you may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

In this case victory is no easy matter, but it is a necessary matter unless we intend again and again to submit to the will and the whims of the other body like slaves.

Perhaps the problems caused by these amendments from the other body will cause us to pass our own bills and send them over so we will not be asked to accept a lot of nongermane language from the conference. That is a stupid and unnecessary procedure. We must stand now for our rights.

I will support strongly passage of an Alaskan pipeline bill and amendments to our outdated rights-of-way laws across Federal lands. I just as strongly urge you to support the recommital motion instructing the conferees to delete the objectionable provisions.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there are, as with every issue that confronts us, particular ones that generate interest. There are several things at stake here that go beyond the phrasing of the language. Basically, Mr. Speaker, the reason we are confronted with this division within the House at this point is a very simple one. The Senate, in their haste to pass the pipeline bill, adopted some language which dramatically revised the Federal Trade Commission and its activities and dramatically revised the method of requiring small business, all business, to make reports to that Government agency. The Senate did so without any hearings, without any knowledge of what the language did, the importance of the language, and they did it because they knew that the pipeline was a critical piece of legislation that this Nation must have.

It is a simple case of the Senate sticking this language in here.

Mr. Speaker, the language that I will propose in the motion to recommit is very specific. It will not cause any delay in the process of the passage of the pipeline beyond that which has already been created, and it will assert once and for all the legislative sounding that I think everybody in this House wants. There have been no hearings in this body or the other body on the import of this language. This language is totally far reaching. It affects all business; it makes a totally autonomous agency under the Federal Trade Commission, an agency with no precedent, I might add.

Above all, I think the most important thing is that it was done with a certain knowledge that because of our concern over the energy crisis, we probably would not be concerned with what appeared to be innocuous language. I will tell the House exactly what happened. I will tell the House the business community was very late in being aroused over the problem. That is why we have been bombarded by the business community.

I will tell the chairman that they were late, but the language was inappropriate. It could not stand by itself. It will go down in defeat in an up or down vote in this House.

What I am going to ask the House to do is confirm language which would restore the FTC to its present status and restore the reported practice, with slight modification, to its present status. This is not a matter of parochial pride or House pride versus Senate pride. This is a very basic issue. Should the House accept a totally inappropriate amendment to a bill simply because that bill is desperately needed at this time of an energy crisis? The answer is, I will tell the Members, a resounding no.

By adopting this language which I propose to offer in the motion to recommit, then the Senate will know we are locked into this position. They want the pipeline bill as much as we do. Then we can proceed in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to support the pending motion to recommit.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the action taken by the majority of the conferees on this conference report is reprehensible. It is high time that this House takes steps to make certain that the rules of this House are not circumvented as they were in this case.

We have a serious parliamentary situation here and it needs correcting. The rules of the House were previously amended with the membership believing they would have an opportunity to vote on these nongermane Senate amendments brought back to the House by our conferees. To preclude the House from passing on these nongermane amendments, the conferees have substituted the Senate bill for the House-passed bill. At the present time, I am serving on a subcommittee of the Rules Committee which is delving into these devious methods of circumventing the rules of this House. Hopefully, we will report rules changes which will end these practices.

In the instant case, the House of Representatives passed this needed Alaskan pipeline legislation before we went on recess in August. I must ask the House now: Where has this legislation been all this time? Did my Democratic friends

who were in the majority in this conference committee not know how important this bill was to the welfare of the country and that an energy crisis was fast approaching?

I think the American people will be asking this question. Why was this legislation not immediately agreed to by the conferees and returned to the House? It should have been so reported. Everyone knows this but do they know how the legislation was being held captive in order for some to insert antibusiness, anticonsumer amendments for reasons known only to the sponsors?

At the present time, American business spends too much of its time—and cost—in completing all too many duplicate reports requested by the Federal Government. This duplication costs money and the consumer must and is paying for it when he or she purchases an American-made product. Let us give the consumer a break and return this conference report to committee with instructions to delete these costly, nongermane amendments.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the House the rather unique position I find myself in, because the gentleman from Ohio has raised it. I am a signer of the conference report and I want to tell the House exactly why I signed it and why I now will offer a motion to recommit. We simply did not have the votes in the conference to take the offending language out. I thought the only remedy was to offer the motion to recommit to this whole House. I thought it was not fair to the Nation or to the House simply to arbitrarily hold up passage of the pipeline bill which I think is essential.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee (Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this body has been subjected for many years to amendments that are not germane to legislation under consideration, amendments which have been adopted by the other body. In 1970 in our Reorganization Act we attempted to correct this matter. We adopted a rule in the House that any nongermane amendment adopted by the other body and coming back in a conference report would require a separate vote on the floor of the House. Due to the parliamentary situation today, however, we are not allowed a separate vote on these nongermane amendments. That violates the spirit of the rules of the House. Unless the rules of the House are adhered to, the Congress, as an institution, is in its declining days.

Let me point out two of the major amendments. One is in regard to the FTC which provides that every time the Department of Justice does not act within 10 days on FTC cases, they automatically go over to the FTC for action.

The second amendment is an extremely important amendment to every businessman. I want the Members to mark this. It applies to every businessman—not only the large corporations in the country but it will apply from the mom-and-pop stores on up, because it amends a 1942 act, Mr. Speaker, and takes away from the OMB the power to review and approve requests from the agencies to send questionnaires out to all business. It transfers the power from the OMB to GAO but it omits from the present law the requirement that the OMB has to approve before the department or agency is to send the questionnaire out. So it means every agency of the Government and every department of the Government, at will, can request information from business without the approval of anyone. Under the present law approval is required of OMB.

In the recommittal motion I understand the conferees will be instructed to omit these two sections from the bill. Approval of the recommittal motion will not delay construction of the Alaskan pipeline. The recommittal motion will simply instruct the House conferees to not accept these two nongermane amendments. The conference can resume immediately and approve the bill without these two amendments in a matter of minutes. If delay occurs, it would rest solely on the chairman of the Interior Committee of the body, as well as the chief conferee of the House. I hope the recommittal motion is adopted.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Nebraska who have just spoken are members of the Rules Committee which gave to the House the rule that brought the pipeline bill to the floor, so they were authors of the rule that made it in order to substitute the House language for the Senate-passed bill. I find nothing wrong with that procedure. It has been used by the same Rules Committee with these two gentlemen concurring for years. I find that their protesting now on nongermane amendments does not apply since this is the language that was in the Senate bill and all of the Senate passed bill became germane under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, about 3 months ago, the Congress defeated a crippling amendment to the Alaska pipeline bill by a vote of 221 to 198. The same day, the Congress voted final passage of the Alaska pipeline legislation by a substantial margin.

Our Nation is suffering the most critical energy crisis in its history. We have heard the President, on television last week, lay down stringent regulations to cope with the fuel scarcity for this coming winter. We may have to ration gasoline within the next few months.

Through the well-organized lobby of special interests which have no regard for the convenience and comfort of about 200 million Americans, these special interest groups are conducting a telephone, telegraph, and mail lobby on the Members of Congress to sidetrack the Alaska pipeline legislation, with the hope that eventually billions will be spent by our Government constructing a pipeline down through the central part of Canada and give Canada, and eventually Great Britain, something to say about the multibillions of barrels of oil in our own domain up in Alaska.

This pipeline should be constructed so that the world's great deposit of oil is under complete control of the United States. It is estimated that the U.S. energy needs will be increased almost 75 percent now and the next 15 years. The increase since 1962 for petroleum products alone has been 55 percent. It is also estimated that by the year 2000 the total energy needs will have increased 166 percent over 1972.

It is now necessary that we act immediately to take advantage of this mammoth discovery of petroleum in Alaska, and it will provide great relief for the United States within the next couple of years after this American-controlled Alaska pipeline is completed.

John W. Scott, prominent attorney of Washington, D.C., and former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, wrote me the following letter, dated September 6, 1973, which I hereby submit with my remarks:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
September 6, 1973.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RAY: May I suggest that the public interest urgently requires that the legislation relating to the proposed Alaskan Pipeline contain language which will assure the American people that the fuel so urgently needed in the United States will not be diverted elsewhere. In this regard, I believe the following language would accomplish this result:

"No petroleum, natural gas, liquid hydrocarbons or petroleum products or commodities of any kind transported by or moved through any pipeline constructed, owned or operated by any person, firm or corporation pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be pledged, bartered, traded, sold, or otherwise disposed of, or made available to anyone for use other than within the States of Alaska, Hawaii, and the continental limits of the United States. It is the express legislative intention that the reserves of petroleum, natural gas and liquid hydrocarbons transported through any pipeline constructed pursuant to this Act shall be utilized solely within said States of Hawaii, Alaska and/or the Continental United States."

Trusting that you had a pleasant visit back in Indiana, I am with kind personal regards

Cordially,

JOHN W. SCOTT,
Attorney at Law.

I am also enclosing with my remarks a letter dated August 1, in the form of a statement by the AFL–CIO executive council on the Alaska pipeline:

STATEMENT—AFL–CIO

The Senate is to be commended for passage of S. 1081, introduced by Senator Henry M. Jackson, to clear the way for prompt construction of the Alaska pipeline and early development of one of our largest domestic reserves of petroleum—Alaska's North Slopes. The Jackson bill, as amended by Senators Gravel and Stevens, would hasten construction of the pipeline by obviating the necessity of further judicial review.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives has reported out favorably a bill (H.R. 9130) by Congressman John Melcher of Montana, which is similar to the Senate-approved

measure. We urge the House to pass this bill this week.

It is imperative in the interests of the American economy, national security and America's balance of trade that this nation develop this domestic reserve of oil to reduce dependence on petroleum imports.

The AFL–CIO strongly supports construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline because it is the fastest, most economically feasible and most secure method of transporting oil from the North Slope fields to the rest of the United States.

This Congressional action is necessary to legalize many other oil and gas pipelines in all regions of the country which, as a result of a recent court decision, are technically illegal. Unless legal remedy is promptly provided, the pipelines could be enjoined and the energy crisis worsened.

H.R. 9130 would permit early start of work on the Alaska pipeline by solving the right-of-way problem while providing strict environmental safeguards and stringent liability requirements if damage should result from the pipeline authorization.

H.R. 9130 also deals with the problem of judicial review in provisions similar to the Senate version. Other provisions of the bill would insure that the Alaskan oil be used in America's domestic markets and would authorize a feasibility study of a second pipeline across Canada while construction proceeds on the Alaska line.

We urge passage of H.R. 9130 by the House so that American workers can get about the job of building the pipeline and related plant construction and U.S. shipyards can speed building of the 33 new U.S. flag tankers which would be manned by American seamen in the carriage of this oil which is so badly needed to relieve the nation's energy crisis.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to pass this House-Senate conference report authorizing the Alaska pipeline, so that our Nation can immediately start releasing 206 million people from being blackmailed by the Middle East and provide sufficient energy fuel for generations to come. I have received hundreds of letters from my congressional district, 90 percent of which are urging that the United States have complete control over this Alaska pipeline investment and enact a bill as reported by the conference committee. Secretary of Interior Morton is 100 percent for passing the Alaska pipeline bill as reported by the conference committee.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN).

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have a particular interest in section 204(c) of S. 1081, the trans-Alaska pipeline bill. This section establishes a structure of strict liability upon any vessel from which there occurs a spill of petroleum while engaged in the carriage of products from the Alaskan pipeline to the lower 48 States. I wish to commend the conferees for their foresight in addressing themselves to this problem, and I wish to compliment the chairman of the conference and the floor manager, Congressman MELCHER, for the inclusion of an insurable limitation of vessel liability, and for the inclusion in the conference report, on page 29, of language which expresses the hope that the appropriate committees of the House and Senate which will be considering the more general subject of marine liability will harmonize the liability provisions of section 204(c) with the liability provisions of any general legislation that may be developed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the House that our committee, at the appropriate time, will address itself to the problem as contemplated by the conference report to bring into harmony implementing legislation of any international conferences on pollution liability, together with existing Federal law in this area and the liability section of the bill before us today.

In the past several months, our committee and the Interior Committee have had many areas of mutual concern and we have worked these problems out in a very satisfactory manner. This is just one more example of committee cooperation. I want to thank Mr. MELCHER and the conferees for recognizing the legitimate areas of jurisdictional consideration of other committees and I again compliment Mr. MELCHER and the conferees on a job well done on a very difficult and controversial, yet necessary and critical piece of legislation.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO).

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I find many things about the conference report which I do not like but I am going to vote for it anyway, and I ask others who have some similar feeling to vote for this also.

Mr. Speaker, I resent—I deeply resent the fact that at 10 o'clock today we did not even know what the language was to be of this recommittal. I got home to Wyoming about a month ago, and I recognized from the managers of the conference that the head of the OMB had injected himself into this matter and had asked that there be changes made in this legislation.

I announced in Wyoming and asked that Mr. Ash of OMB please not inject himself in legislative proceedings and let us pass this bill and get a pipeline built. I deeply resent the fact that he would not allow the Federal Trade Commission to continue its objective search for truth, which is to ferret out price fixing and other illegal practices, that might be engaged in by the major oil companies who will use this line.

Mr. Speaker, the people do not believe us any more. They do not believe the President. They do not believe the spokesmen for the oil companies, and they do not believe Mr. Ash, either. They want someone whom they do believe in, with guts, to tell the truth and pursue the facts today as to what is going on in Alaska.

Why can we not build a pipeline and allow the Federal Trade Commission to do its investigative job? I resent the Office of Management and Budget sticking its nose into my business, and if this conference report is returned, I will vote against the Alaska pipeline in objection to what Mr. Ash has done to our prerogatives.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in response to the chairman of the Rules Committee, I would just like to correct a statement he made a few moments ago.

In introduced a resolution which would have provided the House with an opportunity to vote on four nongermane amendments in this bill two of which concern the Federal Trade Commission and the reporting amendments.

The gentleman refused to allow a vote in the Rules Committee because one Member was absent, and he advised the Committee on Rules that we would not have a vote because one member was out of town and could not be there, and had requested that he be protected on the rollcall.

I talked to the absent gentleman this morning, and he told me he did not know anything about the matter of being protected on the vote. We had a similar situation the following day in the Rules Committee, but I will not go into the details of what happened after that.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to urge the Members of the House to vote for the recommitment to remove the FTC sections from this bill, which properly belong to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and the reporting section, which belongs to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this conference report was before the Rules Committee by a motion of Congressman MARTIN demanding a rule for a separate bill was brought up on a motion by Mr. MELCHER, and it was votes on two Senate additions and was tabled by a voice vote of 8 to 6 and sent back for the conference report to be voted approval on the floor of the House.

The gentleman must be mixed up with some other bill, I might say to my good friend from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I demand time, because that is a complete misstatement of the facts. There was not any vote taken in the Rules Committee on my resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include below a transcript of the Rules Committee meeting last Tuesday, November 6 when my resolution concerning separate vote on nongermane amendments to the Alaskan pipeline bill was discussed in the Rules Committee. You will note that there was no vote taken on my resolution:

TRANSCRIPT OF RULES COMMITTEE HEARING, NOVEMBER 6, 1973

Mr. YOUNG. Now let's take up something confusing.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute. As far as this pipeline is concerned, like I stated before, Mr. Murphy's father is ill and he requested that we not take the matter up while he is absent. He will be back here the rest of this week, maybe. His father has had a heart attack and he is in serious condition.

Mr. Martin?

Mr. MARTIN. It seems strange to me, we have had half a dozen votes here this afternoon and there was no request on the gentleman's part from Illinois to be protected on these other votes.

It seems to me rather odd that this should be brought up at this time in view particularly of this conference report that has been

brought up and can be called up at the floor at any time.

This matter of postponing it until next week means we will not be able to take any action on the resolution at all.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a bill down there now on the pipeline.

Mr. MARTIN. This was scheduled today. I think it should be taken up and discussed and voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to answer you on that. Mr. Murphy lives in Chicago. He is probably much interested in the fact that it is time for this country to get busy with the law that they passed here on creating a pipeline and start working on it and get some fuel down here because there will be millions of people in his area that probably will be freezing in the next few years if we don't get some fuel down here. That is why we would like to get the pipeline rolling. We have passed a bill on that.

Mr. QUILLEN. There was an election in New York and the gentleman from New York came down here to be at this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. My gracious. I realize that.

Mr. QUILLEN. I remember when there was a death in Tennessee, nobody would protect me.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be no vote on it until Mr. Murphy releases me.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the chairman's ruling be overruled. I make such a motion and call for a roll call vote.

Mr. DELANEY. I don't like to vote on it, but if I have to, I will.

Mr. LATTA. Roll call.

Mr. QUILLEN. I think we should have this pipeline bill. It is a national emergency situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Let me say this: Another reason why we should not vote on it, besides Mr. Murphy's situation, is this: We will read here in the morning paper, "Congressmen in general and the Rules Committee in particular, have been vigorously lobbied by the divided business community," House sources said yesterday.

"The Chamber of Commerce attacked the disputed provisions as highly objectionable and argued that they could impede the bill's final passage. The Administration—here is where the rival comes—the Administration is also divided. OMB Director Roy L. Ash said he would recommend a veto of the bill if it contains the provisions strengthening the FTC and weakening OMB."

Listen to this Congressman Pepper, "The Secretary of the Interior, he is the man in charge, not Ash, the Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, said last week he disagrees and would recommend that the President sign the bill" if that bill is downstairs passed.

"There has been no indication from the White House that the President would veto the bill if it contains the disputed provisions. Capitol Hill sources say President Nixon's choice for Vice President, Leader Jerry Ford, has lent his support to the Conference Committee."

That bill is downstairs waiting to be voted on.

"Jerry Ford, Minority Leader, is for it, the next Vice President is for it, and it is the contention that there should be one vote, up or down, on the entire pipeline bill. So has Speaker Carl Albert, from these sources," and so on.

What is your motion?

Mr. MARTIN. I move to overrule the chairman's ruling in regard to a vote on this resolution on H. Res. 669.

The CHAIRMAN. Roll call.

Mr. DELANEY. I ask Mr. Martin to reconsider that. It is a question of whether the ruling is up—

Mr. SISK. I move to table it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All in favor of Mr. Sisk's motion signify by saying aye; those opposed? No.

The yeas have it.

Mr. SISK. Is there any other business pending?

Mr. LONG. I move that we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. We will meet at 2:00 o'clock on the Budget bill.

(Whereupon, at 1 p.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the chair.)

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the remarks made by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MELCHER) to the effect that it is the fault of the Rules Committee that we have this problem before us today. Actually, he is one of the conferees that reported out this Alaskan pipeline bill with substantial nongermane amendments.

As far as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is concerned, I want to say to him that if the Senate wants to put through legislation changing the FTC and changing business-reporting practices, let us allow them to be men and stand up and do it. Let us not resort to this subterfuge we are asked to accept here today.

Mr. Speaker, we are voting on the Alaskan pipeline bill, and there is no sense in letting the Senate hold this bill hostage. If we vote to strike these nongermane amendments, that will place the responsibility right where it belongs, on the other body. They can hold it up if they want to, and then they can take the blame from the American people.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my colleagues that we are faced today with a decision whether we are going to develop a source of oil delivered to the South 48 States in the next 3 years.

Now, I have heard comments on the floor about what the Senate did that was wrong and what the House did that was wrong, and we are casting blame on both sides. But the facts are that we need this oil.

Alaska needs a pipeline, and believe me, we all need the pipeline.

Now, some of my colleagues have said that because of these other provisions, the bill should go back to the conferees. I can assure the Members that if it does go back to the conferees, there is a good chance and a possibility that there will not be any action taken by the conference committee until possibly the middle of January.

Now, to many of us this may not seem like a long period of time. However, I have lived in the Arctic of Alaska. It is a reality that we will not proceed with the construction before March, which means a lead time of at least 3 months. We will lose a full year of construction time, which puts the oil on line 5 years from now and not 3 years from now. I do not believe this Nation can afford that, and I do not believe any of us can afford that.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many accusations made concerning what the Senate has done, and I will admit, because of an oversight, that we did accept the Senate's number and title and everything that is germane under the House rules.

The decisions will have to be made by the Members here today. Whether we are going to have Alaskan oil within 3 or 5 years, that is our decision.

I am thoroughly convinced that a recommitment motion, if it is adopted, will put us in the 5-year bracket.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Montana will answer a few questions which I would like to put at this time, I will appreciate it.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to respond, if the Gentleman will yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Under section 28(D), is the Secretary or agency head required to conduct a hearing prior to making a finding that a right-of-way wider than 50 feet is necessary?

Mr. MELCHER. No.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. That section provides that the reasons for such a finding be recorded. It is my understanding that the Secretary may record his reasons in the right-of-way permit, the Bureau of Land Management public land records, an environmental impact statement, or any other public document.

Mr. MELCHER. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Is the final determination under section 28(H)(2) that a plan of construction, operation and rehabilitation submitted complies with section 28 within the sole discretion of the Secretary or other agency head?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Are the procedures for suspension and termination provided in section 28(O) applicable to the trans-Alaska pipeline?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Is my understanding correct that the common carrier requirement contained in section 28(R) is not intended to apply to the component parts of a pipeline system not directly involved in the transportation of oil or natural gas to market. For example, related facilities such as access roads, airstrips, electric lines, and fuel lines for supplying power to pumping stations, would not be subject to this requirement?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Is it correct that the regulations provided for in section 28(X)(1) specifying the extent to which holders of right-of-way would be liable to third parties is not meant to supersede or preempt State law with respect to third party liability but is intended only to apply to those lands, such as Federal enclaves, for which there is no applicable State law governing third party liability?

Mr. MELCHER. I would agree with your interpretation in general, but would state it a little differently. The second sentence of section 28(X)(L) applies only to geographic areas where the United States has exclusive legislative jurisdiction. Those are areas where the State laws do not apply. The law with respect to third party liability within such areas must therefore be provided by Federal

legislation. This sentence will have no application in Alaska, because there are no exclusive jurisdiction areas in Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Does the general preclusion of judicial review contained in section 203(D) cover not only the issuance and the procedures followed in issuing all rights-of-way, permits, leases, and other authorizations for the trans-Alaska pipeline system, but also any terms and conditions contained therein and any further authorizations, such as notices to proceed, which would be issued in the course of construction of the pipeline.

Mr. MELCHER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Would the liability imposed by section 204(A)(5) upon the holder of the permit or right-of-way for the trans-Alaska pipeline cease when construction under the rights-of-way and permits issued to the State is completed and the holder is no longer a contractor of the State?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Am I correct in understanding there is nothing in this report that precludes the Secretary of the Interior from granting to the State the necessary authorizations for the construction of airstrips and roads as mentioned in the environmental impact statement—pages 27, 28, 29, volume I, and elsewhere—that are necessary and related facilities of the pipeline?

Mr. MELCHER. Yes, you are correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Am I correct that this bill does not intend to confer exclusive jurisdiction in any areas where the State would have traditional jurisdiction? Alaska may exercise its established and traditional powers as a sovereign State and as a landlord for the State portion of the pipeline route?

Mr. MELCHER. You are generally correct, but I would phrase the situation differently. This bill confers on the Federal Government no exclusive legislative jurisdiction in terms of jurisdiction over a geographic area. Moreover, the bill does not preempt any particular subject-matter field of legislation. Alaska may exercise its concurrent legislative jurisdiction over the land covered by the pipeline right-of-way, as determined by other principles of law, to the extent it does not conflict with this bill. In case of conflict, the Federal law with respect to the Federal right-of-way will prevail.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank my good chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and compliment him on his activities not only as chairman of that subcommittee but as chairman of the conference committee.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. I take extreme exception to your timetable. You said that if we do not pass this bill the way it is, it will not be passed until some time next year.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Just a moment for a correction. I did not say next year as far as the bill is concerned. I said as far as beginning construction of the pipeline is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When you come in with nongermane amendments adopted in the Senate, even though every Member of this House is in favor of building the pipeline, do you think the Members of the other body want to go home for their Thanksgiving Day recess and for a sine die adjournment, especially those Senators running next year, when they are holding up the pipeline? I say to you the answer is, "No."

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I say to you that I do not know what the other body is thinking at this time, because if they had been thinking, they might not have passed this legislation in this manner.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER.)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have one question. Is it true that the reporting provisions provided in the Senate bill which now included in the conference report, exempts, and I repeat, exempts in its application information that is sought by the Internal Revenue Service, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Bureau of the Public Debt, the Bureau of Accounts, the Division of Foreign Funds Control of the Treasury Department, information sought from banks by Federal Bank supervisory agencies, the General Accounting Office, all divisions of the District of Columbia, and it also excludes, does it not, any information that is requested by other independent regulatory agencies? In other words, are not all of these things excluded in what is required in filing this report?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will respond to the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois by telling the gentleman that section 409 deals with the information as it appears in the conference report, and removes the prerogative of making a judgment as to whether the information is necessary for whatever agency is producing it. It removes that from the Office of Management and Budget, and places it in the hands of the GAO with no exemptions the gentleman from Illinois has recited.

I will also advise the gentleman from Illinois that under the law as it is now written before the adoption of the conference report the OMB had the prerogative of rejecting agency requests for information. GAO under this new authorization does not have the right to reject any requests by any agency of any business establishments, large or small. Therein I believe lies the dramatic difference between the existing law and the proposed law in the conference report, and the one that is going to do a great deal of harm to all of our constituents.

I will tell the gentleman from Illinois, and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I disagree very strongly with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) as to the legislative delay that is going to be caused by the motion to recommit. I will also advise my colleagues that the Senate and House Members do not want to be responsibile for their constituencies being out in the cold this winter, so that I cannot imagine a delay of over a day or two at the most, so I do not believe that we would be holding for ransom the desires of our constituents and adopt language which would not be responsible language, to say the least. I do not know where the gentleman from Illinois got the idea that there were exemptions for the agencies the gentleman has recited, but the gentleman is in error.

Mr. COLLIER. I thought the act itself specifically did so.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. As it is now written?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, that it specifically exempts from its application this information.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, I am unable to respond to the question asked by the gentleman from Illinois because I do not know what the act is, as it is now written, even though I was a party to accepting the new language which amended it. And that, I submit, is the basic defect of this bill, that those of us on the conference committee had no idea what we were amending, so therefore we could not be responsible if we had the will or the wit to act.

Mr. COLLIER. Then the gentleman is saying that all of this information which may be required by existing law from all of these agencies that I have suggested, may now be asked to be duplicated by the Federal Trade Commission under this act?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I will tell the gentleman that the act is entitled, in the conference report, "Information For Independent Regulatory Agencies." Now, I read that as meaning not only the Federal Trade Commission, but also the Federal Power Commission and all the other regulatory agencies, and my answer would be yes to the gentleman's interragatory. And I will tell the gentleman that those individual businesses would not now be exempt from those questions asked by the agencies the gentleman cited.

Mr. COLLIER. All these other agencies?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. All these other agencies.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority members on the Committee on Government Operations (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit. I should like at the same time to say that I feel very strongly about getting the trans-Alaskan pipeline completed as quickly as possible. I voted for the bill after much soul-searching when it came to the House. I feel very strongly about supporting the bill that passed the House and building the pipeline as expeditiously as possible.

But I also feel that if we adopt this conference bill without the motion to recommit, we would be passing nongermane Senate amendments, amendments which ought to have gone through the

House and been handled by the appropriate committees of the House before we voted on them.

I should like to talk just a moment about section 409, which amends the Federal Reports Act.

Section 409 of this bill would allow the regulatory agencies to collect whatever information they desired from businesses or individuals. I think this provision would be most unwise, and should be deleted from this conference bill.

This provision, another of the nongermane Senate amendments, was never considered by the House. I doubt any of the conferees of the Interior Committees have ever studied this issue, since the Federal Reports Act which is being amended is within the jurisdiction of the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committees. I am familiar enough with the issues involved to say to my colleagues that you would be opening Pandora's box by allowing this provision to go through.

The Federal Reports Act of 1942 sets up a system whereby agencies wishing to collect information from the public are required to justify their requests to an outside agency, the Office of Management and Budget. This review was required because we found the agencies often were collecting not only duplicative, but also unnecessary information. Since this review system has been established, my committee has been called upon to amend the law on several occasions. But we have always been called upon to further limit the number of information requests made by the Federal Government.

I can say to my colleagues that I have never been told that the present system allows too few requests for information. If Members have seen problems in the reports control system, they have always been that too many requests are permitted. Business, in particular, is going bankrupt trying to respond to all the requests for information being submitted by the Federal Government. Section 409 would only increase the burden imposed on business.

I do not mind criticizing OMB when it deserves it, but the evidence just does not support the charge that OMB is using the Federal Reports Act to stifle the regulatory agencies. If Members feel this is the case, I would be the first to insist that hearings be held on OMB's stewardship of this reports control function.

If OMB is no longer adequately performing this function, we should consider fundamental changes in the system. Certainly, though, I doubt very much my committee would recommend developing two duplicative bureaucracies to perform the function of determining whether reports would be duplicative. Nor do I believe my committee would recommend that this executive function be given to the General Accounting Office, which is an arm of the Congress. Changes may be necessary in the reports control function, but not the changes made by this conference bill.

Last Wednesday, November 7, I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 36311, a statement on the provisions in this conference bill that I felt had to be amended or deleted. Included in that material was an explanation of needed changes in sections 404 and 405 of the conference bill.

Section 404 of the bill, as reported by the conference, would require Senate confirmation of the Director of the Energy Policy Office. Section 405 would require Senate confirmation of the head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration. Whether appointments to these two offices should be subject to Senate confirmation is not the issue here, because this bill will do much more than just require Senate confirmation. Since the incumbents would not qualify for their offices once Senate confirmation of their appointments is required, they would be removed from their offices upon enactment of this bill. Moreover, if an incumbent were nominated to fill his present office, he could be removed at any time by a majority vote of the Senate. I strongly recommend that these two provisions be either deleted or amended to apply only to future appointments of these offices.

Also included in that material was a letter from the Comptroller General discussing the proposed transfer of Federal reports control for the regulatory agencies to GAO.

The Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office wrote this:

I am frankly disturbed about the provision because it would establish an executive function in the General Accounting Office. In the past the Congress has avoided placing operating responsibilities of this type in the GAO because of our responsibility for advising the Congress as to how the executive agencies carry out their responsibilities. We cannot carry out an operating function and, at the same time, provide the Congress with an evaluation of it which would be considered as objective and unbiased. I believe that is the situation we face in connection with this amendment.

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

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What the gentleman has apprised us of, has just occurred to me would be a very important point, and that is that this entire question may be unconstitutional, inasmuch as the General Accounting Office is an arm of the legislative branch of the Government. Here we have the Executive assigning the legislative branch a function in the administration of the law. Will the gentleman comment on that point?

Mr. HORTON. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's comments. I do not know whether it is constitutional or unconstitutional, but I do think it creates a problem. The appropriate committee of the House, the Committee on Government Operations, ought to have an opportunity to have witnesses come in and testify on this subject. But if we vote today on this bill without supporting the motion to recommit, we are just going to be acting, I think, haphazardly.

Now, today the administration has sent another letter, this time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER), also objecting to the inclusion of the Federal reports control changes. Roy Ash said in this letter:

The President shares the great concern expressed by Members of Congress regarding the need to begin construction of an Alaskan pipeline without further delay. The painstaking work by the Congress on a bill to permit immediate pipeline construction is an example of bipartisan cooperation at its best.

It is precisely because your efforts so clearly reflect an appreciation of the urgent need for an Alaskan pipeline that we are concerned about the inclusion of provisions extraneous to the larger intent of this legislation. Moreover, I am convinced that these provisions have great potential for mischief, and as presently drawn, would alter in the most fundamental way the present regulatory process. This is a position of long-standing, and not an eleventh hour objection.

We particularly believe that the amendments contained in Sections 408 and 409 of the proposed legislation should be considered separately and at length. We pledge our support and cooperation in the process; however, such a process should not be permitted to hamper the immediate passage of the Alaskan pipeline bill.

In the spirit of compromise which has distinguished the proceedings on this legislation so far, I hope you will work out a bill without these extraneous provisions as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reports Act was intended to control the paperwork burden laid on the public by Federal agencies. The regulatory agencies want to be free to do as they wish, ask what they wish, of whom they wish, in any way they wish. If we allow them to do so, we will be creating a huge loophole in the Federal reports control system.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that if we pass this conference bill as is, we will be pulling down the barriers to a paperwork avalanche.

I urge the Members to support the motion to recommit.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who opposed the construction of the Alaskan pipeline without the Nation first taking a good, hard look at the Canadian alternative. I think the country made a mistake in not looking at the Canadian alternative and in not going that route.

But I am here today to say that we are going to make a grave mistake if we support the motion to recommit and if we do not send this legislation to the Senate this afternoon and on to the White House for this signature.

I want to make just two or three points. I know a number of my friends who have been identified with the environmental movement, among whom there seems to be a feeling that maybe since they were opposed to the Alaskan pipeline, they can show it by supporting the motion to recommit and voting against the bill.

We will never get a better bill from the environmental standpoint. As the temperatures go down this winter, the pressure to cut further environmental protection standards is going to increase. We actually improved the environmental protection features of this legislation in conference. We have strict liability provisions written in now. We took out the "act of God" exemption which would have limited liability for earthquakes in a pipeline crossing the most earthquake-prone region of the world.

That great man, Mr. JOHN SAYLOR, who is no longer with us, was one of the strongest environmental supporters. He signed the conference report. In my opinion he would be here today voting against the motion to recommit.

Second, there is a lot of concern about small business. We have had telegrams saying we will make a serious mistake if we vote against the motion to recommit in terms of these new provisions. All we are doing in the bill is changing from the OMB—and I did not think there were many great admirers of the OMB here in the Congress—to the General Accounting Office, thus giving an arm of Congress the right to approve and make determinations as to the adequacy of these reporting requirements.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) asked me about the effect of section 409 on the business community's right to comment on questionnaires and reports that may be required by the Federal Trade Commission—a right currently assured by OMB practice.

It is certainly my desire—and as far as I can tell the will of the conferees—that the GAO afford business organizations the opportunity to comment on proposed reports and questionnaires. The chairman of the FTC, Mr. Engman, recently stated in a letter to Senator JACKSON that "close coordination between OMB and GAO will be necessary," and that he sees "no reason to suspect that GAO will be less diligent in protecting the businessman than OMB has been." Moreover, he assured the Senator from Washington that the Commission is receptive to constructive suggestions for its line of business forms.

The FTC is trying to do something about too much monopoly in the oil business, is trying to meet the fears expressed in this country that the big oil businesses are using the shortage of gasoline to squeeze out the small independent retailers who have written letters to every Member of Congress asking that these provisions be retained in the bill.

Let me underline one other point. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) stood in the well and asked for us to vote down the motion to recommit and send this bill off for final passage today. The point he made needs to be underlined. In Alaska we have a short construction season. If we vote this up for recommital today, the whole conference report, which contains a great many tradeoffs, will be open. The chairman of the Senate committee has indicated there is going to be a long, long new conference while we renegotiate all these complicated tradeoffs and the balanced agreements we made in this conference report. If we vote for recommital we are talking about bringing this bill back here in January or February and we are talking about the probable loss of 1 year of construction. We are not talking about losing a month's time but a year's time in construction.

So if Members are for action to meet the energy crisis, they will vote down the motion to recommit and they will vote for the conference report.

I would like to elaborate on why I take the position I do. First I believe the bill to be a stronger one than the House-passed. The bill does have some problem areas, but those are generally items that I opposed at the time they were considered in the House.

From the outset I realized that we must have the Alaskan oil and that the debate should instead focus on the safest and most practical route. I opposed the Alaskan route proposal because I did not believe that the Canadian alternative was given an adequate hearing. I still believe that the trans-Alaskan route was decided for us by the oil companies and the administration. I am deeply concerned about the conduct of our State Department regarding the Canadian Government's position and I firmly believe that this matter should be thoroughly investigated.

I am, however, encouraged by several improvements in the legislation that came out of the conference. First, we wrote a strong liability provision for the Alaskan pipeline and the marine leg from Valdez to other U.S. ports. Section 204 of the report provides that the Alaskan pipeline permit holder shall be strictly liable without regard to fault for all damages that result from a pipeline related incident along the right-of-way. This includes damages to Alaskan Natives for any losses they might sustain by disruptions in their subsistence economy that are caused by the pipeline. It will apply, for example, if the pipeline disturbs a caribou migration or if an oil spill in a river ruins a salmon run. The conferees set a limit of $50 million for liability of the pipeline permit holder to any third party for any one incident.

For the marine leg, from Valdez to ports in the lower 48 States, the conferees agreed that there should be strict liability for any spills. The first $14 million for clean up and damages is to be assessed against the ship owner and the rest—up to $100 million per incident—is to be paid out of a fund which will be created by a 5 cents-per-barrel levy on all oil transported through the pipeline.

This is a landmark provision for environmental protection and one that may well mark the standard for future oil spills everywhere. It is admittedly forcing a tougher liability standard on Alaskan oil than exists for other oil, but the House has consistently maintained that the environmental risks of transporting this oil were significantly greater. The oil companies have, in turn, consistently promised that both the pipeline and sea leg were safe. We are doing no more than holding them to this promise.

Second, the House conferees agreed to accept a compromise version of the Senate proposed amendments to expand the Federal Trade Commission's authority. The controversy over the oil shortages and the role the oil companies played in this brought to light the problems the FTC has had obtaining the information it needs to fulfill its statutory obligation and protect the public interest. Under section 408, as adopted by the conferees, the FTC will have subpena and injunctive power and will be able to initiate, prosecute, and appeal violations of the Federal trade laws. The FTC must first apply to the Attorney General who will have 10 days to act on the FTC's proposed action after which the FTC may act if the Attorney General chooses not to proceed. This is important, for the delays that occurred in investigating the practices of the oil companies during recent months severely limited the Commission's effectiveness.

The conference report also provides that Alaskan oil must be allocated equitably among the States. In short, this oil is not just to benefit the west coast, but the entire Nation.

Another provision gives the Senate authority to advise and consent in the selection of the Director of Energy Policy and the head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration.

The report also:

Authorizes advance payments for Alaskan Natives out of revenues due them under the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act.

Exempts stripper wells producing less than 10 barrels per day from controls under the 1970 Economic Stabilization Act.

Requires implementation of Coast Guard regulations for vessel construction standards and directs the establishment of a vessel traffic control system for Valdez, Alaska.

Deletes the House buy American amendment.

Deletes the House provision prohibiting foreign labor on the pipeline.

Deletes the act of God defense to strict liability, thus insuring that the pipeline permit holder will be liable for earthquake caused damage.

Deletes the Senate bill's provision that would prevent the Secretary from requiring private power companies to wheel public power over power lines that cross Federal lands.

These provisions and deletions, in my opinion, strengthen the report. It is the product of long and deliberate discussions by the conferees under the able leadership of the conference chairman, Mr. MELCHER.

There are, however, provisions in the final bill that I do not agree with and which detract from its basic rationality.

Mr. Speaker, I find particularly disturbing the provisions in title II which attempt to override the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. These provisions were approved by both Houses of Congress after bitter debate and thus the conferees were bound to include them in the final bill. Yet the end result is still unfortunate.

The congressional finding in section 203 that the Secretary need take no further action under NEPA is a serious mistake which casts a shadow over this act.

If we really wish to amend or limit the thrust of the National Environmental Policy Act, we should say so and do it openly.

Moreover, we are stating that NEPA has been satisfied, a finding that is properly left to the judicial branch. The fact is, Congress has never really scrutinized the Secretary's decision nor the voluminous impact statement to determine if NEPA had been satisfied. The clear issue that is still regretfully framed for decision in the courts is: Can Congress make such a determination that one of its laws has been complied with?

I understand, Mr. Speaker, our need to have the Alaskan oil as soon as possible and thus the need to prevent any further unnecessary delays. I do not favor, however, short circuiting the American judicial process and casting aside our well established system of judicial review in the process.

First, I point out that it was only 4 years ago that this Congress made the momentous policy decision that concern for the environment was to be a major consideration in all future Federal decisionmaking. Yet here we have the first real major test of our will to stand behind this historic law and we are found wanting—we are saying that the procedural and substantive safeguards that we have established in NEPA are to be brushed aside. I think we have overreacted.

Certainly the impact statement is formidable in its complexity and volume and most assuredly the possibilities of an alternative route through Canada were discussed in this statement. Yet we all know—as the House hearings discovered—that the Canadian route was not seriously considered by the administration. This, I submit, is the real reason—indeed, the necessity—of overriding NEPA. The pipeline boosters do not want a court examining the decisionmaking process and the consideration of alternatives. I have faith in the courts and in the wisdom of NEPA and I would like to have seen this Congress defend the policy decision it made in NEPA and to abide by the results in the courts.

There is much to be said for the Canadian route, not only because it does not include a sea leg through dangerous northern waters and is not within an area of high seismic activity, but because the oil would flow to the Midwest—the area that needs it most. I certainly hope that other major energy decisions we must make in the future will not be made in the same manner.

In addition to the NEPA issue, I am concerned about additional provisions of section 203 which are aimed at minimizing the possibility of judicial review.

Recognizing the constitutional problems and fearing they jeopardized the legislation, the administration urged during the conference that the total preclusion of judicial review be relaxed to include a review of due process claims and those claims alleging that the Secretary had acted outside the scope of his authority. Other than these claims—and any challenge to the constitutionality of this act, all of which must be filed in 60 days—judicial review of any decision approving the construction of the pipeline under any law is precluded. This is another dangerous precedent even if it withstands constitutional attack, for it effectively insulates from review all kinds of decisions that are yet to be made by any number of Federal officers about different aspects of the pipeline during its construction. I do not think Congress, in all its wisdom, can look ahead and make such a bold determination. Nor, do I think it is fair to make a potential litigant rush his case into court under the pressure of this unique 60-day statute of limitations.

The disruption of the normal judicial process does not, however, stop here. Section 203(d) places jurisdiction of any such claim in a single Federal district court. This provision was not in the House bill and the Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The language added in conference is ambiguous at best. It appears to narrow the choice of a forum and to preclude a suit—in the District Court for the District of Columbia, for example—if a claim is first filed elsewhere. It also would divest the District of Columbia District Court of its present jurisdiction over the case if a claim is filed elsewhere. It is no secret that corporate defendants would rather avoid the Federal bench in the District of Columbia whenever possible.

Even more objectionable is the fact that the only appeal from this Federal district court is directly to the Supreme Court, bypassing the circuit court of appeals. While the former House proposal for a three-judge court also received a good amount of well-deserved criticism, the single-judge, direct-appeal provision is almost unprecedented. It is a radical provision that the judiciary will surely criticize harshly, for it tampers with the appellate process and was done without any input by the judicial community or appropriate committees of the Congress.

Moreover, the report may not even provide for review by the Supreme Court. The language does not require review by the Supreme Court but is instead permissive. The only statute which requires direct review by the Supreme Court from a single district court does so only if that court has held that a Federal statute is unconstitutional. There is no guarantee that the Supreme Court must hear this case if the district court upholds the Congress. The Supreme Court does have the power to reach down for a case if in its discretion it chooses to do so, but this is a doubtful proposition. Thus, we have a situation where a single Federal judge may soon decide that this law is constitutional and the Supreme Court will not have to accept review. The language of section 203(d) does not, in my opinion, require they do so.

There is yet another controversial provision in section 203(d) of the bill. Language was added in conference, which was not in the House-passed bill, that prevents the Federal court that does hear a claim under this act from issuing any kind of temporary injunctive relief. My feeling is that this is an uncalled for and onerous departure from our normal judicial procedure. We are telling the Federal district court that it cannot, under any circumstances, use its inherent equitable powers to issue a temporary injunction. Again, I think we have gone too far.

These are all serious problems which detract from the rest of the bill. They are a product of the crisis atmosphere under which this legislation was considered. I for one do not believe the Alaskan timetable is justification for such a gross departure from our appellate process. It is clear that the oil will not be flowing for years and there is the very distinct possibility that antitrust litigation will further delay activities on the North Slope. The bill does not affect the antitrust laws and serious questions remain as to whether these laws have been violated.

A primary goal of this legislation—and one that took a back seat to the Alaskan right-of-way during deliberations in the House—was to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. It was this law that the court in Wilderness Society against Morton held had been violated and which in turn led to this legislation.

The act has been amended to do the following:

First. It gives the Secretary broader authority to grant rights-of-way across Federal lands. The important change is that the Secretary can grant a right-of-way wider than the previous 50-foot limit if he finds it necessary to do so for construction or environmental reasons. This change is to negate the narrow holding in the Wilderness Society decision.

Two. This act will apply to rights-of-way only for oil and gas pipelines across most Federal lands. The Secretary has broad authority to promulgate regulations concerning the issuance, duration, and termination of the permits. The environmental standards included in the original House bill are also returned.

Three. The costs of right-of-way applications will be borne by the applicant who must also provide a bond or other security where the Secretary deems it necessary.

Four. All pipelines and related facilities are to be considered common carriers and cannot discriminate as to oil and gas products carried whether produced on Federal or non-Federal land.

Five. The Secretary shall review the need for a system of right-of-way corridors which would minimize environmental damages and submit his findings to Congress.

Six. Existing right-of-way permits may be confirmed by the Secretary if they comply—to the extent practical—with this act.

Seven. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations as to liability standards for the permitholder's liability to the United States, including in his discretion, strict liability. Liability to third parties injured by pipeline incidents will be left to State law except on Federal enclaves under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Eight. It provides for reporting annually to the Congress on the administration of this title and when an application for a right-of-way is made that will exceed 24 inches.

Nine. It also directs the Secretary of Transportation to inspect all pipelines and facilities on Federal lands annually for safety purposes and to report to Con-

gress and the administration on any safety or environmental hazards.

Finally, the bill requests that negotiations with Canada be undertaken to explore the feasibility of other pipelines across Canada and the arrangements which must accompany any such agreements. The President is directed to report to Congress on the results of these deliberations.

This is an important provision and one welcomed by those of us in Congress that have felt all along that the Canadian route might well be the better alternative.

There were tradeoffs that necessarily had to be made in this legislation. Both Houses of Congress had decided that the need for oil far outweighed even any possible delays in getting it to our refineries and automobiles. The oil will be consumed and the North Slope fields some day depleted, but the Arctic wilderness will, of course, never be the same. Perhaps we are irrevocably committed by our industrial and mobile society to making these environmental sacrifices. I remain, however, optimistic that we can keep our perspective and search for alternatives that will be more in the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act's promise that we "fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations."

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works and chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Alaska pipeline bill.

As we all know, the Nation is facing a severe energy crisis which has been intensified by the cutback on oil exports.

The alternative route through Canada does not appear to be a reasonable solution to the problem since it is estimated that the use of this route would occasion a delay of 4 years, would involve construction of a pipeline twice as long as that to the coast and would also involve the payment of royalties to the Canadian Government.

There is a great and urgent need to get on with the task of developing the Alaskan oilfields and transporting the oil by the most direct and shortest route possible to the United States.

This conference report will accomplish this objective.

There has been some discussion of the so-called nongermane amendments included in this report by the Senate.

The Senate by its rule can adopt such amendments and after reviewing the amendments to this bill, I can find no solid basis for objection to the conference report at this time.

These miscellaneous provisions include an amendment to the Ports and Waterways Act of 1972 providing for vessel construction standards and establishment of a vessel traffic control system for the Port of Valdez—where the oil would be piped for water shipment to the continental United States.

This provision would provide additional protection for the environment and lessen the chances of oil spillage and pollution—I can see no objection to this provision.

Another Senate provision would require Senate confirmation of the Director of the Energy Policy Office and the Director of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration.

This provision which represents an attempt to restore some of the proper and appropriate powers and prerogatives of the Congress should be accepted.

Another Senate provision provides that the first sale of oil and gas from stripper wells—involving not more than 10 barrels a day—would be exempt from price restraints of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

This appears to be a reasonable provision and hopefully would stimulate new oil and gas exploration and discovery.

One provision would provide for advancement payments to Natives under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act—this appears just and reasonable.

Another Senate amendment would strengthen the powers of the Federal Trade Commission to fight deceptive trade practices and would allow regulatory agencies to send questionnaires to business without approval of the Office of Management and Budget. Under the bill the General Accounting Office would provide advisory screening services of proposed questionnaires.

May I say that I have introduced similiar legislation to strengthen the powers of the Federal Trade Commission in its efforts to curb false and deceptive trade practices. It is manifestly untrue that these provisions represent the death knell of small business in America.

I see no justification for a budget bureau having censorship control over regulatory agencies which are creatures of the Congress—the GAO can provide ample screening and coordination of questionnaires.

Therefore, I favor the major thrust of the bill, the construction of the Alaska pipeline, because of the energy crisis.

And I support the conference report with the amendments, because they are reasonable, equitable, and serve the public interest.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal today about the technicalities and the rules and so forth. I think it is time we hear just as much about the plight of the small businessmen.

As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Small Business for several years, I have been exposed to example after example of anticompetitive and predatory practices on the part of big business against small businessmen in the oil business and the dairy business and other businesses.

A provision in this bill would permit the FTC to secure injunctions on their own as necessary. By the time the FTC goes through the procedure of the cease-and-desist order and obtains a final court order to that effect, these small businessmen are sometimes long since gone and they are out of business for 2 or 3 years. If we are going to preserve small business in this country it is time for us to do something now and do it in this bill instead of waiting another 10 years for the appropriate committees to report out that legislation—which they have not reported out in the last 10 years.

The Federal Trade Commission is charged by its statute with assuring fair, free, and honest competition in the marketplace, but their ability to do so has been limited. The primary tool they have been authorized to use is the cease-and-desist order. As a practical matter, a determined and aggressive corporate giant can postpone the final date of such an order for years after the first complaint is issued. During this period millions of consumers may be misled by its false advertising and honest competing businessmen are unlikely to survive unless they are possessed of resources of extraordinary size. Mergers may be completed and the merged companies and markets so changed that the competitive situation can never be restored. Small businessmen especially are at a great disadvantage.

The situation may be equally bad for dealers and franchisees who may see their life savings wiped out before the abuse is finally stopped. All of the areas within the Commission's jurisdiction support examples of anticompetitive and anticonsumer practices whose short range results are simply not reversible by the eventual cease-and-desist order issued months or even years after the practice has ceased to be necessary.

Without injunctive powers the Federal Trade Commission frequently is left with having to impose remedies that are conspicuously inadequate. Even in instances where the anticompetitive nature of the conduct is obvious, the FTC lacks the power to provide the sort of immediate remedy needed to insure the survival of small business. Even the consent order procedure takes time. And firms determined to pursue an illegal course of action are unlikely to consent to strong remedies. The Commission may rule the conduct illegal but during this operation the patient may die. A timely example is the spring curtailment of gasoline to independent marketers by the integrated oil companies. Though that action may ultimately be ruled illegal by subsequent court proceedings, there is little hope of saving the small independent gasoline dealers who already have been forced out of business. Armed with authority to seek injunctions at the incipiency of the curtailment the Commission would have been in a position to prevent the collapse of much of the independent sector of the retail gasoline industry.

There are innumerable areas where the Commission, with the aid of these powers, could halt anticompetitive practices at an early stage, preventing significant damage to small business. Large-scale predatory pricing in geographic markets has been a time-honored means by which large, subsidized companies

eliminate effective competition from small business in a market. Dominant national producers of retail products have engaged in prolonged price wars, featuring sales below cost, extensive consumer and trade promotions, and massive advertising in order to either prevent the entry of new competitors or inhibit aggressive marketing by smaller regional and local producers. Their expensive campaigns cannot be matched by the smaller competitors, and the campaign frequently forces the smaller firm out of the market. An injunction during the initial stage of such campaigns is needed to save the smaller producers.

There are countless situations where this power would be used to benefit both the small businessman and the consumer. It is a common practice for cosmetic companies to force upon the small retail drug stores a "full line" of cosmetic items when the druggist only wants one high turnover, inexpensive cosmetic product. The coercive tying of the high-profit, inexpensive item with a "full line" of expensive, low-volume products clogs the druggist's shelf space and reduces his capacity to sell competing products of other cosmetic producers.

The local recreation equipment distributor who wishes to carry a certain brand of recreation equipment is forced to accept other parts and accessories which may be of low quality or too expensive for the distributor's purposes. A small producer may have his excellent product disparaged through the advertising of a dominant competitor with extensive national advertising which the small producer is unable to match. *L. G. Balfour Co.* v. *F.T.C.*, 442 F.2d 1 (7th Cir. 1971).

In the petroleum industry gasoline retailers are induced to carry only tires, batteries, and accessories produced by a company partially owned by a dominant oil company.

The practice in many sectors of enforcing suggested and artificial retail prices in situations where the retailer must reduce the price in order to be competitive, suggests the need for immediate action to stem the demise of the small, minimally financed retailer.

A last example is franchising, which now encompasses over 500,000 small businesses. Franchisees have been prey to many anticompetitive practices which unduly burden the small "Mom and Pop" business. For instance, it is common to require the franchisee not only to purchase the right to use the trade name, but to accept a variety of items from the franchisor which are expensive and could be purchased at a lower price from a third party.

The sophisticated means by which dominant sellers and buyers may injure small business and the consumer are almost limitless. Experience teaches that the cumbersome adjudicative processes of the Federal district court and the FTC are ill-suited to assist small business at its time of greatest peril—when larger, better financed competition seeks to destroy or hinder competition. The injunctive provisions of this bill provide a sorely needed means by which the small businessman can be aided at the incipient stage of such conduct.

The example of where this power is needed could be multiplied endlessly. The recent case of the advertiser who planned to enclose sample razor blades in the Sunday paper without adequate protection for children is typical of the protection consumers need. A cease-and-desist order against this advertiser would do nothing to aid the children injured by this thoughtless practice. False advertising campaigns usually have a "life expectancy" shorter than the proceedings necessary to order their cessation.

The very existence of the power to seek injunctions will halt many of these abuses. The inability of the Commission to do anything practical for their survival is at the heart of the failure of many small businessmen to complain or resist the predatory practices of their larger competitors and suppliers. The possibility of injunction should give serious second thoughts to those who plan a quick "killing" and withdrawal before retribution occurs.

Without this injunction power consumers have no protection at all during the pendency of the suit and competitors must have sufficient resources to survive or to finance the complex litigation necessary to assert their rights. Two recent cases, the IBM-Telex case in Texas and the ITT Continental-Homestead Baking case in Denver indicate the continuing existence of predatory practices in the American economy and the tremendous strain of such practices to even the most well heeled of competitors. In these cases the victims were sufficiently well off that they could afford the enormous legal costs necessary to assert their rights. There is no similar protection available to either consumers or less well heeled victims.

This is not to indicate that there will not be serious and careful checks upon the use of this injunctive power. The Commission itself will not be empowered to issue injunctions. It will have to go to a U.S. district court judge and establish a series of carefully delineated preconditions before the judge will be empowered to issue an injunction. Among these requirements is that the Commission must establish a probability of success before the injunction will issue. This requirement alone will prevent the power from being used in frivolous and insubstantial cases. It is only good sense that where there is a probability that the act will eventually be found illegal and the perpetrator ordered to cease, that some method be available to protect innocent third parties while the litigation winds its way through final decision.

For these reasons, I urge adoption of the conference report and defeat of the motion to recommit.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the committee.

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we have had this legislation before the House here for a number of years. It was brought to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We have worked on it since January this year and we are here today with the conference report that was worked out with the conferees. All conferees signed the report. Everything that is here before us today is germane under the rules of Congress.

We used the Senate bill. The Senate bill was brought to test here on the floor. We amended our House provisions into it and sent it back to them.

Now we have perfected a bill that would get the Alaskan pipeline on its way and allow for some oil to flow within a period of 5 years from Alaska into the 48 States.

I believe if we are going to recommit this today, we are going to go through the whole process all over again, because when we meet in a conference between the Senate and the House, there are certain things to compromise on.

I believe the FTC is an agency of our Government set up for certain purposes and the Office of Management and Budget is another agency of the Government. It does not have too much in the way of jurisdiction over the matters that the Federal Trade Commission actually has under its jurisdiction.

I believe placing this under GAO is going to give us a better operation to give better protection to the small businessman throughout the United States.

I do want to place at this point, Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, my analysis of section 408 and section 409 in the RECORD, as well as a letter from the Federal Trade Commission in support of the provisions that are in this bill.

My analysis is as follows:

ANALYSIS—SECTION 408 OF SECTION 1081

Subsections 408(a) and (b)—These subsections are prefatory, setting out in preamble form the findings and purpose which justify the need for the specific amendments contained in Section 408.

Subsection 408(c)—This subsection would amend Section 5(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act by increasing from $5,000 to $10,000 the civil penalty for violation of final orders of the Federal Trade Commission. The proposed increased maximum fine is in the nature of a modernization rather than a revision, made necessary by twenty-five years of inflation since the $5,000 limit was prescribed in 1938. This provision in no way affects the Commmission's substantive authority.

Subsection 408(d)—This subsection is designed to eliminate the delays which are necessarily incident to the Commission's required reliance upon the Attorney General to represent the Commission in the Federal courts. It would leave undisturbed the Attorney General's present authority to represent the Commission in the courts, but would authorize the Commission to appear by its own attorneys and in its own name should the Attorney General not take the action proposed by the Commission within 10 days. Such representation would be authorized in all civil proceedings arising under the Federal Trade Commission Act and would include among other actions, petitions for injunctions pendente lite, actions to enforce subpoenas, and civil penalties for failure to furnish reports required by Commission orders entered pursuant to Section 208 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. For many years prior to 1968, when its authority to do so was put in doubt by the holding in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Guignon*, 390 F. 2d 323 (8th Cir. 1986), the Commission enforced its own subpoenas in the Federal courts. The enactment of Section 408(d)

would restore this subpoena enforcement power to the Commission. A number of other independent agencies (including the SEC, ICC, and CPSC) are already empowered to handle most or all of their own litigation.

Subsection 408(e)—This subsection would narrow the exemption from the Commission's investigative and information gathering autority which now applies to federally regulated banks and common carriers by providing that this exemption will not preclude such investigative activities where necessary to the investigation of a corporation, group of corporations, or industry which is not, or only incidentally, engaged in banking or common carrying. This provision could have been quite useful, for example, in the Commission's recent investigation of the petroleum industry, at it would clarify the Commission's authority to compel production of data from pipeline companies, notwithstanding their common carrier status.

Subsection 408(f)—This subsection would authorize the Commission to seek temporary or permanent restraints of imminent or actual violations of the laws under its enforcement cognizance. When vigorously contested, the Commission's cease and desist order proceedings must be measured in terms of years, despite the serious public injury which can continue during their pendency. In especially aggravated cases, it is essential that the Commission have authority to prevent the aggregation of serious public harm during the period required for the Commission to complete cease and desist order proceedings and attendant appeals. Prompt judicial determination of the relative merits of the respondent's right to continue a questioned course of conduct versus the public need for an immediate injunction has the further dual advantage of assuring due process to the respondent and, if the injunction is granted, of eliminating any incentive for action by a respondent taken for purposes of delay. Enactment of this section would provide the Commission with comparable authority to that already possessed by the Attorney General in antitrust cases.

Subsection 408(q)—This is a technical amendment which brings Section 16 of the Federal Trade Commission Act into conformity with subsection 408(d).

ANALYSIS—SECTION 409 OF S. 1081

Section 409—Under this section the General Accounting Office replaces the Executive Office of the President (Office of Management and Budget) as the screeening and clearinghouse authority for processing identical information gathering questionnaires directed to more than nine persons which are originated by the independent Federal regulatory agencies. Advice to such agencies concerning such questionnaires submitted to the GAO for clearance would be advisory rather than mandatory and the GAO would be required to communicate such advice within 45 days.

In amending the Federal Reports Act Section 409 is precisely tailored to eliminate undue delay and to remove control, or the appearance of control, by the Executive branch over the investigative and enforcement activities of the independent regulatory agencies without sacrificing the important goals which prompted the enactment of that Act in 1942. There will thus be no hiatus in the program to safeguard the business community from redundancy and arbitrariness in the collection of data by the Government, as the General Accounting Office will perform all of the functions of OMB which are necessary to achieve that end.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., November 9, 1973.

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: In your letter of November 2, 1973, you asked for my views on the significance and practical impact of those provisions of S. 1081 which involve the authority of the Federal Trade Commission and the administration of the Federal Reports Act.

As I have previously stated, I believe that Section 408 of the bill, if enacted, would greatly enhance the Commission's effectiveness in discharging its Congressional mandate to prevent unfair and deceptive business practices and unfair methods of competition. The major provisions of this section would:

(1) authorize the Commission, after notifying and consulting with the Department of Justice, to represent itself in civil proceedings arising under the FTC Act, provided the Department does not take action proposed by the Commission within 10 days;

(2) authorize the Commission to go into federal court to seek temporary injunctions to prevent the continuation of particularly aggravated violations of the laws under its jurisdiction, pending the completion of the lengthy administrative proceedings and appeals which lead to a final cease-and-desist order; and

(3) increase from $5,000 to $10,000 the maximum civil penalty for violation of Commission orders—a modernization made necessary by 25 years of inflation since the $5,000 limit was enacted in 1938.

Each of these provisions is essentially a "gap-filling" measure; none would increase the Commission's substantive jurisdiction in any respect. This becomes evident when one realizes that a number of other independent agencies (including the SEC, ICC, and the CPSC) are already empowered to handle most or all of their own litigation, and that for many years prior to 1968, when its authority to do so was put in doubt by the holding in *FTC* v. *Guignon*, 390 F.2d 323 (8th Cir. (1968)), the Commission enforced its own subpoenas in the federal courts. In addition, the Commission already possesses the authority to seek preliminary injunctions under the FTC Act in cases involving the advertising of food, drugs, and cosmetics, and the Department of Justice, with whom the Commission shares responsibility for enforcing the antitrust laws, already has such authority under the Clayton and Sherman Acts. Each of these provisions has been the subject of hearings before Committees of both Houses of Congress, and each was incorporated, albeit in a more modest form, in S. 1219 and H.R. 6313, Administration proposal submitted to the 92d Congress.

In view of these facts, I consider the concern apparently being displayed by certain segments of the business community over Section 408 to be totally misplaced. While the added authority provided by this provision would undoubtedly increase the Commission's efficiency, I see no threat of any kind to the responsible businessman. To the extent that the Commission could be more effective in preserving free and open competition, this can only redound to the benefit of the entire system of free enterprise, and particularly to that of small business. It might be noted in this regard that the occasion for incorporating these provisions in the present legislation was the realization by yourself and other Members of Congress, at the time of the acute gasoline shortage last spring, that because it lacked the authority to seek preliminary injunctions the Commission would have been completely powerless to aid the small gasoline retailer, distributor, or refiner, even assuming there had been proof of the most blatant anticompetitive behavior by their major competitors.

Section 409 of the bill simply transfers from OMB to GAO the administration of the Federal Reports Act insofar as the independent regulatory agencies are concerned. While it is true that GAO would not have the veto power over agency requests for information currently possessed by OMB, I see in this omission no cause for alarm on the part of the business community. The Federal Reports Act was enacted to protect businessmen from duplicative and unnecessarily burdensome information requests from the federal government. Since the vast majority of such requests originate from within the Executive Branch, rather than the independent agencies, OMB will continue to bear the major responsibility in this regard. With respect to the independent agencies, it seems eminently reasonable, if they are to be truly "independent," that their proposed requests for information be passed upon by an agency responsible to the Congress, instead of by OMB. Close coordination between OMB and GAO will of course be necessary, but I see no reason to suspect that GAO will be less diligent in protecting the businessman than OMB has been.

As considerable attention has apparently been focused upon a particular FTC questionnaire with regard to which we have requested OMB approval, the proposed "line of business" form for reporting corporate financial statistics, I would emphasize not only that this questionnaire would go only to the largest of the nation's corporations, but also that the Commission is most receptive to constructive suggestions for modification of the form in order to insure that the costs of compliance will not be excessive.

In conclusion, I would reiterate that the provisions in question, while designed to close several long-overlooked gaps in the Commission's law enforcement authority, in no way extend its substantive reach, nor subject to sanctions any conduct or practice not already covered by the laws under the Commission's jurisdiction. If enacted, they will mean significant benefits for the American consumer and the small businessman, and a greater return on his dollar for the individual taxpayer.

Sincerely,

LEWIS A. ENGMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I will vote to recommit the Alaska pipeline bill to the conference committee, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. I would have preferred a separate vote on each nongermane amendment, but our leadership has found a way to deny us those votes. Therefore we have only the alternative of the motion to recommit.

Rarely a week ago this House faced a similar situation. A needed bill, the military authorization bill, came from conference with a nongermane Senate amendment. We yielded to the Senate, thereby flaunting our own rules and obviously encouraging the Senate to indulge in further whimsical activities.

Time after time we have been blackmailed into accepting nongermane Senate amendments to the debt ceiling bills.

Today we are asked to accept four Senate amendments, clearly nongermane, to a bill we all want passed as quickly as possible. The old Senate blackmail seems likely to triumph again.

If we vote to recommit, we can get a bill back today.

If we do not vote to recommit, we ratify, without debate or discussion, or even reading, nongermane matters pending before one of our committees which the House has not even considered. In the name of expediency we will be abdi-

cating our responsibilities to legislate responsibly. Worse, we will have conceded our authority to the Senate.

In times when we bemoan the erosion, or the pilfering of our prerogatives, how dare we vote to throw them away ourselves? How can we tell our constituents that the legislative branch is carrying out its responsibilities if we cannot even following our own rules.

In this case, I believe the unworthiness of the amendments are less important than the need to uphold the prerogatives of the House. The pipeline bill itself is essential. I support the pipeline bill strongly on a basis of need, but the Senate amendments are lacking in merit.

Sections 404 and 405, which would allow the Senate to disapprove, or fire, the incumbent directors of both the Office of Energy Policy and the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration are unpleasant enough. I seem to remember the House going through the motions on a similar OMB bill, not too long ago. These alone could cause major problems. But sections 408 and 409 are far more objectionable. Section 408 would authorize the Federal Trade Commission to take its enforcement actions directly into the Federal courts if the Justice Department does not act within 10 days. Presently the Commission is entitled to seek a preliminary injunction for situations where a threat to individual safety is raised by dangerous flammable products or false advertising of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. This bill would grant them the right to take action, which they alone would enforce, pending the outcome of their own internal administrative proceeding. The recommit motion provides 60 days, which makes more sense.

This section also grants the FTC the authority to examine and require reports from banks and common carriers in the course of investigations which are not directed at either banks or common carriers.

Section 408 should be considered on its own merits by a committee of this House. The Senate has already passed similar provisions on to us in this FTC warranties bill. S. 356 now H.R. 7917 is in markup in the Commerce Committee. We need that committee's recommendations.

Section 409 also has nothing to do with the construction of our badly needed pipeline; 409 transfers from the Office of Management and Budget to the Government Accounting Office the authority to review questionaires and report forms required of private industry by the independent regulatory agencies. Under the existing Federal Reports Act, the agencies coordinate with OMB.

To eliminate unnecessary reports, and to reduce the burden and cost of reporting, OMB's authority also includes the obligation to hold hearings and to solicit public reaction. In section 408 there are no provisions for holding public hearings, or rejecting conflicting or burdensome reports, or protecting confidential company data from foreign or domestic competitors. In this provision, GAO is only an advisory body. We are granting the agencies a license to run roughshod over our individual firms.

Many people seem to have the mistaken impression that this bill will only have serious effects upon our big business conglomerates. This is not so. The effect upon small business throughout the country could be drastic. In a Senate report of April 17, 1973, we note that as of December 31, 1971, there were 5,298 different types of these forms, and that various businesses were forced to allocate an estimated 130.5 million man-hours per year, not including tax forms, on Federal paper. And that it cost our small businesses an estimated $18 billion yearly to fill out these forms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask today that this body stand up today for itself. I ask that it not pretend it is a branch office of the other body. I ask it to stand up for its own rules. Senatorial courtesy may be a revered custom on the other side of this building, but it has no place in careful lawmaking. I hope this House votes to recommit. Let us prove that we are not content to be Senate doormats forever.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. VIGORITO), a member of the committee.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we realize how serious a problem we are facing today. We have a crisis. It is an energy crisis. It is an oil crisis, because oil provides 50 percent of our total energy needs as of today.

In 1970 we had a daily oil production of 11-million barrels.

In 1971 we had 10-million barrels daily production.

In 1972 we had 9.4-million barrels.

This year we are producing oil at the rate of 9.3-million barrels of oil. By the time we complete the Alaska pipeline, we may be down to 7-million barrels.

It is most urgent that we proceed now with the pipeline in Alaska.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues will recall, I opposed the legislation when it was before the House previously. I wish to announce to this body and to my colleagues that I intend to support the conference report, and that I intend to vote against the motion to recommit the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report (No. 93–617, Oct. 31, 1973) on S. 1081. It is tragic that the American people must forego environmental protection and safeguards afforded by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the judicial system under the threat of an oil crises. This crises has arisen, in part, because the shieks of the Middle East are trying to bludgeon us into supporting them 100 percent in their long struggle with Israel, and in part because this Government's energy policies and planning have been dictated by the oil and minerals industry and their handmaidens in the executive branch.

I shudder to think where we would be today if Congress had not passed NEPA and dedicated public-minded citizens had not looked at the judicial branch to force the oil-industry-dominated Interior Department to go slow on the approval of a pipeline across Alaska. Indeed, the safeguards and procedural requirements included in title II of the conference report would not have evolved, if it were not for NEPA and the courts.

I am not at all certain that title II of this conference report, particularly section 203, will survive a court test. But I am satisfied that Congress, at least, in rescuing the executive branch in this so-called energy crisis, has taken some giant steps to protect the public interest and our environment. Let us all hope that Interior's experts and those of the oil industry are correct that a pipeline can be built and operated safely.

Mr. Speaker, title I of the conference report is a vast improvement over earlier versions. This title, I am convinced, could not have been enacted in Congress with such haste if it were not for the fact that it is piggybacked on the Alaska pipeline title.

Section 28(a) authorizes pipeline rights-of-way across all "Federal lands," except National Park System lands, Indian trust lands, and OCS lands.

Thus, it is possible that such pipelines could cross National Wildlife Refuge System and Wilderness System lands. Section 28(b), however, requires, as to Federal reservations—which include, but are not limited to, lands of the above two systems, the National Forest System, the National Grasslands, Scenic Trails, and military reservations—a determination which quite clearly must be in writing and made available to the public that such right-of-way "would be inconsistent with the purposes of the reservation." This is helpful.

Sections 28 (f), (h), and (k) all provide for the issuance of regulations. These regulations are subject to the rulemaking procedures of 5 U.S.C. 553. The regulations must be published and promulgated before any new applications are considered.

Section 28(h)(1) contains a disclaimer that section 28 does not in any way affect the requirements of NEPA. Thus, NEPA applies to section 28 pipeline right-of-way applications and actions. In addition, the environmental impact statement requirements of section 102(2)(C) of NEPA also applies to such applications and actions where they meet the criteria of that section of NEPA.

Section 28(h)(2) requires applicants "for a new project which may have a significant impact on the environment" which includes any application for a right-of-way across any Federal reservation or part thereof shall "submit a plan of construction," et cetera. It is my understanding that the public will have an opportunity to review the plan and to comment on it in writing and at the public hearings concerning, among other things, its adequacy in terms of compliance with this section.

Sections 28 (i) and (j) relate to certain disclosure and technical and financial capability requirements. It is my understanding, based on the language of the conference report, that any data obtained under these two sections must be available to the public. Fortunately,

there is no basis in the conference report for any claim by the Secretary of the Interior or the applicant that such data be kept confidential. I hope none is made.

Section 28(k) of the conference report, page 4 states:

> The Secretary or agency head by regulation shall establish procedures, including public hearings where appropriate, to give Federal, State, and local government agencies and the public adequate notice and an opportunity to comment upon right-of-way applications filed after the date of enactment of this subsection.

In discussing this section, the conferees note that it "does not require public hearings that would duplicate the public participation procedures required by" NEPA. The "public participation procedures" reference of the conferees is somewhat confusing, since NEPA itself does not require public hearings in connection with section 102(2)(C) of NEPA. But Executive Order 11514 (March 5, 1970) which implements NEPA requires all Federal agencies to develop "procedures to insure the fullest practicable provision of timely public information and understanding of Federal plans and programs with environmental impact in order to obtain the views of interested parties." These "procedures" must include, "whenever appropriate, provision for public hearings." Thus, it is my understanding that, unless a public hearing is held pursuant to the NEPA environmental impact statement process, as supplemented by the above Executive order, in connection with a pipeline application, a public hearing on such application under section 28(k) will always be "appropriate."

At this juncture, I note that section 28(p) provides for the joint use of rights-of-way. This provision is quite timely and important, because I understand that there exists a proposal to transport natural gas by pipeline from Prudhoe Bay in Alaska to the lower 48 States. One company is preparing even now to apply to the Federal Power Commission for authority to construct such a line through a route that would pass through a national wildlife area in Alaska. Another company wants to run the line along the trans-Alaska pipeline route. It is my understanding that Interior officials are looking at five alternative routes, but these two companies have paid scant attention to all five, let alone thoroughly evaluating each one. Section 28(p) can quite properly be the basis for Interior or the public requiring both companies and Interior and the FPC to fully evaluate each route. We do not want or need another Alaska oil-pipeline debacle from the Interior Department.

Section 28(g) directs that Interior "shall impose" safety requirements for workers in the construction of all pipelines, including the Alaska pipeline, and for the purpose of protecting the public, including the environment. This provision applies to any ratification or confirmation of any existing right-of-way under section 28(t). I expect that Interior will consult with the Departments of Transportation and Labor regarding these safety requirements and will publish them for public comment before adoption and revision thereof.

Section 28(w)(3) requires annual inspection by DOT "of all pipelines and associated facilities" on Federal lands now and in the future and the prompt reporting of potential leaks and safety problems. Those reports will, of course, be available to the public. This is an important provision, and I intend to learn from DOT and Interior what procedures will be developed to fully carry it out and when the first inspections will begin.

Mr. Speaker, I note with great pleasure the provisions of titles III and IV of the conference report. Both of these titles are of extreme importance and I applaud the conferees for including them in the final version of the bill.

I am particularly pleased to see the provision which requires confirmation of the director of the Energy Policy Office and the head of Interior's Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration. I feel certain that at these confirmation hearings the Senate will have an opportunity to delve deeply into the operations of both of these officials. The Director of the Energy Policy Office has been called the Czar of Energy Policy within the executive branch, yet I understand that he has only 21 employees to carry out this function and to deal with the many agencies of government that have energy responsibilities. It is astounding to me that this director could carry out this function effectively with only 21 people. I am therefore asking Director Love to provide to me his estimates of the number of people needed to run the office properly and at the same time provide to me a statement of the number of people delegated from other Federal agencies on a temporary basis to run the Energy Policy Office.

I am also pleased to see the various provisions of this bill relating to the Federal Trade Commission. I note that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget has threatened veto on this bill because of this FTC provision and some other features of this legislation. It is my hope that the Congress makes it clear to the administration that should the President veto this bill the congressional deep freeze for the trans-Alaska pipeline bill may be more permanent than the permafrost in Alaska. In my opinion the merits of this bill would disappear rapidly if any of the provisions of title III and IV were excised. Such a veto would be a severe blow to the public and efforts to defuse the energy crisis.

Mr. Speaker, some Members of the House who are opposed to the FTC provisions in the Alaskan oil and gas pipeline conference report suggest that this legislation will somehow turn the FTC from a small independent agency with basic Federal antitrust and consumer protection responsibilities into the scourge of the small businessman. I am unable to discern how anything in this legislation could possibly have such an effect. The bill makes no changes whatever in the substantive powers of the FTC. It does, on the other hand, allow the Commission to exercise the powers it now has in a more efficient and less bureaucratic manner. It seems wholly irresponsible to trifle with the security of the Nation over such matters.

Indeed, I believe that the opposition to this particular part of this Alaska oil and gas pipeline legislation, specifically the proposal to recommit the bill in order to kill the FTC housekeeping improvements section, is based on a fundamental misconception about what is good for the small and medium-sized businesses which form the core of the American economy.

The antitrust enforcement efforts of the Commission have been helpful in protecting the small businessman from being swallowed up by the anticompetitive practices of many industrial giants in this country. I cannot imagine any small businessman opposing the work which the Commission has done in the antitrust field.

People who purport to represent the small businessman have suggested to me that the pipeline bill would allow the regulatory agencies to avalanche small businesses with new paperwork requirements by transferring the oversight responsibility of information demands from OMB to the GAO. Would anyone seriously portray OMB as the small businessman's representative? In fact, the OMB review procedure dealing with Federal data collection efforts has been dominated by big business interests. One look at the lists of representatives attending the past OMB review meetings, and the OMB advisory committees' implementation of the Federal Reports Act, will illustrate this point. Does anyone suggest that representatives from the Nation's giant corporations represent the small businessman?

What does this bill really do to the powers of the Federal Trade Commmission? It will permit the FTC to go to court and ask for injunctions to restrain violations of the laws it enforces. I am fully confident that the U.S. courts are capable of determining when an injunction may be necessary to protect the public.

The bill would allow the FTC to go to court on its own behalf, rather than through the Justice Department. The administration opposes this change because it would reduce the Department's control over Federal litigation. Since when is the Justice Department supposed to control the enforcement litigation of the independent regulatory agencies? Or are they supposed to be independent only until one of the regulated forces an issue into the courts?

It has also been argued recently that the powers of the FTC are somehow not germane to the Nation's energy crisis. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is precisely the time when we desperately need a strong and efficient FTC to insure that the antitrust laws are enforced in order to assure that no anticompetitve practices restrict output by the energy sector of the economy.

In summary, I believe that it would be irresponsible to recommit this measure for further consideration. No new issues have arisen. No new facts are known. The Nation's security deserves congressional action to solve the energy crisis, not more delay.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, if the House gives in to the Senate by accepting the nongermane amendments to S. 1081, the trans-Alaskan pipeline authorization conference report, it will have moved that much closer toward undermining the sound legislative procedures upon which we have operated and been guided by.

These amendments, sections 408 and 409, were never considered or voted upon when this bill was before the House. The other body stowed them on board the pipeline bill knowing how important that construction authorization is in meeting the Nation's energy needs in the very near future.

This take-it-or-leave-it proposition we are handed subverts the will of the House to the whim of the Senate. Surely it cannot be in the national interest for one House of Congress to be able to foist its will on the other. When laws are enacted, they should reflect a consensus of the Congress through its deliberate, thorough, and open debate. I am afraid the American people are being denied that here today by legislative bulldozing.

If the aim of the Congress is to fool the American people through slight-of-hand, then this conference report is a classic.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ).

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, there are very few Members of this House who desire to delay the construction of the Alaskan pipeline. I support the pipeline. It is my feeling, however, that the conference report contains a number of nongermane amendments that originated on the floor of the other body. This House has had no adeqate consideration of any of the matters contained in section 404, 405, 408 or 409 of the conference report.

I support the motion to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the Managers to insist on deletion of these four sections. Should this motion to recommit fail, however, I will support passage of the conference report.

I want to commend the conference committee for giving relief to the small stripper well operators. These producers operate well producing 10 barrels or less per day and would, under this legislation, be given relief from the price stabilization rulings of the Cost of Living Council. I offered a similar amendment to the oil allocation bill which came before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was reported in September. That committee in its wisdom accepted my amendment.

I do not believe recommitting this conference report will endanger the Alaskan pipeline. The members of the other body are reasonable men and will not hold the pipeline hostage for these nongermane amendments. I support recommitting this conference report.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the coal miners of the Nation support one of the nongermane Senate amendments requiring confirmation of the head of the Mining Enforcement and Safety Administration. This amendment was added in the other body by West Virginia's Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. Those supporting the motion to recommit would weaken certain provisions added by the other body to protect the consumers of this Nation.

I oppose the motion to recommit. I hope that motion will be defeated. I shall reluctantly support the final passage of the conference report, which is an improvement over the bill which originally passed the House.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would say in response to the earlier remarks by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) that the vessel liability provision was troublesome to many of the conferees. I, for one, felt that we were not fully aware of all of the implications of the provision or how it would affect pending international conventions. It certainly is my understanding that all of the conferees agreed that this area should be carefully reviewed by the appropriate committees when legislation implementing the pending conventions is considered to make sure that the liability imposed by that legislation will apply to all U.S.-flag vessels, including vessels carrying oil from Valdez, Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, again, if I may, and I know that everybody here recognizes the significance of the pipeline, the environmental, and the energy needs, but I hope that in the heat of the moment, and in the concerns of the day, we do not lose sight of what is at stake here in this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here, in my view, is in the face of the absence of any testimony, any analysis, any study by staff or Member; we are asking the House, in accepting the conference report unamended, to accept language which it does not understand. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that on that basis alone we should adopt the motion to recommit, for the purpose of the integrity of the House, of the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fallacious to state that to vote for the motion to recommit is to delay the pipeline for a year. That is simply not the case. We are talking about a day or two. This week we are going to resolve this thing, and we are not talking about any year's delay. They cannot get started until March anyway. We can have this thing on the President's desk by next week.

Please do not be seduced into opposing the motion to recommit on the basis of delay. I will guarantee that there will be a vote on the final passage of the conference report, for those who might be persuaded that, by voting for the motion to recommit, they will be interpreted as being opposed to the conference report. I can understand that political problem, and I assure the Members that there will be a vote on final passage of the conference report, win or lose the motion to recommit.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LANDRUM).

Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in all of my experience I have never seen the people all over the Nation as concerned and as disturbed and as alarmed as they are today about so many things, and particularly about the fuel crisis or the energy crisis that confronts us.

We are being charged from every corner of this Nation with having been derelict in our duties to build an energy program that would make this Nation independent of the natural resources of other nations.

Finally, we came to the point this year of passing what is known as the Alaskan pipeline bill, and all of us are being told that the earliest that we can possibly see any flow of fuel, raw fuel, through this line is 3 years.

A few moments ago I listened to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) say that in his opinion if this conference report is recommitted, it will delay the construction of the Alaskan pipeline from the estimated 3 years at the present time to not less than 5 years. Two years is an awfully long time to be cold or to have rationed gasoline.

Therefore, I have asked the gentleman from Montana to let me have the opportunity to say this and to put this question to him:

Does the gentleman from Montana have an opinion, and if he does have an opinion, what is it, concerning the delay of the Alaskan pipeline, as associated with a motion to recommit this conference report?

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to answer the question which has been put to me by the gentleman from Georgia, and the answer, I will tell the Members, is as follows:

Further delay brought by the motion to recommit will mean more than a delay of days; it could mean a delay of weeks.

The inclusion of the amendments by the Senate constitutes part and parcel of the Senate-passed bill. They were in the bill when it came over to the House, and we in the conference committee have agreed to them, because they were in the legislation when it was passed. The other body is not going to back down from its decision quickly.

Whatever compromise could be arrived at in conference between the House and Senate conferees will not be resolved just between now and Thanksgiving or perhaps just between now and Christmas. We may be talking about weeks of delay, because there would have to be a compromise from the Senate's position.

That being the case, it could very well be, as the gentleman from Alaska has warned us, that there could be a delay of construction time of 6 months to a year on the start of construction on the pipeline in Alaska because of the necessity of starting when the permafrost is frozen this winter.

I urge the House to reject the motion to recommit and permit final passage of the bill to permit as rapid a start on the pipeline as possible.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to recommit S. 1081, the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline Authorization

Conference Report with instructions to delete sections 408 and 409.

Both of these nongermane amendments, in my opinion, suffer from serious substantive and procedural defects. Section 408 would dramatically expand the authority of the Federal Trade Commission by allowing it to take its enforcement actions directly into Federal courts if the Department of Justice does not act within 10 days. This will set a precedent for similar autonomy for all other Federal regulatory agencies and the end result of such autonomy will be haphazard and uncoordinated Federal litigation efforts.

The second amendment, section 409, would delete OMB authority under the Federal Reports Act of 1942 to review requests for business information by the regulatory agencies. This authority would be transferred to the General Accounting Office but the role of the GAO would only be an advisory one, with no power to prevent duplicative efforts by these agencies.

These amendments significantly expand regulatory agencies' powers in all areas. While all of us may support the concept of independent regulatory authorities, I think that it is important to recognize that a thin line separates proper regulation from bureaucratic overregulation. I strongly suspect that the implementation of sections 408 and 409 of this conference report would thrust us across this line into the area of overregulation.

My second objection to these amendments is the manner in which they arrived before this body for consideration. Despite the importance of these amendments, the appropriate committee has not had an opportunity to review them, nor have any hearings been held. It would seem to me that this body is doing a great disservice to itself and to the Nation if it allows far-reaching legislation of this nature to slip through without proper discussion and review, and if it permits the established legislative process to be circumvented in this manner.

These amendments should be given serious consideration on their own merits, and should not be attached to a bill as important as the Alaskan pipeline project. It would be a tragedy if these amendments cause construction of the pipeline to be further delayed.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in recommitting the conference report with instructions to delete sections 408 and 409.

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the importance of this legislative item which we are considering today cannot be emphasized strongly enough. The trans-Alaska pipeline will provide the Nation with resources on which it will heavily depend for the years to come. Energy-saving measures are important too; however, in the long run, we are going to need the ready and dependable oil from Alaska's North Slope.

I think the conferees have, for the most part, acted wisely. They have recognized the need for the immediate construction of the pipeline system, and the conference report reflects this wisdom. In the years to come the United States must become self-sufficient for its energy sources. Recent experience in the Middle East makes this necessity particularly clear. The Alaska pipeline is the soundest and most expedient way to assure this self-sufficiency. For this reason I am supporting today's conference report, as I did the original House bill. This support, however, should not be construed as representing 100 percent agreement with all the provisions of the conference report.

My most serious objection is to the section concerning "limitations on exports." This body was very deliberate in writing provisions to insure that Alaskan oil would not be sold abroad if it were needed domestically. Such insurance is only logical.

The mechanism in the House version to limit oil exports was a prohibition on all oil transported over rights-of-way through Federal lands unless affirmatively authorized by concurrent resolution. This was strong language, but strong language was necessary to prevent oil from being exported until Congress gave a definite "go-ahead." Under the basic Senate language adopted by the conferees, however, exports can proceed unless Congress disapproves by use of the concurrent resolution. This means that once the President has given notice that oil exports will not endanger the national interest or diminish the U.S. supply of oil, exports can begin and continue unless Congress disapproves. This scheme is another chapter in the continuing story of the erosion of congressional authority.

I bring this clause to the attention of my colleagues because I believe it will create the necessary opportunity for oil companies to export their product, an opportunity which I am afraid will be exploited too readily. With the prevailing worldwide demand for oil, richer, more lucrative markets will quickly be found outside the United States. And the losers will be the U.S. consumer who will be without sufficient oil.

One part of the problem is that hard and fast data on oil supplies is hard to come by; the industry itself is the primary collector and disseminator of such information. Based primarily on its estimates, the President will make the decision to allow oil exports.

A second aspect of the procedure which disturbs me is the fact that exports can take place immediately after the President gives notice of his intention to allow them. If Congress later decides to disapprove of these exports, much of the damage will already have been done. And if Congress does not act within 60 days, the damage will be even greater.

I am sincerely disappointed that the conferees did not choose to assert itself and allow Congress to assume some of its legitimate authority. Congress should retain authority to forbid exports unless, and until, it makes the determination that oil exports would not harm domestic supplies. This type of orderly procedure is clearly the most responsible, and the only type of action that our citizens will tolerate.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 1081, the trans-Alaskan pipeline authorization. This proposed legislation is a result of an extensive 2-year study conducted by the Department of Interior and has undergone an exhaustive deliberation of both the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. This proposed legislation is by no means perfect and it may not satisfy each and every desire of every interest, but it is, like much of life today, a compromise between the demands of our Nation for its energy and the counterbalancing demands for ecological preservation.

The need for bringing fuels into the country and to increase our domestic production is conceded by all. Meeting projected demands will require both stern conservation measures and the maximization of resource acquisition. If we abandon the North Slope oil, or prolong indefinitely its delivery to market, there is no doubt in my mind that we will damage our economy and will further increase the energy dilemma in our country. This bill goes about as far as a bill can go in satisfying both demands, that for increased energy supply and that for minimum hazard to our environment.

The argument has been levied that further study and further advancement of engineering technology is necessary before the pipeline can be built to withstand the hazards of the North Slope. However, the study of the trans-Alaskan pipeline was the most extensive environmental study ever undertaken by the Government. The final environmental impact statement which was released in March 1972 required 175-man years of study by the Department of Interior and other agencies at a cost in excess of $9 million.

Congress has been kept fully appraised of the trans-Alaska pipeline system since its very conception when it was first considered 4 years ago. It is evident that Congress most now resolve this problem in a manner acceptable to the American consumer, after giving considerable attention to all necessary measures to protect the environment. I believe that this bill will meet the desired criteria that the Congress has been striving to achieve for the past 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation that is presently highly dependent upon fossil fuels. America's energy needs today are supplied overwhelmingly by fossil fuels, with oil and gas providing 77 percent. There are all kinds of estimates on fossil fuel reserves and a confusing array of predictions on how long they will last under varying degrees of husbandry. One thing is certain, fossil fuels are finite.

The construction of the Alaska pipeline will undoubtedly help to alleviate our short-term energy situation. The estimates call for at least 600,000 barrels per day to come through the pipeline in the first year, or 3 percent of our daily needs, and about 1,200,000 barrels per day will be pumped for the next 4 years working up to a capacity of 2 million barrels after 5 years.

While the construction of the pipeline

is essential to meet our present energy demands it should not be construed to mean it will solve our energy shortage or even attempt to solve it. Rather, it should serve to remind us that we must develop a national energy policy and should centralize all energy related research projects in one central agency. At least 9 of the 11 Cabinet departments presently are exercising varying degrees of regulation over the energy industries and as a result there have been instances of uncoordinated and sometimes contradictory actions.

The announced cut-off of Arab oil will drastically affect the lives of all Americans and repercussions are already being felt. Major airlines have begun to drop flight to save fuel. The administration is reviewing plans for rationing gasoline to motorists. Legislation has been proposed to impose 50 mile per hour speed limits on our highways. Efforts are being made to convert oil and gas burning powerplants to coal. All of these changes should tell us that we must devote our full attention developing alternate sources of energy.

Our country has the manpower and ability to achieve any goal it sets forth. This is best emphasized in the development of our space program and our desire to land a man on the Moon. On May 25, 1961, President Kennedy announced in a special message to the Congress on "Urgent National Needs," that the United States would make every effort to land a man on the Moon by the end of the decade. By redirecting and pumping new technology into our space program we achieved this historic event on July 21, 1969.

I firmly believe that the need exists today to centralize our energy research projects and coordinate a national energy policy. This should be one of the major goals of the 1970's. We as a Nation should accept this challenge and should do so with full force.

I am reminded of the words of the philosopher George Santayana who once wrote that—

Those who do not understand history are doomed to repeat it.

Let us hope that we have learned that we cannot depend as heavily as we have in the past on one particular source of energy but that we must develop alternate sources which can be utilized to meet our increasing demands.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline is evident and I urge the Members of this body to adopt the conference report as the initial step in meeting our energy needs. We must then strive to formulate a national energy policy and work to develop alternate forms of energy to release our dependence on fossil fuels.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report (H. Rept. No. 93–617) on S. 1081. The amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act and to the Federal Reporting Services Act that title IV of S. 1081 would effectuate, provide the Federal Trade Commission with some of the additional powers it needs to protect the public from antitrust violations and economic deceptive practices and from the disastrous impact these have on our free enterprise system.

Enactment of the proposed legislation is clearly in the public interest. During recent hearings before many House subcommittees, including my own Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law during its food price investigations, many have testified that more vigilant enforcement of the antitrust laws would have saved consumers moneys calculated in the billions of dollars. S. 1081, as reported by its distinguished conference committee, would reduce significantly procedural and organizational barriers presently hampering the effectiveness of the FTC in the discharge of its antitrust legislative mandates.

The FTC was selected by the Congress as one of the two major protectors of the public interest and national policies expressed in the antitrust laws. S. 1081 would equip the Commission with the means necessary to promote as well as to protect the important goals of our antitrust laws and the free enterprise system.

Moreover, as the energy and oil pipeline background and features of S. 1081 evidence, the legislation under consideration involves aspects of the public confidence in its representative form of government to cope with widespread and growing causes of critical shortages in food, newsprint, and other commodities, as well as in oil and petroleum products.

My distinguished colleague JOHN MELCHER and the conference committee that he chaired labored under difficult and pressure-laden circumstances. I believe that they are especially to be commended for the expeditious manner in which they have delivered this important legislation to the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the Alaska pipeline bill was before this House on August 2, I voted against it. I was disturbed by a number of provisions in the bill which I felt should have been amended, especially the provision overriding the normal requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the failure of the legislation to require a high priority study of the trans-Canadian alternative route before proceeding with the trans-Alaska pipeline.

Today I shall vote for the conference report on the bill. I am doing so because the dimensions of the energy crisis have become clearer in the intervening months. The boycott by Arab oil-producing states has underlined the urgent need for the United States to achieve as rapidly as possible a position where it will no longer be dependent on oil supplies from such unreliable sources and will no longer be subjected to such outrageous attempted blackmail.

I am also less enthusiastic about the possibility of a trans-Canadian alternative than I was in August. During the intervening months, no practical proposal for a Canadian pipeline has been made. More important, the recent action by the Canadian Government drastically increasing the tax on oil for export has brought home the realization that Canada too has interests of her own which she may choose to pursue and which may not be the same as ours. In other words, the argument in favor of an all United States route for bringing down the badly needed north slope oil has been made to seem compelling.

I remain strongly opposed to the NEPA-override provision of the bill. This provision is not only unnecessary, but in my view may cause serious delays in the construction of the pipeline because of the almost inevitable challenge to this provision in the courts. However, a vote against the conference report on this ground at this late stage would seem to be a futile gesture.

An additional reason for supporting the conference report is that the bill now contains desirable provisions adopted in the Senate strengthening the powers of the Federal Trade Commission. I am of course opposed to any effort to delete these provisions from the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the conference report on the trans-Alaskan pipeline authorization, and against any motion to recommit the bill to conference. I do want to make clear, however, that I had intended to support a rule for this bill which would have permitted separate House votes on the controversial sections of the bill which were added by the other body. Unfortunately, we were precluded in the Rules Committee from even voting on such a rule. I have, in the past, made quite clear my opposition to the practice by the other body of complicating conferences by the addition of what would have been nongermane amendments in this body. Ordinarily, we would have been permitted that opportunity on this conference report under clause 4 of House rule XXVIII. But, due to the manner in which the original House resolution on this bill was written, these controversial provisions are not technically considered nongermane, and thus, without a special rule providing for a separate vote on these provisions in the conference report, we are confronted with the unpallatable alternative of either voting the entire conference report up or down, or sending the bill back to conference with instructions to delete all four sections.

This puts us in a most difficult position, especially in view of the energy crisis and the need to begin immediate construction of the Alaskan pipeline. Sending this bill back to conference now with instructions on all four sections would not only make it difficult to resolve those issues with the other body, but would, in effect, open the entire conference report to renegotiation and further prolonged delays in the final enactment.

While it is conceivable that the conferees could resolve all these differences before this session adjourns, it is also conceivable that reopening the conference on the bill could involve a delay carrying into early next year. I am informed that a further delay in action on this bill could well result in setting back construction of the pipeline by a year due to seasonal and logistical problems connected with Alaska's severe winters.

I do not think we in the Congress want to bear the responsibility for delaying for another year our access to this vitally needed North Slope oil. If we send this bill on to the President now

and the rights-of-way are granted by the Interior Department by the end of this year, the pipeline should be completed by sometime in 1977. If, on the other hand, we recommit this bill to conference, the pipeline may not be completed until sometime in 1978.

I very much regret that the provisions which are in dispute; namely, sections 404, 405, 408, and 409, will not be given full and thorough consideration in this body, both by the appropriate committees and the full House. This is obviously the orderly and responsible way to approach such substantial and controversial issues. I also deeply regret that we are not given an opportunity in the Rules Committee to at least vote on a rule which would have permitted a separate debate and vote on each of these issues in considering this conference report. And in this regard, I might add, I would hope our Rules Subcommittee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), will soon bring to us a revised rule which will plug the loophole under which these amendments were allowed to slip through conference without being subject to the procedures of clause 4 of rule XXVIII. But all this is now water under the bridge, and we must now decide on what are our overriding national responsibilities and priorities. For these reasons, I urge immediate adoption of the conference report.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with many substantial reservations that I will vote for the conference report on S. 1081, the Alaskan pipeline authorization. Although we are in the middle of an energy crisis it is not at all clear that the oil that will become available because of this pipeline construction will relieve the crisis in any meaningful way. For one thing, it will be many years before the oil is available. Also, the Alaska route will serve to increase the already abundant oil supply in our Western States and will offer little help to the oil-starved States in the Northeast and Midwest.

I feel the major problem with this bill is that it forecloses for the moment the alternative of the Canadian route for the pipeline that would be of benefit to the heavily populated Northeast. A second major problem is that this bill eliminates any judicial review of environmental considerations and I do not favor abandoning application of environmental standards lest we create environmental chaos.

Nevertheless, the conferees did make some improvements in this bill, such as strengthening the powers of the Federal Trade Commission by giving it authority to enforce subpenas and to seek preliminary injunctive relief to avoid unfair competitive practices. I was also pleased with an amendment to the Federal Reporting Services Act that would enable Federal regulatory agencies to gather information from the industries they regulate without having to obtain prior approval from the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report to the Alaska pipeline bill, which I will vote against, represents the kind of up-against-the-wall, shotgun approach which has regrettably come to characterize decisionmaking in the energy area. It is an approach which has been developed by the oil industry and perfected by the administration in order to force policies upon the Congress and the public, policies which otherwise would be given more careful scrutiny.

Although the passage of this bill will not ease our Nation's supply shortage this winter, or next winter, or even the winter after that, the measure has been presented to Congress as an immediate solution to an urgent problem.

Congress was not asked to formulate a policy but rather to rubberstamp a fait accompli. An examination of the pipeline's history bears out this analysis. A consortium of private oil companies determined the most profitable route for the pipeline; acquired the land; built the road along it; stacked hundreds of miles of pipe along the route; brought in millions of dollars of heavy equipment; made arrangements with the State of Alaska for payments of royalties; and then, and only then, asked Congress for permission to build the line.

The administration aided the consortium in its effort by refusing to examine any alternative routes to the one proposed by the private companies, and by misleading Members of Congress as to the willingness of the Canadian Government to participate in a joint venture.

Today's expected vote will not only reflect congressional acquiescence to private initiative in the name of expediency, but will also mirror the underlying problem chiefly responsible for the present energy crisis.

I am referring to the complete breakdown of the market system, which, when operating properly, assures the equitable allocation of resources at the best price to consumers. Construction of the pipeline violates free market principles. In a competitive market, supplies are channeled to areas of greatest demand. But the Alaska pipeline will not supply oil to the drastically undersupplied upper Midwest and east coast. It delivers to the more self-sufficient west coast. This will force the majority of Americans to remain dependent on foreign supplies which are both less dependable and more expensive, or force them to develop offshore reserves, at great environmental risk which might otherwise not be necessary.

A competitive market structure would channel low-cost supplies to areas where the need is greatest, and where the cost is highest. The Alaska pipeline does just the opposite. The east coast, where multimillion-dollar profits are being made, will remain dependent on high-priced oil.

The energy crisis was created by an industry structure out of touch with the marketplace, and by an administration acting without foresight and in the interests of the oil industry. It was not caused by a lack of resources, which we have in abundance, or by consumer demand, which has increased at a steady rate over the last 15 years.

Rather, as the Federal Trade Commission reported, the energy crisis was created through the market manipulation of the largest oil companies, acting in concert to keep supplies down and prices up. The building of the Alaska pipeline will only reinforce this problem.

Until the Congress realizes that basically cosmetic proposals like the Alaska pipeline will not solve the energy crisis, the American consumer can look forward to many years of getting less energy for more money. The crisis will only be solved when we take a hard look at the cause of the shortages and act to correct the institutional structure which created it.

There are a number of positive steps the Government can take to deal with the problem. We can authorize a U.S. fuel corporation—a publicly owned corporation to develop energy reserves on public lands—thereby assuring adequate supplies of energy and at the same time providing a yardstick against which the fairness of other energy prices can be measured.

We can set up an allocation system that will assure all regions of the country equitable supplies at equitable prices. We can institute anti-trust actions against the largest oil companies, thereby returning the industry to a more competitive posture. This, more than anything else, will solve the energy crisis.

In the meantime, we can demand from the oil industry complete and accurate information on the availability of energy supplies. Since we do not know how much oil and gas reserves we have and whether or not the oil companies are utilizing these resources to their fullest possible extent, any attempt we make at policy formulation is sheer guesswork—a situation which the oil industry takes great comfort in.

These then are some positive policies we can formulate to deal with the energy crisis. But in order to implement these policies the Congress must declare its independence from the oil industry. If we do not, the day will shortly come when, as in Alaska, the oil companies will haul their rigs to the beaches of the east coast, stack their pipes along our tidal marshlands, close the gas stations along our highways, and then say to us in Congress, "The time has come for you to decide to let us drill off our shores." And what choice will we have?

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote today in favor of the Alaska pipeline bill (S. 1081) and against any effort to delete sections 408 and 409 of the bill.

Unfortunately, our need to obtain fuel from the north slope of Alaska is ahead of our knowledge of facts about fuel supply and production costs. The expected fuel shortage this winter, the Middle East crisis, Canada's recent announcement to tax oil exports to the United States at an increase of 400 percent, and the inadequate domestic oil reserves prompt me to vote in favor of this bill. The passage of the pipeline authorization bill today will authorize immediate construction of the Alaska pipeline, expand the minimum width of rights-of-way for oil and gas pipelines, and include important provisions designed to strengthen the powers of the Federal Trade Commission and limit the authority of the Office of Management and

Budget. These latter provisions are of special importance.

The Federal Trade Commission will be granted the authority to enforce subpenas issued by the Commission and to seek preliminary injunctive relief to avoid unfair competitive practices. Section 408 strengthens the Federal Trade Commission by providing it with the authority to represent itself in all civil proceedings connected with enforcement of the laws under its jurisdiction after notifying the Attorney General. This changes the current law, where the Federal Trade Commission must rely upon the Attorney General or the Justice Department whenever it needs to go to Federal court.

The bill also amends the Federal Reporting Services Act to enable Federal regulatory agencies to gather information from the industries they regulate without having to seek prior approval from the Office of Management and Budget. Presently, the Office of Management and Budget, which is an arm of the White House, is able to block Federal regulatory agencies from carrying out responsibilities delegated to them by Congress. OMB usually prevents the gathering of information from regulated industries after consulting with its powerful Business Advisory Council. This council consists of representatives of the industries from whom the information is being sought. The abuses of such a system are obvious. The present bill, in section 409, authorizes the General Accounting Office to index all available information and to review all proposed surveys. This procedure will prevent businesses, particularly small ones, from being burdened with unnecessary requests. It is not the intention of this legislation to create a great increase in burdensome paperwork, which would not be in the interests of the business community. The House and Senate conferees gave full and deliberate consideration to sections 408 and 409 before agreeing to these provisions. They are important to consumers in our country. They will enable regulatory agencies in general and the FTC in particular, to do the job which Congress intended for them without excessive dependence on the executive offices.

The oil from Alaska's north slope is of vital importance to the well-being of the American people. I have some very serious misgivings about this bill. I am not in total agreement with its provisions concerning proceedings under the National Environmental Protection Act and concerning the right of judicial review. I hope that the exception to the National Environmental Protection Act standards which we make in this legislation will not be considered a degradation of the vitally important environmental laws that have been developed by the Congress. I do not believe that the energy crisis sacrificing these environmental protection measures. I am, however, aware that recommittal of this bill to conference may result in the killing of important antitrust and consumer protection provisions, but will not improve the environmental sections. Accordingly, I cast my vote today in favor of the pipeline in this time of serious national energy crisis.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, among the provisions in the conference report which we are considering today, is a section permitting independent agencies—such as the Federal Trade Commission—to seek information from businesses without prior approval from the Office of Management and Budget. The provision requires that the independent agency obtain the certification of the General Accounting Office that the information is not already available and that it is being obtained "with a minimum burden" upon business.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly support efforts to reduce the amount of Government paperwork required of the private sector, and in hearings this spring, I pointed out that there appeared to be a woeful lack of coordination between forms required by the IRS and the Census Bureau.

But it is also true that we need more information. The energy information sources of the FPC are unbelievably bad and must be improved. In areas of public policy, such as taxation and business growth patterns, the Federal Government and the Congress are operating hopelessly in the dark.

To obtain information on who is producing what—and what the production entails—the Federal Trade Commission has proposed an annual line of business report programs. In an age of mergers, conglomerates, and multinational corporations, it has become impossible to determine who is manufacturing and controlling product lines. Such information is vital for tax policy and effective antitrust and FTC policy.

On August 3, 1973, the FTC asked the Office of Management and Budget for authority to proceed with annual line of business information gathering. Despite the fact that this FTC effort will not burden small business in any way and will only involve some 2,000 of America's very largest corporations, the FTC request has not yet been approved.

The amendment in the conference report will permit faster action on these requests and remove these independent, quasijudicial agencies from the very political control of the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. Speaker, the importance and benefit of information to the independent agencies is very well stated in the FTC's statement of purpose requesting authorization to proceed with the annual line of business report program:

II. BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM

A. THE ROLE OF INFORMATION IN THE ECONOMY

Information plays a critical role in the efficient working of a free enterprise economy. Generally speaking, the greater the amount of information which is possessed by all the groups which are interested in a given market, the more efficiently the market will work. Other things being equal, then, society stands to reap benefits from the dissemination of information.

The benefits of the dissemination of information must be weighed against its cost, of course. One potentially serious cost of the uncontrolled disclosure of information is associated with the dampening of incentives by private parties to discover new basic knowledge or to innovate. This hazard is substantially mitigated by the protection afforded by the patent, copyright, and trademark laws.

Assuming that the ability to recoup the private costs of the discovery and development of new products and technologies is reasonably well protected by these laws, attention can be turned to some specific ways in which various groups in society may benefit from the data collection and publication activities of the LB Program.

B. POTENTIAL BENEFICIARIES OF LINE OF BUSINESS DATA

The first group of users of meaningful data on separate categories of goods and services are the buyers of those goods and services. With data on sales, costs, profits, and assets, buyers are able to form judgments concerning the appropriateness of price/cost margins and profit rates.

These data will also be of great value to small business firms. The size of the expenditure needed to acquire useful financial information means that large enterprises can better afford to engage in information search. To the extent that the search and reliability analysis of available public and private sources is productive of useful information, smaller firms, to whom this type of information service is essentially unavailable, are disadvantaged. If reliable data were available from a public source, on the other hand, small firms would be able to make use of them at minimal cost.

Established firms are significant users of published data on profitability and other aspects of performance for industry categories. Most of the 4,500 private individual subscribers of the QFR quarterly publication are corporations. The LB data will be extremely useful to these firms. It will be possible for a firm to compare the performance of each of its lines of business with the performance of lines of business of other firms which produce similar products. Potential competitors, both large and small, would benefit greatly from the LB data. Firms which have resources which they wish to invest in some activity, whether they are newly organized or already established, will seek those activities which offer the greatest return for the investment. Where data on the actual returns which established producers are earning in various industries are not available, or where the available data are of poor quality because of the intermingling of primary and secondary product data, incorrect choices of investment alternatives will be made. And that will result in an inefficient allocation of the total resources which are at the disposal of society.

The labor movement also has an interest in data on sales, costs, and profits for individual industry categories. The evaluation of the share of total sales or receipts which goes to labor can be performed efficiently only if such data are available. These data will also facilitate comparisons of labor's share among different industries. And finally, for those companies where laborers are organized on a product, or craft, basis, data on sales, costs, and profits on a line of business basis are essential to the efficient working of the bargaining process. Organized farm groups have the same need for information in dealing with suppliers and processors.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the issues before the House are complex and intertwined. There is the question of energy supplies and energy needs. There is the question of sections 408 and 409 of the conference version of S. 1081, which relate to the powers of the FTC, and other Federal agencies, vis-a-vis the business community and other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

There is the serious question of the environment involved here.

I have fought long and hard with numerous of our colleagues over many months, indeed, over many years, in order to find the best way for America to obtain needed oil supplies from the Alaskan North Slope, and at the same time protect, to the fullest extent practical, the environment of Alaska, and of the west coast coastal areas.

The problems confronting us combine all of these, and add certain new twists. Sections 408 and 409 of the conference bill provide excellent consumer protective powers and should be left intact. In fact, it can be argued that, if the FTC had had such powers 6 months ago, many small, independent gasoline businesses would still be in business.

A vote against recommittal would be quite cut and dried on this point, if the legislation did not contain the provisions exempting the pipeline project from NEPA. While many of us would favor retention of sections 408 and 409, we would be pleased to see the anti-NEPA language removed.

However, the reality of the present situation is that, were the bill sent back to conference, we would be presented not only with the anti-NEPA language intact when it came back, but also with two strong consumer oriented sections deleted. Therefore, the best course available to us is to oppose sending the bill back to conference.

I believe that we can say that many of us have fought a good fight for the environment. I am distressed over certain provisions in the legislation which I believe set poor precedents which might well encourage future "end-runs" around NEPA. I shall continue to fight efforts which would seek case-by-case exemptions from some or all of the provisions of NEPA. However, we are now faced with the realization that, if we vote this bill down today, it will be back before us in the very near future in the same form, minus the consumer protective provisions.

The final passage of this conference report, in its present form is only preferable when one considers the alternatives.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as we confront the energy crisis, let us make sure that all of our efforts to solve this crisis include strategies to maximize employment and enterprise opportunities for black citizens. The multimillion dollar trans-Alaskan pipeline project offers us a great opportunity to spur minority employment and minority enterprise. I am pleased to note that my colleague, Congresswoman BURKE has already approached the Secretary of the Interior on this subject. I submit for the RECORD her recent letter to Secretary Morton. I wholeheartedly endorse her approach.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1973.

Hon. PARREN J. MITCHELL,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MITCHELL: In response to your inquiry concerning my intention in offering the Equal Employment Opportunity amendment to S. 1081, the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline bill, I thought it would be helpful if I provided you with the following background information.

The Conference Report to S. 1081 contains this amendment in Section 403. It calls upon the Secretary of Interior to promulgate rules and regulations concerning the establishment and enforcement of an affirmative action program in all activities relating to the pipeline. I want to call your attention to the remarks which I made on the House floor during the debate of this bill regarding the intended scope and purpose of this bill. The statement appears in the *Congressional Record* of August 2, 1973 at Page 27652, and the relevant portions begin on Page 27654 thereof.

To summarize briefly my intent in proposing this amendment, I intended to have the Secretary of Interior develop regulations which would insure, among other things, that minorities and minority business enterprises were provided, to the maximum extent possible, opportunity to participate in all activities connected with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline.

This provision should also insure that minority owned construction firms, supply and material companies, transportation companies, contract consultants, engineering, architectural and managing consultating firms, as well as minority workers, will have an opportunity to participate fully in this venture. And there are many types of activities in which these enterprises should be allowed to participate, including both the actual construction, operation and repair of the pipeline, as well as the incidental and supporting activities. In the latter category, I had in mind a full range of activities including, but not limited to, storage refining and processing facilities, designing and management of logistical supply for all related facilities, worker residence transportation networks and facilities, office buildings, schools and medical facilities.

In developing the substance of these regulations, it is my intention to have the Secretary of Interior draw upon the full range of Federal affirmative action programs, adopting the broadest and most inclusive provisions possible.

I have listed a few of these programs in my August 2, 1973 Floor statement. These programs include, but are not limited to, affirmative action policies and programs under Executive Orders 11246 and 11625, Government Procurement Contracts, Minority Business Enterprises' subcontracting procedures, Small Business Set Asides and the like.

I also spoke about the enforcement procedures which were intended by my amendment. These should include the most flexible, but the most firm, enforcement procedures existing under Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Orders 11246 and 11625, and similar Federal enforcement mechanisms.

I hope this has provided you with a clearer understanding of the scope and purpose of this Equal Opportunity amendment to the Trans-Alaskan Pipeline bill. I hope that as the Secretary of Interior develops the appropriate rules and regulations implementing this section of the bill, he will call upon all parties affected by this amendment to receive their suggestions for implementing this provision.

If I may be of any further assistance to you regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

With best personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE,
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE PARREN J. MITCHELL ON THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE GUINEA GOVERNMENT

Wire service reports claim today that PAIGC has declared independence from Portugal. Luiz Cabral, brother of the late Amilcar, is reported to head a fifteen member council of state.

If this information is correct, I would like to add my name; in fact place it at the top of the list, of those calling for United Nations recognition of the Cabral government. A first step for those of us in the United States who are concerned about the liberation of oppressed peoples throughout the world is to demand that our country be one of the first to recognize the new government.

This will not be easy. It would be a decision on the part of foreign policy-makers in this country to make clear to Portugal that the ideals of the American Revolution do still bear and have consequence on our relations with foreign states. It will not be easy because within the foreign policy establishment in our country, the race question is considered (when it is considered) to be a side issue one far down on the priority list that shapes national security.

Just as recently as two months ago, I charged, during the floor debate over the Mutual Development and Cooperation Act of 1973, that this country takes three times as much money out of Africa. We need to turn that situation around. Or at least get some parity going. A first step in that direction would be the recognition of the Cabral government. A second step would be bilateral discussions on development assistance.

The news of independence then should be accepted with a commitment to push for United States and United Nations recognition as well as with exhilaration. The PAIGC has been fighting for years for territory that is rightfully theirs. Our fight in this country to make America's ideals its practice has also been a long fight. The cry in Africa rightfully is "independence". The cry here in America can only be "recognition".

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on S. 1081 known as the trans-Alaska pipeline bill. The passage of this bill could signal the beginning of the demise of the ecological movement whose continued growth is necessary for man's survival. The action we take here today is the culmination of a well planned, calculated lobbying effort that has completely overridden the processes of thought and rational deliberation that are usually found in this Chamber.

The most distressing aspect of this bill is the section that declares that the Interior Department's environmental impact statement on the pipeline satisfactorily complies with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. This section bars a court review of the findings made in that report.

The action of Congress in barring a coordinate and coequal branch of Government from carrying out its constitutional functions is always suspect on its face. What is more disheartening in this case, is that both friend and foe to this legislation are sure that it will result in grave ecological damage to the land.

The proposed route of the pipeline crosses one of the most active and high risk earthquake zones in the world. Any violent movement of the earth's crust would rupture the pipeline and cause irreparable damage to the Alaskan tundra. Second, the oil will have to be carried on part of its journey by oil tankers. It is a statistical certainty that there will be oil spills and that the marine pollution will have catastrophic effects. The bill even admits this certainty by specifying that the oil companies will have ab-

solute liability for the damages. But it is time for this Congress to learn that money will not repair the ecological damage that the oil will inflict on the land and sea.

Further this bill is being presented as a means of alleviating the energy crisis that is growing worse daily. Yet the truth of the matter is that even if we acted today, the first drop of oil would not pass through the pipeline until 1978 and it would not reach full capacity until 1980. The passage of this bill will not heat homes in New England this winter or next; it will not provide the gasoline to power the cars in cities such as Los Angeles in the near future. The pipeline will not end the energy crisis and it is time that the interest groups stop telling the people that this bill is a panacea to cure the ills of our society.

The Congress is doing nothing but ratifying the wishes of the oil groups. These special interest groups determined the most profitable route for the pipeline, acquired the land, built the road along it, stacked the pipe along the road and then as an after thought came to get congressional approval for the decision they had already made.

Congress has again been forced into a corner with a gun cocked at its head. It has decided to submit to the oil lobby rather than protect ecological interests.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. STEIGER OF ARIZONA

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona moves to recommit the conference report on the bill S. 1081 to the committee of conference, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on disagreement to title III and to sections 601 and 602 of the Senate bill.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. 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 162, nays 213, present 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

YEAS—162

Abdnor	Bauman	Burgener
Andrews, N.C.	Bray	Burke, Fla.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Breckinridge	Burleson, Tex.
Archer	Brinkley	Butler
Armstrong	Broomfield	Byron
Ashbrook	Brown, Mich.	Camp
Ashley	Brown, Ohio	Carter
Baker	Broyhill, N.C.	Casey, Tex.
	Broyhill, Va.	Cederberg
Chamberlain	Jarman	Rhodes
Clancy	Johnson, Pa.	Riegle
Clawson, Del	Jones, Okla.	Robinson, Va.
Cochran	Kazen	Robison, N.Y.
Collins, Tex.	Keating	Rogers
Conable	Ketchum	Rose
Conlan	Kuykendall	Rousselot
Coughlin	Landgrebe	Runnels
Crane	Latta	Ruppe
Daniel, Dan	Lott	Sarasin
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Lujan	Satterfield
	McClory	Scherle
de la Garza	McCollister	Schneebeli
Dellenback	McEwen	Shuster
Denholm	McKinney	Sikes
Dennis	McSpadden	Skubitz
Derwinski	Madigan	Snyder
Devine	Mahon	Spence
Dickinson	Mann	Steelman
Dorn	Martin, Nebr.	Steiger, Ariz.
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, N.C.	Steiger, Wis.
Erlenborn	Mathias, Calif.	Stuckey
Esch	Mathis, Ga.	Symms
Fisher	Mayne	Talcott
Fountain	Michel	Taylor, Mo.
Frenzel	Milford	Teague, Calif.
Frey	Miller	Teague, Tex.
Froehlich	Mizell	Thone
Gettys	Moorhead, Calif.	Thornton
Ginn		Treen
Goldwater	Mosher	Veysey
Gonzalez	Myers	Waggonner
Gross	Nelsen	Wampler
Grover	Nichols	White
Gubser	O'Brien	Whitehurst
Guyer	Parris	Wiggins
Hanrahan	Passman	Williams
Hansen, Idaho	Pickle	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Harsha	Poage	
Harvey	Powell, Ohio	Wyatt
Hastings	Preyer	Wylie
Hillis	Price, Tex.	Wyman
Hinshaw	Quie	Young, Ill.
Holt	Quillen	Zion
Horton	Railsback	Zwach
Hunt	Rarick	
Hutchinson	Regula	

NAYS—213

Abzug	Edwards, Calif.	Leggett
Adams	Eilberg	Litton
Addabbo	Eshleman	Long, La.
Anderson, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.
	Evins, Tenn.	McCloskey
Anderson, Ill.	Fascell	McDade
Annunzio	Findley	McFall
Arends	Fish	Macdonald
Aspin	Flood	Madden
Badillo	Flowers	Mailliard
Bafalis	Foley	Mallary
Barrett	Ford, Gerald R.	Maraziti
Bell	Ford, William D.	Mazzoli
Bennett		Meeds
Bergland	Forsythe	Melcher
Biaggi	Fraser	Metcalfe
Biester	Frelinghuysen	Mezvinsky
Bingham	Fulton	Minish
Blatnik	Gaydos	Mink
Boggs	Giaimo	Mitchell, Md.
Boland	Gibbons	Mitchell, N.Y.
Bowen	Gilman	Moakley
Brademas	Goodling	Mollohan
Brasco	Grasso	Montgomery
Breaux	Gray	Moorhead, Pa.
Brotzman	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Brown, Calif.	Gude	Moss
Burke, Mass.	Gunter	Murphy, Ill.
Burlison, Mo.	Haley	Natcher
Burton	Hamilton	Nedzi
Carey, N.Y.	Hansen, Wash.	Obey
Carney, Ohio	Harrington	O'Neill
Clay	Hawkins	Owens
Cleveland	Hébert	Patten
Cohen	Hechler, W. Va.	Pepper
Collier	Heckler, Mass.	Perkins
Collins, Ill.	Heinz	Pettis
Corman	Helstoski	Peyser
Cotter	Henderson	Pike
Cronin	Hicks	Price, Ill.
Culver	Hogan	Pritchard
Daniels, Dominick V.	Holifield	Randall
	Holtzman	Rangel
Danielson	Howard	Rees
Davis, Ga.	Hungate	Reuss
Davis, S.C.	Ichord	Rinaldo
Delaney	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Dellums	Johnson, Colo.	Roe
Dent	Jones, Ala.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Diggs	Jordan	Rooney, N.Y.
Dingell	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Donohue	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Drinan	Kemp	Roush
Dulski	King	Roy
Duncan	Koch	Roybal
du Pont	Kyros	Ryan
Eckhardt	Landrum	Sandman
Sarbanes	Steed	Whalen
Schroeder	Steele	Widnall
Sebelius	Stratton	Wilson, Bob
Seiberling	Stubblefield	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Shipley	Studds	
Shoup	Sullivan	
Shriver	Taylor, N.C.	Winn
Sisk	Thompson, N.J.	Wolff
Slack	Thomson, Wis.	Wydler
Smith, Iowa	Tiernan	Yates
Smith, N.Y.	Towell, Nev.	Yatron
Staggers	Udall	Young, Alaska
Stanton, J. William	Van Deerlin	Young, Fla.
	Vander Jagt	Young, Ga.
Stanton, James V.	Vanik	Zablocki
	Vigorito	
Stark	Walsh	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ware

NOT VOTING—57

Alexander	Griffiths	Nix
Beard	Hammer-schmidt	O'Hara
Bevill		Patman
Blackburn	Hanley	Podell
Bolling	Hanna	Reid
Brooks	Hays	Roberts
Buchanan	Hosmer	Roncallo, N.Y.
Burke, Calif.	Huber	Rostenkowski
Chappell	Hudnut	Ruth
Chisholm	Jones, N.C.	St Germain
Clark	Jones, Tenn.	Stephens
Clausen, Don H.	Kluczynski	Stokes
	Lehman	Symington
Conte	Lent	Ullman
Conyers	McCormack	Waldie
Davis, Wis.	McKay	Whitten
Downing	Matsunaga	Wright
Flynt	Mills, Ark.	Young, S.C.
Fuqua	Minshall, Ohio	Young, Tex.
Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Griffiths.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Young of Texas.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Young of South Carolina with Mr. Downing.
Mr. Beard with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Huber.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Hanley.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Fuqua.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Reid with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Hudnut.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Symington.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Lehman.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Nix with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. McKay.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Lent.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.
Mr. Hammerschmidt with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Wright.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MELCHER. 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 361, nays 14, present 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

YEAS—361

Abdnor	Adams	Anderson, Calif.
Abzug	Addabbo	

Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Milford
Andrews, N.C.	Ford,	Miller
Andrews,	William D.	Minish
N. Dak.	Forsythe	Mitchell, Md.
Annunzio	Fountain	Mitchell, N.Y.
Archer	Fraser	Mizell
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Moakley
Armstrong	Frenzel	Mollohan
Ashbrook	Frey	Montgomery
Ashley	Froehlich	Moorhead,
Badillo	Fulton	Calif.
Bafalis	Gaydos	Moorhead, Pa.
Baker	Gettys	Morgan
Barrett	Giaimo	Mosher
Bauman	Gibbons	Moss
Bell	Gilman	Murphy, Ill.
Bennett	Ginn	Myers
Bergland	Goldwater	Natcher
Biaggi	Gonzalez	Nedzi
Biester	Goodling	Nelsen
Bingham	Grasso	Nichols
Blatnik	Gray	O'Brien
Boggs	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Boland	Gross	Owens
Bowen	Grover	Parris
Breaux	Gubser	Passman
Breckinridge	Gude	Patten
Brinkley	Gunter	Pepper
Broomfield	Guyer	Perkins
Brotzman	Haley	Pettis
Brown, Mich.	Hamilton	Peyser
Brademas	Hanrahan	Pickle
Brasco	Hansen, Idaho	Pike
Bray	Hansen, Wash.	Poage
Brown, Ohio	Harsha	Powell, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey	Preyer
Broyhill, Va.	Hastings	Price, Ill.
Burgener	Hawkins	Price, Tex.
Burke, Fla.	Hébert	Pritchard
Burke, Mass.	Hechler, W. Va.	Quie
Burleson, Tex.	Heckler, Mass.	Quillen
Burlison, Mo.	Heinz	Railsback
Butler	Helstoski	Randall
Byron	Henderson	Rangel
Camp	Hicks	Rarick
Carney, Ohio	Hillis	Rees
Carter	Hinshaw	Regula
Casey, Tex.	Hogan	Rhodes
Cederberg	Holifield	Riegle
Chamberlain	Holt	Rinaldo
Clancy	Holtzman	Robinson, Va.
Clawson, Del	Horton	Robison, N.Y.
Clay	Howard	Rodino
Cleveland	Hungate	Roe
Cochran	Hunt	Rogers
Cohen	Hutchinson	Roncalio, Wyo.
Collier	Ichord	Rooney, N.Y.
Collins, Ill.	Jarman	Rooney, Pa.
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Rose
Conable	Johnson, Colo.	Rosenthal
Conlan	Johnson, Pa.	Roush
Corman	Jones, Ala.	Rousselot
Cotter	Jones, Okla.	Roy
Coughlin	Jordan	Runnels
Crane	Karth	Ruppe
Cronin	Kazen	Ryan
Culver	Keating	Sandman
Daniel, Dan	Kemp	Sarasin
Daniel, Robert	Ketchum	Sarbanes
W., Jr.	King	Satterfield
Daniels,	Koch	Scherle
Dominick V.	Kuykendall	Schneebeli
Danielson	Kyros	Schroeder
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Sebelius
Davis, S.C.	Latta	Seiberling
de la Garza	Leggett	Shipley
Delaney	Litton	Shoup
Dellenback	Long, La.	Shriver
Denholm	Lott	Shuster
Dennis	Lujan	Sikes
Dent	McClory	Sisk
Derwinski	McCloskey	Skubitz
Devine	McCollister	Slack
Dickinson	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Diggs	McEwen	Smith, N.Y.
Dingell	McFall	Snyder
Donohue	McKinney	Spence
Dorn	McSpadden	Staggers
Drinan	Macdonald	Stanton,
Dulski	Madden	J. William
Duncan	Madigan	Stanton,
du Pont	Mahon	James V.
Eckhardt	Mailliard	Steed
Edwards, Ala.	Mallary	Steele
Eilberg	Mann	Steelman
Erlenborn	Maraziti	Steiger, Ariz.
Esch	Martin, Nebr.	Steiger, Wis.
Eshleman	Martin, N.C.	Stratton
Evans, Colo.	Mathias, Calif.	Stubblefield
Evins, Tenn.	Mathis, Ga.	Stuckey
Fascell	Mayne	Studds
Findley	Mazzoli	Sullivan
Fish	Meeds	Symms
Fisher	Melcher	Talcott
Flood	Metcalfe	Taylor, Mo.
Flowers	Mezvinsky	Taylor, N.C.
Foley	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.	Waggonner	Winn
Thompson, N.J.	Walsh	Wolff
Thomson, Wis.	Wampler	Wyatt
Thone	Whalen	Wydler
Thornton	White	Wylie
Tiernan	Whitehurst	Wyman
Towell, Nev.	Widnall	Yates
Treen	Wiggins	Yatron
Udall	Williams	Young, Alaska
Ullman	Wilson, Bob	Young, Fla.
Van Deerlin	Wilson,	Young, Ga.
Vander Jagt	Charles H.,	Young, Ill.
Vanik	Calif.	Zablocki
Veysey	Wilson,	Zion
Vigorito	Charles, Tex.	Zwach

NAYS—14

Aspin	Harrington	Obey
Brown, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Burton	Landgrebe	Roybal
Dellums	Long, Md.	Stark
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ware

NOT VOTING—57

Alexander	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.
Beard	Griffiths	Nix
Bevill	Hammer-	O'Hara
Blackburn	schmidt	Patman
Bolling	Hanley	Podell
Brooks	Hanna	Reid
Buchanan	Hays	Roberts
Burke, Calif.	Hosmer	Roncallo, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Huber	Rostenkowski
Chappell	Hudnut	Ruth
Chisholm	Jones, N.C.	St Germain
Clark	Jones, Tenn.	Stephens
Clausen,	Kluczynski	Stokes
Don H.	Lehman	Symington
Conte	Lent	Waldie
Conyers	McCormack	Whitten
Davis, Wis.	McKay	Wright
Downing	Matsunaga	Young, S.C.
Flynt	Mills, Ark.	Young, Tex.
Fuqua	Minshall, Ohio	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Young of Texas.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Carey of New York.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mrs. Burke of California.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Mills of Arkansas.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. Lehman.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Symington.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Young of South Carolina.

Mr. Podell with Mr. Beard.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Hudnut.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Hanley with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Roncallo of New York.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hammerschmidt.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Reid with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Lent.

Mr. Nix with Mr. McKay.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Huber.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Conte with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Ruth.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Jones of Tennessee.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

Mr. Patman with Mr. St Germain.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

NOVEMBER 9, 1973.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's office at 5:52 p.m. on Thursday, November 8, 1973, and said to contain a message from the President on energy.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.
By W. Raymond Colley.

REPORT ON THE ENERGY CRISIS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93–187)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As America has grown and prospered in recent years, our demands for energy have begun to outstrip available supplies. Along with other major industrialized nations, we are now faced with the prospect of shortages for several years to come.

Two years ago, in the first energy message ever sent to the Congress by a President of the United States, I called attention to the looming energy problem. Since that time, I have repeatedly warned that the problem might become a full-blown crisis, and seeking to minimize shortages, I have taken a number of administrative steps to increase supplies and reduce consumption. Earlier this year, I also sent more than a half dozen urgent legislative proposals to the Congress. While none of these has yet been enacted, I am hopeful at least several of the measures will be ready for my signature before year's end.

Unfortunately, the energy crisis that once seemed a distant threat to many people is now closing upon us quickly. We had expected moderate shortages of energy this winter, but four weeks ago, when war broke out in the Middle East, most of our traditional suppliers in that area cut off their shipments of oil to the United States. Their action has now sharply changed our expectations for the coming months.

Largely because of the war, we must face up to the stark fact that we are heading toward the most acute shortages of energy since the Second World War. Of the 17 million barrels of oil a day that we would ordinarily consume this winter, more than 2 million barrels a day will no longer be available to us. Instead of a shortage of approximately 2–3 per-

cent that we had anticipated this winter, we now expect that our supply of petroleum will be at least 10 percent short of our anticipated demands—and could fall short by as much as 17 percent.

ADMINISTRATION ACTIONS TO MEET THE EMERGENCY

Faced with this emergency, I believe that we must move forward immediately on two fronts: administrative and legislative.

In a speech to the Nation last night, I announced a number of immediate actions:

First, industries and utilities which use coal—our most abundant resource—will be prevented from converting to oil. Efforts will also be made to convert powerplants from the use of oil to the use of coal.

Second, reduced quantities of fuel will be allocated to aircraft. This will lead to a cutback of some 10 percent in the number of commercial flights, but it should not seriously disrupt air travel nor cause serious damage to the airline industry.

Third, there will be reductions of approximately 15 percent in the supply of heating oil for homes, offices and other establishments. This is a precautionary measure to ensure that the oil now available not be consumed early in the winter, so that we shall have adequate amounts available in the later months. This step will make it necessary for all of us to live and work in lower temperatures. We must ask everyone to lower the thermostat in his home by at least 6 degrees, so that we can achieve a national daytime average of 68 degrees. In offices, factories and commercial establishments we must ask that the equivalent of a 10-degree reduction be achieved by either lowering the thermostat or curtailing working hours.

Fourth, there will be additional reductions in the consumption of energy by the Federal Government, cutting even deeper than the 7 percent reduction that I ordered earlier this year. This new reduction will affect the operations of every agency and department in the Government, including the Defense Department, which has already led the way in previous cutbacks. As one of the steps in this Federal effort, I have ordered that daytime temperatures in Federal offices be reduced to a level between 65 and 68 degrees. I have also ordered that all vehicles owned by the Federal Government be driven no faster than 50 miles per hour except in emergencies. This is a step which I have also asked Governors, mayors, and other local officials to take immediately with regard to vehicles under their authority.

Fifth, I have asked the Atomic Energy Commission to speed up the licensing and construction of nuclear plants, seeking to reduce the time required to bring nuclear plants on line from ten years to six years.

Sixth, I have also asked Governors and mayors to reinforce these actions by taking appropriate steps at the State and local level. Among the steps which I believe would be helpful are these: staggering of working hours, the encouragement of mass transit and carpooling, alteration of school schedules, and elimination of unnecessary lighting. I have also recommended to the Governors that, consistent with safety and economic considerations, they seek to reduce highway speed limits to 50 miles per hour. This step alone could save over 200,000 barrels of oil a day.

NEED FOR EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

As essential as these actions are to the solution of our immediate problem, we must recognize that standing alone, they are insufficient. Additional steps must be taken, and for that purpose, we must have new legislation.

I am therefore proposing that the Administration and the Congress join forces and together, in a bipartisan spirit, work to enact an emergency energy bill. Members of my Administration have been consulting with appropriate leaders of the Congress for more than 2 weeks on this matter. Yesterday I met with the bipartisan leaders of the House and Senate and found them constructive in spirit and eager to get on with the job. In the same manner, I pledge the full cooperation of my Administration. It is my earnest hope that by pushing forward together, we can have new emergency legislation on the books before the Congress recesses in December.

Based on previous consultations with the Congress, I have decided not to send a specific Administration bill to the Congress on this matter but rather to work with the Members in developing a measure that would be acceptable to both the executive and legislative branches. As part of that process, I think it would be helpful to call attention to those provisions that I think should be included in this emergency bill. At a minimum, I hope that the act would:

—Authorize restrictions on both the public and private consumption of energy by such measures as limitations on essential uses of energy (office hours, for instance) and elimination of nonessential uses (decorative lighting, for example).

—Authorize the reduction to 50 miles per hour of speed limits on highways across the country.

—Authorize the exemption or granting of waivers of stationary sources from Federal and State air and water quality laws and regulations. Such actions would be taken through the Administrator of EPA.

—Authorize the exemption of steps taken under the proposed energy emergency act from the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA).

—Provide emergency powers for the Federal regulatory agencies involved in transportation to adjust the operations of air, rail, ship and motor carriers in a manner responsive to the need to conserve fuel.

—Empower the Atomic Energy Commission to grant a temporary operating license of up to 18 months for nuclear powerplants without holding a public hearing. Such actions would be subject to all safety and other requirements normally imposed by the Commission.

—Authorize the initiation of full production in Naval Petroleum Reserve #1 (Elk Hills, California) and the exploration and further development of other Naval Petroleum Reserves, including Petroleum Reserve #4 in Alaska.

—Permit Daylight Saving Time to be established on a year-round basis.

—And authorize the President, where practicable, to order a powerplant or other installation to convert from the use of a fuel such as oil to another fuel such as coal and to make such equipment conversions as are necessary.

In addition to the provisions above, all of which I believe must be enacted before December, there are a number of other authorities which should be provided as soon as possible and hopefully will be included in the emergency measure.

One such provision would grant the President additional authority to allocate and ration energy supplies. Under this new authority, the President could take such actions based solely upon energy considerations. It is my hope that rationing of energy products will never be required, but if circumstances dictate it, there should be no impediments to swift action. For contingency purposes, I have already directed that plans for gasoline rationing be drawn up and held in reserve.

Recognizing that a more efficient use of our transportation resources is necessary, we should also provide additional authority to encourage greater use of funds from the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 for mass transit capital improvements.

In addition, we should provide the Federal Power Commission with authority, during the duration of the energy emergency, to suspend the regulation of prices of new natural gas at the wellhead.

Finally, I believe it would be wise if, on energy grounds, the President were empowered to exercise any authority now contained in the Defense Production Act, the Economic Stabilization Act and the Export Administration Act, even though those acts may have otherwise expired.

MEETING THE LONG-TERM CHALLENGE

As we act to deal with the immediate problem before us, we must not ignore the need for preventing such a crisis from recurring. The leadtimes required to meet our long-range energy needs dictate that we must move on them at once.

Legislation authorizing construction of the Alaskan pipeline must be the first order of business as we tackle our long-range energy problems. The American people are depending upon the Congress to enact this legislation at the earliest possible moment, and they are depending upon me to approve it. With passage apparently imminent, I would urge the Congress not to burden this legislation with irrelevant amendments. This is no time to hold the Nation's energy future hostage to other controversial interests.

I am also requesting early action on pending legislative proposals to:

—permit the competitive pricing of new natural gas;

—provide reasonable standards for the surface mining of coal;

—provide simplified procedures for the siting and approving of electric energy facilities;

—establish a Department of Energy and Natural Resources;
—and provide procedures for approving construction and operation of deepwater ports.

Because of the critical role which energy research and development will play in meeting our future energy needs, I am requesting the Congress to give priority attention to the creation of an Energy Research and Development Administration separate from my proposal to create a Department of Energy and Natural Resources. This new administration would direct the $10 billion program aimed at achieving a national capacity for energy self-sufficiency by 1980.

This new effort to achieve self-sufficiency in energy, to be known as Project Independence, is absolutely critical to the maintenance of our ability to play our independent role in international affairs. In addition, we must recognize that a substantial part of our success in building a strong and vigorous economy in this century is attributable to the fact that we have always had access to almost unlimited amounts of cheap energy. If this growth is to continue, we must develop our capacity to provide enormous amounts of clean energy at the lowest possible cost. Thus, irrespective of the implications for our foreign policy and with the implicit understanding that our intentions are not remotely isolationist, the increasing costs of foreign energy further contribute to the necessity of our achieving self-sufficiency in energy.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 8, 1973.*

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT EWING THOMASON

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the death of a former Member of the House, Judge Robert Ewing Thomason, of El Paso, Tex.

Mr. Thomason was elected to the House of Representatives in 1930 and he served for 16 years as a Representative in Congress from the El Paso area of Texas. Prior to his having been elected to the Congress he served as speaker of the Texas House of Representatives and later as mayor of his home city of El Paso. In 1947 Ewing Thomson, as we knew him and loved him, was appointed by President Harry Truman as a Federal judge for the western district of Texas. Judge Thomason passed away last Thursday, November 8.

Mr. Speaker, there are at this time 22 Members of the House of Representatives who served here with Ewing Thomason, and I see a number of them in the Chamber at this time.

In the Chamber at this time is the distinguished gentleman from El Paso, RICHARD WHITE, who ably serves the district once represented by Judge Thomason. I shall yield to him in a few moments and I am sure he will include in his remarks some detailed information in regard to the life and work of Ewing Thomason. In the meantime, I should like to add a few words.

In the tradition of Davy Crockett and Sam Houston, Ewing Thomason was born in Tennessee and soon moved to Texas, where his life was to be an example of love and duty to one's State and country. No finer man has served in Congress during my time than Ewing Thomason.

The Thomasons and the Mahons were the closest of friends, and that friendship continued throughout the years following the appointment of Mr. Thomason as Federal judge. It is difficult to describe the fine personality of this great Texan. He inspired the confidence of his fellows. He was highly respected by Democrats and Republicans. He and his wife Abbie had a multitude of friends, not only in Congress but in the executive branch of Government.

Mr. Thomason, as a senior member in point of service on the House Armed Services Committee, was a powerful force for a strong defense program in the Congress. His contribution to national defense was quite noteworthy. He was especially active during the years of World War II, and his leadership during this period meant a great deal to the Nation.

Mrs. Thomason, known as Abbie, was much beloved in her own right. She and all members of the family have our deepest sympathy at this time of great loss and bereavement.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, was one of the Members of Congress who were privileged to serve here with Ewing Thomason for many years. We both served on the former Military Affairs Committee of the House and became very close and warm friends.

He was a delightful gentleman and had a lovely family whose company I always enjoyed.

Ewing Thomason was a dedicated American and an outstanding individual, and the House was much the better for his having served here.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from El Paso who serves in Ewing Thomason's district, Mr. WHITE.

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

One of this Nation's longest and most distinguished and accomplished public careers came to an end on November 8 with the death of Judge Robert Ewing Thomason of El Paso. Judge Thomason was well past his 94th birthday at the time of his passing, and most of those years had been spent in dedicated public service in one form or another. He started his public career in 1902 with his election to the then combined office of county attorney and district attorney in Gainesville, Tex. He later moved to El Paso—which was to be his home for the remainder of his long life—and was elected to the Texas State Legislature in 1916. He was reelected to a second term and was honored by his colleagues with the speakership of the Texas House. During this second term, Judge Thomason was prevailed upon by friends and colleagues to seek election as Governor of Texas, and even though his campaign was hampered by two called special sessions of the legislature over which he had to preside as speaker of the house, he barely lost in a runoff for the Governor's chair. As it turned out, this was the only election he ever lost. Following a short period in private practice, Judge Thomason, in 1927, was elected mayor of El Paso, and was reelected to a second term without opposition. The records show that his 4 years as mayor of the city turned out to be one of the most fruitful periods of El Paso's development from a small border cow town to the dynamic metropolis it is today.

In 1930, the 16th District of Texas, then composed of 38 west Texas counties, elected Judge Thomason to the U.S. House of Representatives where he served uninterrupted until the summer of 1947 when he resigned his seat to accept an appointment by President Harry Truman to the Federal bench in El Paso. During his nearly 16 years in Congress, his influence and prestige became widely known. Though his accomplishments were widely dispersed through the legislative spectrum, if I were asked to identify his most singular actions I would refer to his impressive record as a member of the House Military Affairs Committee, and especially his service as vice chairman of the committee during the World War II years when he coauthored all of the major legislation necessary for the successful pursuit of the war and the ultimate victory. During his long tenure as U.S. district judge, he handled cases involving matters of small concern to some of the most famous including the intricately involved Billie Sol Estes case and the first airline hijacker case. No matter how small or how large the case before him, Judge Thomason gave each one the same detailed attention and deliberation. His philosophy of justice would serve as worthy guidelines for all jurists from rural justices to the Supreme Court. Of courts, he has recorded:

> The court house where justice is administered is bulwark of our liberties and the cornerstone of our institutions of democracy. The true administration of justice is the firmest pillar of our government.

And, his opinion of what makes a good judge:

> The greatest attribute of a good judge is humility. One cannot sit on the bench, with the flag of his country unfurled at his side, without being conscious of his power, duty, and responsibility. He must rule fairly and wisely to the end that every litigant, rich or poor, and regardless of color, creed, or nationality, shall be accorded justice. That is the only way for democracy to survive in this country. Our liberties and our way of life can only be preserved by a strict adherence to our Bill of Rights and a calm, dignified and unemotional running of our judicial system by men of character, goodwill, courage, loyalty, and sincerity.

Judge Thomason was an active jurist almost until the very hour of his death. He had removed himself from the day-to-day activities of the Federal bench in the El Paso district 10 years ago, but had maintained an active role

in the district with the designation of Senior Judge. I consider myself a singularly fortunate person for having enjoyed the friendship and the valuable counsel of Robert Ewing Thomason for many years. The pain of his passing to his legions of friends and admirers throughout the land—and especially in his beloved west Texas—is eased somewhat with the understanding that his leadership and wisdom was allowed in our midst for nearly a century, and that his profound legacy will continue far into the future.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and others who are among our colleagues in expressing my sincere regret at the death of the Honorable Ewing Thomason.

During the early years of my service in the House it was my privilege to serve with Mr. Thomason on the House Committee on Military Affairs and later on the Committee on Armed Services. He was at that time one of the ranking members of the committee.

In that capacity he acquitted himself in an outstanding manner as an able and effective proponent of a sound and strong defense for America, particularly during the trying years of World War II.

I recall that he was always courteous, always responsive and responsible, and yet always effective in his work on the floor.

After he left this body to accept a Federal judgeship in his home State of Texas, I continued to follow his distinguished career with interest and I note that he continued to enjoy a reputation for outstanding service. Our Nation has been enriched by Judge Thomason's contributions.

I join in expressing sympathy to the members of his family in their bereavement.

Mr. MAHON. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the 22 Members who are still in the House who had the privilege and the honor of serving in the House of Representatives with the late Honorable R. Ewing Thomason.

As a freshman Congressman, I went on the Committee on Military Affairs, and Mr. Thomason was already a veteran member of that committee. I served with him on the Committee on Armed Services, and I also served with him on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Mr. Thomason was one of the original appointees to that committee.

I join with my colleagues from Texas and other Members of the House in expressing my sympathy to the members of Mr. Thomason's family.

Mr. MAHON. I now yield to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) in paying tribute to a great former Member of this House, a great U.S. judge, and a great American.

I was a new Member of the House of Representatives during Judge Thomason's last term here some 27 years ago. I came to know him. I often visited with him. He had lived just south of the Red River at Gainesville, which is only 4 or 5 miles from my district, in his younger years. Last summer during the August recess I happened to be in El Paso, and a friend of mine recognized me and asked me to come up to one of the civic groups that was holding a meeting. Immediately Judge Thomason found out that I was in town, and I had the opportunity to visit a minute or two with a man I always admired, and probably got to know as well as I knew any other Member with that much seniority during my first term in the Congress of the United States.

I join the gentleman from Texas in his words of appreciation for a great American and a great man.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and other Members from Texas in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our former colleague, Robert Ewing Thomason of El Paso, Tex., who passed away recently.

It was my great pleasure to serve in the House with this great and good man, Congressman Thomason. We had mutual interests as he was born in Shelbyville and Bedford County, Tenn., in the district which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

Certainly Ewing Thomason served his district, State and Nation faithfully and well during his 18 years in Congress—he resigned in 1947 to accept an appointment as a Federal judge, where he also served with distinction.

Judge Thomason had a distinguished career of public service—a triumphant career—beginning as prosecuting attorney, Congressman, and concluding as a judge, and including service as a member and speaker of the Texas Legislature and mayor of El Paso, Tex.

He lived a full and useful life and will be greatly missed.

I want to take this means of extending to members of his family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in regard to the life and service of our late colleague, the Honorable R. Ewing Thomason.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A RESOLUTION TO IMPEACH RICHARD M. NIXON

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

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in concluding his radio-television energy crisis address to the Nation, President Nixon injected unscheduled and unexpected political remarks and declared he has no intention of resigning.

Again he offered no explanation but only further promises that everything will be answered at some unspecified time in the future.

If the President's credibility, innocence, and integrity can be cleared, he owes both the office and the people an explanation now. Otherwise, it can only be concluded he bears some guilt.

I am, therefore, introducing today an impeachment resolution which I will back all the way to the best of my ability.

Heretofore, I have concentrated on efforts to allow the President to resign, thereby sparing the Nation the embarrassment and disunifying experience of impeachment and a long trial in the Senate which would require a two-thirds vote for conviction.

As part of these efforts, I cosponsored House resolutions to investigate and officially document grounds for impeachment and the appointment of a Special Watergate Prosecutor independent of the President.

Some Members of Congress beholding to the White House may require further documentation before acting. As for me grounds already exist. My impeachment resolution includes these specific crimes and misdemeanor charges:

First. Refusal to produce tapes, documents, and other material for inspection as ordered by the court;

Second. Deprived the people of a full and independent investigation and prosecution of certain crimes committed by employees of the executive branch;

Third. Violation of first and fourth amendments by establishing a personal secret police, which engaged in criminal acts including burglaries, wiretaps, and perjury;

Fourth. Participated in obstruction of justice by offering a high Federal post to the presiding judge during the Ellsberg-Russo trial, and burglary of one of the defendant's psychiatrist's office; and

Fifth. Violated the Constitution and laws in ordering the dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity despite statutory authority extending this Office—and did impound more than $40 billion appropriated by Congress for domestic programs affecting the health, safety, and welfare of the American people.

VETERANS DAY DESERVES TO BE A MONDAY HOLIDAY

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best argument for retaining Veterans Day as a Monday holiday has been evidenced this year with the traditional November 11 Armistice Day falling on the second Sunday of November. According to my information very few communities or service organizations observed the November 11 date.

In the case of North Chicago High School, the Veterans Day observance oc-

curred on Friday, November 9. The veterans organizations of North Chicago conducted their Veterans Day ceremonies on Saturday, November 10. In Waukegan, the American Legion and other veterans groups conducted their Veterans Day ceremonies on Sunday, November 11. Lake Forest, Ill., Veterans Day exercises are occurring today, Monday, November 12.

It is quite appropriate to recall that the armistice that ended World War I occurred at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month—giving particular significance to the November 11 date. However, for purposes of providing a time when all may join in a nationwide observance of the sacrifices which our veterans of all the wars have made, it is far more logical to designate a Monday holiday for this purpose. Federal employees and all who deal actively with our Federal agencies are able to arrange their schedules to participate in the Veterans Day observances on the fourth Monday of October. On that day, we can honor also the veterans of World War II which ended on September 2, 1945, the veterans of the Korean war which terminated on July 27, 1953, and the veterans of the Vietnam conflict which ended in January 1973, as well as the veterans of earlier wars which were concluded in various months of the year.

Mr. Speaker, is it not the veterans whom we are honoring on Veterans Day—and not a particular calendar date which must necessarily vary when that date falls on a Saturday or Sunday?

Mr. Speaker, it would be my suggestion that if the veterans organizations are interested in an appropriate day of the year for honoring all of the veterans—and wish to make this day uniform throughout the Nation, they might consider the second Monday in November as an appropriate Monday holiday Veterans Day which all might observe. Indeed, with November 11 falling on Sunday this year, it has seemed to me that the most logic has been demonstrated by those who have seen fit to observe the November 11 Veterans Day today, Monday, November 12.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that thoughtful consideration was given to this proposal when the fourth Monday in October was settled upon as the logical day for observing Veterans Day. The reason for not selecting the second Monday in November was that this day appeared to be too close to Thanksgiving, which, as we know, will be observed a week from Thursday—November 22. I might also observe that the fourth Monday in October was a much more pleasant time of the year than the second Monday in November. In general, the weather was cold and bleak on November 11—whereas on Veterans Day, the fourth Monday in October—October 22—the skies were bright and the weather was relatively warm and highly conducive to the traditional outdoor ceremonies which are part of the traditional Veterans Day observances.

Mr. Speaker, there are many vital and sensitive subjects to which veterans organizations are devoting their attention and concern. It would help to focus attention on those subjects if the controversy regarding Veterans Day could be harmoniously resolved. In the light of this year's confusion, and based upon the points to which I have made reference, it would seem well to move toward an enlightened resolution of this problem.

From my point of view, the reasons for retaining Veterans Day as a Monday holiday are so persuasive as to be overwhelming.

A DRIVE TO ESTABLISH NEIGHBORHOOD IMPEACHMENT CENTERS

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

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the following news item was reported in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, November 11, 1973:

> A drive to establish "Neighborhood Impeachment Centers" in every southern California Congressional District was launched Saturday by the American Civil Liberties Union.

It is anomalous to me that an organization which purports to be the guardian of the civil liberties of all of our citizens should become a leader in an effort to deny to the President the enjoyment of his.

An impeachment proceeding is a process providing for the indictment and trial of civil officers of the United States for "treason, bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors." The constitutional right to due process in these proceedings to a President should be no less than that to which all other persons are entitled as a matter of right.

The unique nature of an impeachment does not excuse the House of Representatives from its duty to act objectively based upon the evidence presented under oath for its consideration. It must disregard public hysteria, in order to insure due process to the accused.

Moreover, should the trial of an impeachment ensue in the Senate, it is the duty of that body to act judiciously based upon the evidence before it. Considerations of public pressure play no part in any judicial proceeding, whether the accused be the President of the United States or an alleged mass murderer.

This is what due process is all about and the ACLU should know it.

Several years ago the President improperly referred to Charles Manson as "guilty" at a time when Mr. Manson was on trial in a notorious murder case. The ACLU and much of the Nation's press roared its moral outrage at the insensitivity of the President to the fundamental right of an accused to a fair and unprejudiced trial. This same guardian of our civil liberties, it appears, is now setting up storefront offices to incite the public against the President and to prejudice his right to fair and impartial hearings of the charges against him.

The ACLU should have greater respect for its principles.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this special order so that the House Members may all have an opportunity to eulogize our late colleague, JOHN SAYLOR.

On Monday, October 29, I announced JOHN'S passing the day before and some of the Members had an opportunity to make some remarks; but since there had been no legislation scheduled for that day, there were many Members who requested an opportunity to make their expressions at a later date. Therefore, this special order.

JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR, Republican, of Johnstown, Pa., was born in Somerset County in 1908; attended Johnstown public schools and Mercersburg Academy; earned an A.B. from Franklin and Marshall College; an LL.B. from Dickinson Law School and an honorary LL.D. from St. Francis College. He was married to the former Grace Dorestler of Lancaster County, and they have two children and two grandchildren. JOHN was also a former partner in the law firm of Spence, Custer and Saylor; member, Cambria County, Pa., and American Bar Associations. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and was a captain, Naval Reserve (retired). He was the recipient of the Achievement Award of the Interservice Club of Johnstown, 1971; the Distinguished Service Award of the Americans for Constitutional Action, 1972; the John Muir Award of the Sierra Club, 1971; the Distinguished Service Certificate from the National Council of State Gardens Clubs, 1972; and the Silver Helmet Award of the American Veterans of World War II and Korea. He had also received the Watchdog of the Treasury Award from the National Federation Independent Business in each of the last four Congresses.

JOHN was a member of St. John's United Church of Christ, Johnstown, former lay member, Synodical Council, Pittsburgh Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church; former member, Commission on Church and Economic Life of the Federal Council of Churches; lay delegate, Convention for the Merger of the Evangelical and Reformed Church with the Congregational Christian Church; 33d Degree Mason; member of the board of trustees, Massanutten Academy, Woodstock, Va.; board of regents of Mercersburg Academy; board of directors, Lee Hospital, Johnstown; and president of the Johnstown Federal Savings & Loan Association; member, board of directors, Capitol Hill Club; Boone and Crockett Club; and numerous other fraternal, sportsman and civic organizations, local and national.

When my good friend and colleague, JOHN SAYLOR, died so unexpectedly of a heart attack in Houston on October 28, he was serving his 13th term in Congress, after having first been elected to the House of Representatives during the 81st Congress in a special election, on September 13, 1949, and reelected to each succeeding Congress. He ranked 35th in seniority of all members of the House and fourth among Republican members.

JOHN and I had been friends for many years—we first met in 1924 when we were both undergraduates at Mercersburg Academy. In the intervening 49 years I had followed with great interest JOHN'S career, particularly after he came to Congress and my more recent and more intimate relationship was reestablished in 1960 when I first was elected to Congress. JOHN and I maintained a close and respectful friendship ever since that time.

As we all know, JOHN'S leadership in the field of conservation was nationally recognized for many years—he was the recipient of many awards. As senior Repubican member of the House Interior Committee, he was credited with leading many endeavors to protect the Nation's scenic and natural resources. He was a sponsor of the Wilderness Act to save woods, water and wildlife. He also backed legislation to estabish the Office of Coal Research to find more uses for coal, and was a major supporter of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. For his moves in conservation, he and former Representative Wayne N. Aspinall, Democrat of Colorado, the other coauthor of the Wilderness Act, designed to save land from development, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, received the National Wildlife Federation's "Conservationist of the Year" award for 1964.

Congressman SAYLOR fought against building dams in the Grand Canyon and for preserving the integrity of Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado. He was a member of the National Forest Preservation Commission and the National Parks Centennial Commission. In 1957, on a routine mission to visit the Scott Base at Antarctica, JOHN became the first Congressman to fly over the South Pole. He was a supporter of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

In addition to his membership on the House Interior Committee, JOHN was also a member of the House Veterans' Committee and well versed in veterans affairs. In World War II, he served in the Pacific and was communications officer of the U.S.S. *Missoula*, an attack troop ship when Iwo Jima was captured by the Americans. He gave the Marines the first American flag to be raised on Iwo Jima and when a photographer saw the flag-raising, he asked that it be done again and a second flag was raised, resulting in the famous photograph that is duplicated by the Iwo Jima statue near Arlington Cemetery.

But JOHN'S success and achievement of excellence covered many fields besides conservation—in the church, veterans' affairs, his service as a trustee of many private schools, hospitals and social fraternities. Significant with his interest in the church, one of JOHN'S last appearances before his colleagues was to address the House prayer breakfast less than a month ago and his discussion of the subject of "Hope" gave much inspiration to the Congressmen present. He was well regarded on both sides of the aisle for his light humor, especially in committee sessions when tempers got hot. His was a voice that roared—but roared with a purpose. He was a diligent worker in the House and recognized for his wit, which often eased what might have become tense situations.

Mrs. Schneebeli joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to JOHN'S family, his wife, Grace, to his daughter and son and two grandchildren. He was among the few remaining more colorful Members of Congress and all of his colleagues here in Washington shall miss him very much. Good and great men like JOHN SAYLOR do not come our way very often.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the illustrious committee on which the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, served for these many years and where he made such a fine record. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me at this particular time.

Of course the passing of JOHN SAYLOR was to me quite a shock. I had served with JOHN ever since I came to the Congress. He was the ranking minority member on the committee and he did well represent the minority views in all legislative matters. As a matter of fact, JOHN SAYLOR was one of the most effective and outstanding legislators to serve in this House during my tenure here.

JOHN SAYLOR was a man of his word, on whom one could always depend to do just exactly what he said on any matter that came before the committee or before the House. Above all, we knew exactly where JOHN SAYLOR stood on all matters. He was able to express his views and there was no equivocation about it. He would let one know immediately what he was for or what he was against.

In all the time I knew JOHN SAYLOR there was one thing I always had to recognize, which was that he was fair in debate and fair in committee always. He certainly was of tremendous assistance to me when I took over the chairmanship of the committee in this session of the Congress.

JOHN was always considerate to everybody's views. He did not hold anything against anyone. If he did not agree with a Member, he was still a friend then and the next day.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that Pennsylvania has lost one of its outstanding citizens. The Nation lost an able legislator. Mrs. Haley and I wish to extend to JOHN'S family our deepest sympathy in his untimely passing.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I could not pass this opportunity to state to the House the affection and admiration that I had for our late colleague from Pennsylvania, JOHN SAYLOR. I knew JOHN during all the years of his service in the House. JOHN was not just one of a multitude. JOHN SAYLOR was an individual, a man who stood out among his fellow men. He was strong. He was courageous. He was dedicated. He was industrious. He was independent when he thought he was right. He was always cooperative when he thought that the occasion demanded cooperation.

I shall miss this distinguished gentleman, this great American, who has made an extraordinary contribution to the legislation of our Nation and to the history of this House.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Saylor family is very grateful to the distinguished Speaker for his remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States suffered a great loss with the death of JOHN SAYLOR. Everyone who takes a hike in a Wilderness area, runs the rapids of the Colorado in the Grand Canyon, or has a picnic along the C. & O. Canal, owes JOHN SAYLOR a debt of gratitude.

I first met JOHN this January when I became a freshman member of the House Interior Committee. I was immediately impressed by his intelligence, integrity, sharp wit and dedication to the cause of conservation. He helped me find my way through the maze of Committee work and gave me timely and thoughtful guidance on a project of great importance to Texas, the Big Thicket National Biological Preserve.

He was the winner of many awards by environmental groups. As ranking Republican member of the Interior Committee, he was the rallying point for the conservation movement. His forceful, incisive and timely questioning and arguments in Committee set the tone in hearing after hearing.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice during the short time I have been a Member of this body to keep a daily log of happenings that made a particular impression on me.

On Thursday, October 31, the day that Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and other Members of the body flew to Pennsylvania to attend the funeral of JOHN, my plane was not able to land due to bad weather and I regret very much having missed the service.

I am sure the several verses I wrote that day will not do JOHN'S memory justice, but I would like to share them with the Members, because of the very deep feelings I had for him.

JOHN HAS PASSED

But life goes on and is stronger and more
vibrant because John Saylor lived.
John loved and respected all things living.

Because he lived and loved the trees, the water, the land and the sky,
And because he served in the United States Congress, we all will,
Because of his conservation efforts, likewise be able to live
And love the trees, water, and sky.

JOHN SAYLOR will be sorely missed by his family, the Congress, and the country.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, the ranking Democratic member of the committee upon which JOHN served so long, Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn of the passing of our colleague from Pennsylvania. Not only had we lost a friend, but we lost an ally who had served his district and his Nation well.

My association with JOHN SAYLOR began when I came to Congress in 1960. As the ranking minority member on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he played an important role in our heavy legislative workload. While we might not always have agreed on an issue, JOHN always made his case and we never had to guess what his position would be.

Few members of this House supported the park program with as much enthusiasm as our friend from Pennsylvania. He worked diligently on so many projects that I dare not mention them all, but one of his greatest efforts was made to assure the protection of the view from Mt. Vernon. The area known as Piscataway Park on the Maryland banks of the Potomac River was under his constant surveillance and he fought an undertaking which threatened to impinge on or destroy the view from George Washington's home.

Congressman SAYLOR was always in the forefront on the major conservation issues of the day. All of the Members of the House are familiar with his leadership role when the Wilderness Act was under consideration, when the Redwood National Park was created, and when the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was approved.

Of all the projects and programs which JOHN SAYLOR helped to create, however, probably the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was the one which gave him the greatest amount of pride. Working with our chairman, the Honorable Wayne Aspinall, he helped develop the program which has made possible the great expansion of our national outdoor recreation potential. Not only has the land and water conservation fund been the sole source of funding for the land acquisition programs at our national parks, seashores, and recreation areas, but it has been a major inducement to State, local and regional units of government to expand their outdoor recreation programs.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN SAYLOR was a powerful person who will be missed in many ways. He was one of the most able, best informed, most dedicated, most colorful, most witty, and hardest working Members of the House. He was working for conservation before it became the popular thing to do, and in many ways, his shoes will never be filled.

We can take consolation in the fact that JOHN'S life was a fruitful one. His ambitions were converted into effective action, and he used his energy and ability for constructive achievement. Our personal sadness at his passing cannot be diminished, but it is somewhat offset by the knowledge that his contribution to this country and to the well-being of his fellowman will endure.

Our deepest sympathy is extended to his wife, Grace, and to the members of his family. We share their grief in this time of sorrow.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his observations.

I now yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN) a member of Mr. SAYLOR'S committee.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I too was profoundly saddened by the news of the loss of our late beloved colleague, JOHN SAYLOR. That sense of loss was shared by the people of my State of Idaho. We lost in the passing of JOHN SAYLOR a true friend and one of the most effective champions of the environment; one of the most effective and strongest guardians of our great natural resource heritage.

JOHN SAYLOR was no stranger to my State of Idaho. He was a frequent visitor to Idaho and the West. As a matter of fact, a few weeks prior to his passing, almost by chance, I came across JOHN on his way to Idaho on his own to investigate personally one of the projects which was the subject of pending legislation. He knew Idaho's lakes and streams and forests and mountains and open spaces better than most people who live in the State. He was well known and highly respected and had a great many friends and admirers in Idaho.

He shared with us a commitment to preserve and pass on to future generations our natural resources in as good a condition as we found them, if not better. He reminded us continually of our role as trustees of these great resources and of the obligations that come with the privileges we have to enjoy them. He also understood the need to put these great land and water resources to work to produce jobs and opportunities for people.

The Nation has lost in the passing of JOHN SAYLOR one of its most articulate voices and strongest leaders. In many ways he was almost the ideal lawmaker. He had courage, he had compassion, he had a deep understanding of the people's needs, a commitment to serve those needs, a keen intellect, the ability to express himself. A high sense of honor and integrity characterized his personal life and his public service. Along with that he had a sharp wit and a sense of humor. These are all qualities that are in great need in any lawmaking body, but, especially in this one in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, one of my more recent memories of JOHN SAYLOR was his appearance to address the House Prayer Breakfast group just a few days before he went into the hospital. I will never forget his talk and the eloquence and depth of insight and feeling with which he expressed himself on the subject of "hope."

In these rather discouraging and depressing days, we need that hope and the message of hope that JOHN SAYLOR brought to us.

We have lost an effective and a beloved colleague. We can honor his memory best by following the example he set and upholding the high standards that always characterized his service to this great body and to the country he loved so deeply.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very generous and fine remarks.

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

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I will now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

I would like to join in the tribute to our distingushed former colleague, JOHN SAYLOR. I was not privileged to serve on the committee with him, although I once worked with him very closely in our efforts to preserve our national forests and woodlands, and he was a very able and energetic ally.

Mr. Speaker, generations of Americans who never heard his name nor looked upon his face will benefit from the fine work he did in this body.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to a gentleman who probably was one of JOHN SAYLOR'S closest friends in Congress, and was for many, many years. He is a gentleman who shared many characteristics with our colleague, JOHN SAYLOR. They have had about the same interests, the same joviality, and the same great personality, and along with being fellow conservationists, they were fellow hunters. And so I am very happy to yield now to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) for yielding to me.

I commend him and compliment him for paying tribute to our beloved dear late friend, JOHN SAYLOR. He has performed a high service to the House in this, as in all things, in giving the opportunity to us for remembering the greatness of spirit and the greatness of heart of JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN SAYLOR was one of our most beloved colleagues; he was a man of courage, dedication, and energy, and he was a great conservationist. He was, as my dear friend from Pennsylvania indicates, not only a close friend of mine, but also a hunting companion and one with whom I shared the joys of the outdoors.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great feeling of sadness that I recognize JOHN SAYLOR'S mighty voice and great spirit will no longer be with us. However, it is

with great pleasure that I recall the greatness of spirit and the wisdom and the goodness of this wonderful man.

He was a crusty individual; he had great strength and force of character, and to the younger members and those who first knew him these characteristics did not easily translate themselves into the warm and wholesome character that so enriched this body with the presence of JOHN SAYLOR. But all of us remember with great affection, I think, when we got to know JOHN, what a wonderful and warm and gentle and good person he was and how dedicated he was, not only to the interests of his district, but to the cause of conservation and to the betterment of this America.

I miss him. I loved him. I, just as my good friend from Pennsylvania who is now in the well, who kindly made this time available to all of us, pay a sad tribute to a great American. I rejoice that I did have the privilege and the pleasure of knowing JOHN SAYLOR.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to one of America's great conservationists, our beloved deceased colleague, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania.

JOHN SAYLOR was a warm, decent, dedicated and highly competent Member of this body. He labored tirelessly for the welfare of the people of his congressional district which he served so well and for the good of all of the people of the United States.

The great conservation legislation in the past 20 years bears the stamp of JOHN SAYLOR'S character and his dedication to the cause of a wholesale environment for all Americans.

The wilderness bill, full funding for water pollution abatement works, wild rivers legislation, prohibition of hunting from aircraft and scores of other conservation actions by this Congress are monuments to his courage, vigor, and service.

Mine safety and black lung legislation also are monuments to his particular concerns for the people he served.

His efforts to halt the wasting of the public lands and to prevent enactment of bad legislation bore fruit in defeat of the timber bill of the last Congress, and of iniquitous giveaways to the grazing and timber interests.

Programs for wise use and intelligent development of the natural resources for the good of all had his genuine and effective support.

As a close friend and admirer of this great American, I shall miss JOHN SAYLOR; but the personal loss I feel is far overshadowed by the loss to this Nation and its people of one of the truly wise and farseeing legislators whose contributions to the public interest will be remembered by Americans everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks eulogizing the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR could be much more extended but there are many Americans who have written and reported their thoughts of Congressman SAYLOR and I believe it is most appropriate at this time that the following biography of our late colleague, and the following radio commentary and editorials on this great American, deserve a high position among the remarks for our friend today:

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON THE HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR

(United States Representative in the Congress from the 12th District of Pennsylvania)

John Phillips Saylor, Republican of Johnstown, Pennsylvania; born in Somerset County, 1908; attended Johnstown public schools and Mercersburg Academy; A.B., Franklin-Marshall College; LL.B., Dickinson Law School; Hon. LL.D., Saint Francis College; married to the former Grace Doerstler of Lancaster County, they have two children and two grandchildren.

Former partner in the law firm of Spence, Custer and Saylor; member, Cambria County, Pennsylvania, and American Bar Associations. Served in the United States Navy during World War II, Captain, U.S. Naval Reserve (retired).

THE CONGRESS

Elected to the House of Representatives during the 81st Congress in a special election, September 13, 1949 and re-elected to each succeeding Congress. Ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and Ex-Officio Member of all seven subcommittees; senior Republican in point of service on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and Member of the Hospitals, Compensation and Pensions, and Insurance Subcommittees.

Ranks thirty-fifth in seniority of all Members of the House and fourth among Republican Members. Senior Republican of the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation and Vice-Chairman of the Pennsylvania Congressional Steering Committee.

AWARDS AND HONORS

First Member of Congress to receive the National Parks Association Award in recognition of distinguished services on behalf of the United States national parks and monuments, 1954; first recipient of the National Conservation Award presented by the six leading conservation organizations in America, 1958.

Citation for Meritorious Services from the Freeport American Legion Post 110, 1961; Conservationist of the Year Award from the National Wildlife Federation, 1964; Conservationist of the Year Award from the Pennsylvania Outdoor Writers Association, 1965; Gold Medal Award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1966.

Received the Gold Medal of the Pennsylvania State Fish and Game Association, 1967; Trout Conservation Award from Trout Unlimited, 1967; Certificate of Appreciation from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1968; first recipient of the Bernard M. Baruch Laureate Award for contributing most to the field of conservation, 1967; the National Commander's Award from the Veterans of World War I, 1968; and the National Commander's Award from the Disabled American Veterans of the United States, 1968.

Holds the Silver Beaver Award of the Admiral Robert E. Peary Council, Boy Scouts of America, 1969; Award of Merit from the Pennsylvania Roadside Council, 1969; first recipient of the Conservation Award of the Sierra Club's Atlantic Chapter, 1969; and the "54" Founder's Award of the Izaak Walton League of America, 1970.

Received the Achievement Award of the Interservice Club of Johnstown, 1971; the Distinguished Service Award of the Americans for Constitutional Action, 1972; the John Muir Award of the Sierra Club, 1971; the Distinguished Service Certificate from the National Council of State Garden Clubs, 1972; and the Silver Helmet Award of the American Veterans of World War II and Korea. He has received the Watchdog of the Treasury Award from the National Federation of Independent Business in each of the last four Congresses.

MEMBERSHIPS—OFFICIAL

Member, Saint John's United Church of Christ, Johnstown; former lay member, Synodical Council, Pittsburgh Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church; former member, Commission on Church and Economic Life of the Federal Council of Churches; lay delegate, Convention for the Merger of the Evangelical and Reformed Church with the Congressional Christian Church; 33rd Degree Mason.

Member of the Board of Trustees, Massanutten Academy, Woodstock, Virginia; Board of Regents of Mercersburg Academy; Board of Directors, Lee Hospital, Johnstown; and President of the Johnstown Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Member, Board of Directors, Capitol Hill Club; Boone and Crockett Club; and numerous other fraternal, sportsman and civic organization, local and national.

The Twelfth Congressional District is composed of the Counties of Armstrong, Cambria, Indiana, Jefferson, Somerset, and the southwestern portion of Clarion (boroughs of Callensburg, East Brady, Foxburg, Rimersburg, and Saint Petersburg; the townships of Brady, Licking, Madison, Perry, Richland, and Toby). Population (1970) of 469,999.

REMARKS OF J. MCCAFFREY, WMAL–TV

(This is the TV commentary as nearly as I can reconstruct it. J. McCaffrey. Monday, 29 October, WMAL–TV)

I really don't need a script to say what I am going to say this evening . . .

This is a time when men and women are turned off by politics and politicians . . . The Nixon Administration scandals have cast suspicion on every man and woman in elective office.

I would like to offer testimony this evening to one of the best men I have known in public life . . .

John Saylor, who died yesterday.

I first knew John Saylor when he was elected as a Republican congressman from Pennsylvania back in 1949 in a special election.

He was probably the best conservationist in Congress . . . during the years he helped push through a great deal of conservation legislation—including the wilderness act and land and water conservation—he did yeoman work in getting statehood for Hawaii and Alaska . . .

He was an independent man . . . he voted himself . . . as he thought . . . his own people would want him to vote . . the party label was not a burden he carried on his back . . . he used it at election time . . . but as a Member of Congress he was an independent man.

He was an attorney, but in another and earlier age I imagine he would have been a woodsman . . . he carried in his car his fishing tackle . . . and he had fishing licenses for at least a half dozen jurisdictions, so that whenever he felt like it, he could pull his car over by the side of a brook and go fishing.

But the most important thing is that John Saylor was a man of integrity . . . a hard worker . . . a man devoted to his job and to his country. John Saylor was one of the many men and women on Capital Hill who allowed me to keep faith in the system.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 30, 1973]

SAYLOR, CONSERVATIONIST

For two decades—and often despite disappointment and frustration—Representative JOHN SAYLOR, who at his death was ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, battled with good

humor and tenacious spirit on behalf of the public interest.

This Pennsylvania Republican early recognized that the Interior Committee's responsibilities are not a provincial concern of Westerners. Rather, they affect the quality of life for all Americans. He strove valiantly to protect and expand the national parks, to conserve the wilderness and endangered species of animals, and to defend the people's heritage of land, water, forests, and scenic beauty. He had a refreshing idealism about public service and lovable human qualities. He will be greatly missed.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, October 30, 1973]

LOSS OF A FRIEND

There might be some argument about who was the best Congressional friend Hawaii ever had in its long Statehood fight, but a strong contender for that title would be Rep. JOHN P. SAYLOR, who died Sunday at the age of 65 following heart surgery.

The Johnstown, Pa., Republican entered Congress via a special election in 1949, was soon assigned to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which handled the Statehood question, and began battling right away to give statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

Mrs. Elizabeth P. Farrington, whose husband was Hawaii's delegate to Congress in those days, and who became delegate herself upon his death in 1954, recalls that "JOHN SAYLOR" was the only Congressman that Joe and I didn't have to convert."

SAYLOR'S conversion had taken place 25 years earlier as a student at Mercersburg Academy when he was assigned to the affirmative side of a debate on whether Hawaii and Alaska should be states.

SAYLOR researched the topic so thoroughly that he convinced himself and reinforced this conviction when he was sent to the Pacific as a Navy officer in World War II.

SAYLOR'S support of Statehood was both indefatigable and invaluable. He moved to the chairmanship of the territories subcommittee in 1953 and there had an even more direct involvement in the long struggle to get the bill enacted until it climaxed successfully in 1959.

A liberal Republican throughout his career, SAYLOR has been best known in recent years for his support of conservation and environmental protection. The Almanac of American Politics notes: "He pushed these concerns long before they became fashionable in the cities and universities of the East and West coasts. Here he has built up not only great expertise in matters pertaining to the environment, but also a good deal of legislative clout."

As a memorial to the legislator, a JOHN P. SAYLOR Conservation Fund is being created. Contributions are being received at his former office in the Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 4, 1973]

SAYLOR OPPOSED EXPLOITATION OF LAND—CONGRESSMAN WAS CONCERNED OVER RAPE OF WILDERNESS

I first met John Saylor one fall day when he walked into the living room of my father's home in Punxsutawney with a beagle cradled under each arm.

The congressman who died last week in Houston, Tex., after undergoing heart surgery, had been hunting grouse in northern Jefferson County when he found the dogs, which were wandering around the woods, looking for some human companionship after having spent a night chasing deer.

Since the name on the dogs' collars was my father's, the good congressman drove out of his way to deliver the pair to our house.

Although the dogs were no longer ours (we had given them to a friend; we no longer had the time to give them enough hunting), we were overjoyed that they had been saved from possible starvation in the woods. The next day we took the dogs back to their new owners, who had been frantically searching the woods for the pair.

In the years to follow I came to know John Saylor well, both the politican and the person, and I came to like and trust him.

Oh, sure, John Saylor was slicker than a wet leaf on a slate rock, but you expect that from a politician.

He was a glad-hander, a thumper on the back, a "how are you doing, nice to see you" guy who could charm a vote out of a rock.

But in his private moments, moments around the fire at a deep camp or sitting in the soft meadow grass along a Montana trout stream, he was a different person. His public mask gave away to a private face that was filled with concern over conservation and the rape of the wilderness.

I recall a phone call to my father late one night from Washington. It was Saylor, who had just learned of a move on the part of a local Republican leader who objected to a project Saylor had been working long and hard on. A project that had won nearly-unanimous praise from responsible citizens of the area. Now that the project was almost assured, one man was threatening to halt it, and destroy in the process months of work by the congressman.

John Saylor broke down that night and wept, the frustration of months finally cracking the political shell and allowing human emotions to pour out. That was the day I realized that Saylor was, above all, a man, a man who took things personally. That was quite a discovery because I thought all politicians were machines.

It was in conservation that John Saylor did his most valuable work for this nation. Not just for Punxsutawney, or Jefferson County, or Pennsylvania, but for the nation.

He was the author of the Wilderness Act, which has saved untold millions of acres from exploitation; the ranking Republican member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs committee, a post he used to influence the acquisition of land for national parks and the protection of existing parks; and the leader who pushed innumerable conservation bills through the House.

He didn't go unrecognized for his work, receiving national awards from, among others, Trout Unlimited, Bernard Baruch Conservation Award Committee, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Association and the Izaak Walton League.

In a Congress and a committee dominated too often by exploitation—oriented congressmen, John Saylor was an important and fresh voice which railed against the destruction of our environment. He will be missed.

[From The Washington Post, Nov. 5, 1973]

JOHN P. SAYLOR

Some Congressmen manage to linger in the House for many terms without ever raising their voices or advocating an important cause or leaving any imprint on the record of their times. Rep. John P. Saylor, who died last week, was emphatically not one of these. The Republican from the Pennsylvania hills had strong convictions and a personality to match. Gruff, sometimes caustic, uncommonly persistent, he was the best kind of opinionated man.

Rep. Saylor was a powerful and creative force in the field of conservation which he made his specialty. During his quarter-century in the House, seniority elevated him to the post of ranking Republican on the House Interior Committee, but it was his own energy and ideas which made him a dominant influence in that committee's work. Rep. Saylor was in the midst of nearly every major conservation battle of his day. He fought against the Hells Canyon dam. He opposed the Grand Canyon dams. He battled to create the national wilderness system and the Land and Water Conservation Fund laws which stand as permanent monuments to his vision and doggedness. Perhaps because he came from a region of scarred and battered hills, he had a keen appreciation of the need to keep some of the nation's natural resources unspoiled and available for the public to enjoy and use.

Rep. Saylor took a very particular interest in the conservation problems of the Potomac Basin and the national capital area. He was a vigorous defender of Piscataway Park and the marshes on the Virginia shore below Washington. He scrapped for years to obtain a workable framework for Pennsylvania Avenue redevelopment. In partnership with the Maryland congressional delegation, he was a leader in the 17-year campaign which finally produced the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park. In these and other legislative battles, Rep. Saylor used his stature and voice to full effect. He was an outspoken, effective champion for a good cause.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the warm personal expression that we have had from our friend, the gentleman from Michigan, who was such a good friend of JOHN SAYLOR'S.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH) whom, I think, I have known almost as long as I have known JOHN SAYLOR.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made with regard to our good friend, JOHN SAYLOR, whose passing was sudden and was mourned by all of us.

When I came to the Congress about 9 years ago, much to my surprise I was assigned to the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOHN SAYLOR became my boss and my leader on that committee because, of course, he was the ranking Republican member even then.

I will always remember with a great deal of gratitude and appreciation the kindness of JOHN SAYLOR to his new members on his committee and the time that he spent with us and the patience he had with us in trying to induct us into some of the mysteries of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have followed JOHN SAYLOR'S presence here in the House for these many years. I want to echo the thought that has already been expressed that he was a great, strong voice.

I did not always agree with him, but I always knew exactly where he stood whether I agreed with him or not.

I know that we, in the Congress, and the people of his district and the people of the United States are going to miss JOHN for his great human qualities and also because he was a strong voice standing up in this Congress for conservation and all of the things he believed were right.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to eulogize an outstanding American, a man whose dedication to his family, his constituents, and the American people is well known by all who had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives.

JOHN'S manifold contributions to the

betterment of life in our country are evidenced by the significant legislation which he sponsored or supported; indeed, his legislative record stands as indelible and irrefutable proof of the excellence of his work in this great Chamber. The statehood for Alaska and Hawaii bills, the Wilderness Act, the Land and Water Conservation Act, and the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act are only a few of the major pieces of legislation which bear his imprint, and his support for conservation measures earned him the National Wildlife Federation's "Conservationist of the Year" award for 1964, as well as many other honors.

I have had the privilege of serving the residents of my district as their Congressman since 1945, and JOHN served with me for all but 4 of those years. His congressional district was adjacent to mine, and we often worked together to solve common problems. He rose to become the senior Republican of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation and vice chairman of the Pennsylvania Congressional Steering Committee, and we in Pennsylvania have lost a valued and effective leader with his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to note the special human qualities of this distinguished gentleman which were so readily apparent to all who shared his company. Many people, for one reason or another, are often reluctant to vigorously express an unpopular or controversial opinion, but JOHN SAYLOR was no such person. He and I often disagreed on the merits of legislation, but vibrant his personal qualities, dedication, and honesty were such that political differences never affected our friendship. Whether he was questioning witnesses at a committee hearing, debating the merits of a bill on the House floor, or responding to a query from a journalist, constituent, or colleague, JOHN's overriding concern was to speak with honesty and clarity. This absolute integrity, in conjunction with his sensitivity to the needs of others, enabled him to command the complete respect of all of us in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN SAYLOR was not only my colleague, but my friend as well, and I shall sorely miss his companionship and advice. My life has been richer for knowing him, and his memory will forever remain with me. Mrs. Morgan and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to his lovely wife, Grace, and his children, John, Jr., and Susan.

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, every American who is concerned about the environment—who wants to insure that future generations will have clean air and clean water—owes a debt of gratitude to the late JOHN SAYLOR.

He began fighting to save our environment back in 1949, long before it was popular to do so.

In fact, every man, woman, and child who visits a wilderness area, who rejoices in land as nature made it, can give thanks to JOHN SAYLOR. For he was the author of the Wilderness Act, the legislation which protected those areas from development.

And that is just one of the many pieces of important conservationist legislation adopted by the Congress which began with the dedication of JOHN SAYLOR.

Unlike many of my colleagues, I did not have the pleasure of working with JOHN SAYLOR for a great many years. But I was fortunate enough to be allied with him in the Big Cypress Swamp acquisition project, a project which will bring great benefits to my district.

It was a pleasure indeed to work with a man so knowledgeable about the environment and the need to protect it. And it was a pleasure I shall long cherish.

JOHN SAYLOR will be missed by his colleagues. But more important, his wisdom and leadership will be missed by the American people.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this Chamber in paying a special tribute to JOHN SAYLOR, whose tragic and untimely passing has left an irreplaceable void in the House of Representatives.

For, Congressman SAYLOR was known by his friends on both sides of the aisle as "Mr. Conservationist." Since 1949, when JOHN first came to this House, he has been a distinguished leader in helping to shape national policies in the areas of conservation, preservation of our country's natural and wildlife resources and environmental quality.

As the ranking Republican member of the Interior Committee JOHN coauthored with former Chairman Wayne Aspinall the Wilderness Act, that monumental legislation designed to save land from development, and the Land and Water Conservation Act. For all his tireless efforts and meritorious achievements in the field of conservation, Representative SAYLOR deservingly received the National Wildlife Federation's "Conservationist of the Year" award in 1964. Ten years earlier, he had been the first Member of Congress to receive the National Parks Association award in recognition of outstanding services on behalf of the U.S. National Parks and Monuments.

Congressman JOHN SAYLOR's concern for conservation was not confined to natural resources. His greatest interest has been in the conservation of human life, and because of this concern, he has courageously persevered in the struggle for greater protection for coal miners and for increased benefits to victims of black lung disease.

To chronicle all JOHN's legislative achievements in the field which has earned him the best claim in the House of Representatives to the title of "Mr. Conservationist" would certainly not do him the justice he merits in this area.

JOHN SAYLOR was an aimable, popular Member of this Chamber, recognized for his sense of humor which often eased tense situations. I have known and appreciated Congressman JOHN SAYLOR as a diligent and conscientious Member of the House, a man of great personal conviction, integrity, legislative responsibility and independence. And I have known JOHN as a member who has served his constituents in the 12th District of Pennsylvania with great distinction, dedication, and purpose.

All of us who have served with Representative JOHN SAYLOR are deeply saddened by his loss and my wife Milly joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy and condolences to his family.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, all of us miss our late colleague from Pennsylvania, JOHN SAYLOR, because he contributed so much to this body, his district, his State, and his Nation.

I served with him here for a quarter century and I know first-hand of his accomplishments in the difficult legislative field. He was an impressive legislative technician and highly dedicated to his responsibilities as the Representative from Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District. He was one of the most respected public officials in our Government today. He was a man of great wit and humor, two characteristics which are in short supply during this period of our history.

He was a man who loved his friends and loved his country. He never stepped back from highly responsible tasks and assignments.

He was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, hard working, industrious, and when he addressed this body, as he often did, he spoke convincingly and with complete knowledge of his subject.

JOHN SAYLOR had a large number of friends on both sides of the aisle, all of whom will miss his charm and great humor.

He was a big man in more than physical size as he was perhaps the greatest exponent of conservation in the Congress in recent years.

As the ranking member on the House Interior Committee, he took the lead in many endeavors to protect the Nation's natural resources and scenic beauty.

He was a sponsor of the Wilderness Act to preserve our forests, water, and wildlife. He also supported legislation to establish the Office of Coal Research to find more and better uses for coal. He was a major supporter of the highly important Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

JOHN SAYLOR left behind a fine record. He lived the good life which must be a great comfort for his wife, Grace, and his son and daughter.

We, in Pennsylvania, will always remember him as an outstanding native son who served his people with distinction and accomplishment. I shall miss him as I know his friends and constituents will also.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I personally felt a deep sense of loss on learning of the death of Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, and I know that my feeling is shared by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Our personal loss represents an even greater loss to the people of this Nation, for JOHN SAYLOR was an exceptional, dedicated, and effective leader of our country's effort to preserve our natural resources and our environment.

Long before the environment was a fashionable concern and ecology a household word, JOHN was leading the fight for conservation. As ranking minority member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, JOHN was instrumental in the creation and passage of legislation to protect the environ-

ment. As author of the Wilderness Act, his contribution to the future of our country is inestimable. Yet this was only one of his many achievements. The people I represent in south Florida owe a particular debt to JOHN for his help in our fight to authorize the Biscayne National Monument in 1968. Without his strong and unyielding support of that project the future of Biscayne Bay and the unique islands and coral reefs there might still be in danger.

JOHN SAYLOR was truly a pioneer in the conservation movement in the Congress. His leadership and commitment to that cause will be sorely missed, but his tremendous accomplishments will long remain with us, much to the benefit of the Nation.

JOHN SAYLOR'S contributions were certainly not limited to the area of conservation. He was a major backer of safety legislation for coal miners, and legislation on behalf of the American Indian. He coauthored legislation for the statehood of Alaska and Hawaii. Yet JOHN was able to combine his leadership on national issues with an intense devotion to the needs of his district and his State, both of which he served so well for 24 years.

I extend my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Saylor and her family. I trust that the knowledge of JOHN'S great contributions to the beauty of our national landscape will be as great a comfort to them as it is to the Nation.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, with other Members of this body, I attended the funeral service for our late beloved colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR, held in Johnstown, Pa., on November 1, 1973. It was, of course, a sad day for all of us.

It was my privilege on that occasion to hear a eulogy to our friend, delivered by Father Regis O'Brien, a professor at Saint Francis College in Loretto, Pa., a eulogy that impressed me greatly. The significance of what took place deserves comment, I believe, and is striking proof of the love and affection in which our colleague was held by the men and women of his congressional district. The funeral service was held in the United Church of Christ and was attended by his brethren in the Masonic fraternity since JOHN SAYLOR has achieved the singular honor of the 33d degree in that order. But also attending the services were two Catholic bishops amid hundreds of others of his friends. And when it came time for the eulogy, his long-time close friend and admirer, Father Regis O'Brien, widely known throughout the area, was the chosen speaker. That he spoke from the heart, that he voiced the warmth and the love and the emotion that all felt, was self-evident.

In due course, the remarks of JOHN SAYLOR'S friends and colleagues made on this floor will be bound into a volume of memorial addresses. That volume would not be complete without the eulogy of Father O'Brien. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, include Father O'Brien's address at this place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS

Reverend Smith, Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States, Secretary Morton, the dignitaries who came here from Washington to honour our good friend, Bishop Hogan, Bishop McGarry, Mayor Flaherty, Grace and your children, relatives of John, and friends of John.

No greater tribute can be paid John Saylor than this: his heart was as big as his frame. Anything other that I can say would be by way of anticlimax or as supporting evidence of this truth. John Saylor's magnanimous heart motivated him to fight injustice that he hated. From the day he set foot in Congress until that heart stopped on last Sunday when God called John home to Heaven he fought the exploitation of those who could not help themselves. John Saylor was a great man. He attained national, nay international fame, but he courted neither since they were forced upon him.

John Saylor was a great man, and as all great men, he had a disciplined beginning as a child and the encouragement of a faithful wife in later life. John Saylor's parents, Tillman and Minerva Saylor, were not pietistic Christians going about this way and that way. They were solid in Christian doctrine. They knew that marriage was a job and not a joyride. They knew that they were cooperators with God Almighty in bringing into existence their children. They realized that through their actual act of love they prepared the bodies into which God Almighty infused an immortal soul, and because of this they knew that their children were persons who one day would be accountable to God for their actions.

And it is our deduction from this basic truth that Tillman and Minerva Saylor knew that every child born into the world entered it with a three-fold right: a right to physical maturity, intellectual maturity, moral maturity. And since every right carries with it a corresponding obligation, Tillman and Minerva Saylor acquitted themselves nobly in the performance of their three-fold obligation. They provided sufficient nurture for their children so that they could develop well in body. They sacrificed many of the legitimate luxuries of life so that they could give their children a full education whereby they would know the world into which they were born and how to give of themselves to the world in which they were born. Just yesterday John's sister, Anne Catherine, said that they were trained to give. And lastly, the parents were uncompromising in the performance of their obligation to instill character and moral development in their children.

Indeed, go no further than John himself. With reverential pride, John would put on that characteristic Saylor smile and look in fancy at his father's character developer, his razor strap. I am not trying to be humorous. I am deadly serious. John Saylor was a great man because of his father's razor strap. In other words, John Saylor entered Congress because he practiced the principles inculcated at the end of that razor strap. He remained in Congress until God saw fit to reward him.

Because of the principles inculcated at the end of that razor strap, John Saylor was a unique politician. He made no empty promises, he would say no with the ease of yes. If he said yes, he meant yes. He would go to the utmost steps to try to secure that which he promised. If he could not, one could rest assured that it wasn't John Saylor's fault. John Saylor was not ambitious. Years ago he was considered timber for the governorship of Pennsylvania and for the United States senatorship. That magnanimous character would have none of it. The people of my District elected me and I will not desert them, was his view. He knew well that if he lost his seniority in Congress his District would suffer. "No, no, a thousand times no, I'll take my chances of running every two years in the Congress", he said more than once. John Saylor is responsible for many a couple and many a widow in this Congressional District and throughout the United States living a life of human dignity today because he fought long and hard for the black lung pension. He gave everybody to understand that this isn't a gift or a dole to the miners, but a right.

Early in his first administration he made a trip to the southwest. He entered a restaurant in which he saw a sign that read "neither dogs nor injuns are permitted". John came back from that trip infuriated. He said to me "I must remain in Congress. I'll never stop fighting the fight of the American Indians." And we know he did that.

In other words, John Saylor's heart and mind was always for the underdog, the downtrodden. Why? Because of his love for mankind and for his constituents. He was an overworked man, both he and his staff. Hundreds and hundreds of requests were made of John Saylor. His noble staff helped him secure answers so that today literally thousands in this area are indebted to him for countless courtesies.

Now, as we close the earthy life of John Saylor, we can evaluate his public career with one word—impeccable! This is the Feast of All Saints, it is thus a glorious day to admit the body of John to the eternal where the Saints will welcome him, I know. There is no room for sorrow, Grace; no room for sorrow, Phillip; no room for sorrow, Susan; no room for sorrow, Kay. This is a glorious occasion. Why? Because God called John Saylor home. To be remembered among these Saints we honor today, I extend John Saylor's blessing to you as he takes his leave. It is an old blessing that he loved: "May the Good Lord keep you in the palm of his hand."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the late JOHN P. SAYLOR was a man of outstanding ability and capacity for work. He was the embodiment of the higher qualities of statesmanship. His accomplishments in the field of conservation of our natural resources won him many awards and will long stand as a monument to his legislative endeavors. Where conservation was at stake, JOHN SAYLOR was neither Republican or Democrat—he was an American.

When I came to Congress as a freshman in 1955, JOHN SAYLOR had been serving his constituency for 6 years and already had demonstrated a capacity for work and leadership which eventually moved him to the top Republican slot on the important Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In that capacity he worked indefatigably to protect our natural resources from depredation and despoilment.

He was a friend of all who needed friendship and his helping hand was not withdrawn for petty reasons. It was typical of the man that, though he was a prominent Protestant and an active Mason, he was a benefactor of St. Francis College, a Catholic institution in his district, which honored him with a doctorate degree. JOHN SAYLOR was, indeed, a great man and a great American.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I have lost a very dear and close friend. When JOHN SAYLOR was fatally stricken on the 28th of October, I was deeply saddened, not only because I had lost an extremely valuable friendship, but rather because the country is now poorer for the loss of such a visionary person.

JOHN served very ably on the Veterans Committee here in the House as well as being active in various civic, fraternal, and social organizations in his private life.

Also as ranking minority member on

the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, JOHN was well-respected and known as a diligent, conscientious legislator, whose talent lay in formulating visionary legislation preserving the vast natural beauty of this great country. A leading conservationist and long an advocate of environmental quality JOHN coauthored such bills as the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act for which he and former colleague Wayne Aspinall were cited as corecipients of the "Conservationist of the Year" award presented by the National Wildlife Federation in 1964. He coauthored legislation to bring the great States of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union so that Americans everywhere could share in their beauty, peace, and serenity.

JOHN SAYLOR will be remembered for his accomplishments—his memorial will be the natural beauty of this great and vast country he preserved for future American generations.

Mrs. Burke and myself extend sincerest condolences to Mrs. Saylor and her family and hope she will take comfort in her hour of great personal loss in the knowledge that her loss is shared by so many.

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and good fortune to know JOHN SAYLOR before I came to Congress. It was a real privilege, however, and my far greater good fortune to be associated with him in this House, in which he served so ably and with such distinction. It also afforded me the opportunity to meet and become acquainted with his lovely and wonderful wife, Grace.

"BIG JOHN," as the Congressman was affectionately and respectfully called by many, had an enviable record of service to his constituents and the Nation. His record of integrity and fairness was outstanding throughout his career.

JOHN SAYLOR possessed great strengths including the power which came from his religious convictions which he had reaffirmed in his address to the House Prayer Breakfast group less than 2 weeks prior to his demise.

While he made no specific reference to Tennyson's poems, I am confident he embraced the thoughts so beautifully expressed by the poet in "Crossing the Bar":

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea,

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and a deep feeling of loss that I rise to pay my last respects to a neighbor, to a fellow member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and a colleague for whom I had deep respect.

The mark of this man can be expressed, I believe, in the words of George H. Candler, whose poem "Now" was JOHN SAYLOR's favorite piece of poetry:

"The clock of life is wound but once,
And no man has the power
To tell just when the hands will stop—
At late or early hour.
Now is the only time you own:
Live, love, work with a will.
Place no faith in tomorrow, for—
The clock may then be still."

JOHN SAYLOR lived each day with a zest and determination which indeed demonstrated that he wished to accomplish his mission on Earth today.

He was one of the hardest working, most dedicated Member of Congress I have ever known. On occasion we disagreed on issues but never in this disagreement was there ever anything but an honest variance of opinions of how best to serve the Nation's needs and especially as they related to our natural resources. JOHN SAYLOR was a tiger when it came to a fight. A more dedicated, tenacious fighter I have not known but as in all of his endeavors he was straightforward, honest and his fights were touched with a sense of humor which came from deep within him.

A distinguished Capitol Hill Commentator said on the evening after his death:

But the most important thing is that JOHN SAYLOR was a man of integrity—a hard worker—a man devoted to his job and to his country. JOHN SAYLOR was one of the many men and women on Capitol Hill who allowed me to keep faith in the system.

For JOHN SAYLOR the clock now is still but the Nation and its people are better off today for his devotion to the words of the poem "Now is the only time you own: Live, love, work with a will."

Albra joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his lovely wife, Grace, and their two fine children, but may they take comfort in the fact that JOHN was a good man, and his works, especially in the field of conservation, will stand for centuries to come as a monument to him.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved by the tragic, unexpected death of Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR last month.

Congress, and the Pennsylvanians he represented so well for 24 years, have lost one of the ablest workers and most effective voices in the House. The Nation has lost a patriot.

I had many opportunities over the years to work with JOHN, and I shall dearly miss his friendship.

As ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he labored for years to warn us of the environmental crisis. Many of the programs now helping us to meet this challenge—the Wilderness Act, the land and water conservation funds, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act—are the results of his legislation and leadership. JOHN never ran from a fight, as those who saw his battle to save the Potomac at Hunting Creek will remember.

JOHN received many awards and honors, such as the National Wildlife Federation's 1964 Conservationist of the Year Award, for this work, and the League of Conservation Voters noted last year that he was—

A real friend of conservation at a time when friends were hard to find. Long before the issue became popular, he was a tireless defender of wildlife and wild places.

He also strived to alert us to the energy shortages confronting the Nation today. It was his legislation that established the Office of Coal Research in the Department of Interior to study how to see our vast coal resources without polluting the air.

A distinguished World War II veteran himself—he gave the Marines the first American flag raised on Iwo Jima—JOHN worked hard for all veterans.

He also coauthored the bills providing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and he fought throughout his life for the little guy and the disadvantaged. He pushed for the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act to protect miners, and he struggled to restore to the Taos Indians of New Mexico their rightful lands.

He was a man the Nation will never forget, and will always miss.

I extend my sincere sympathies to his wife, Grace; and his children, John Phillips Jr., and Susan.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my own personal feelings over the loss of a distinguished Member of the House and a dear friend. I met JOHN SAYLOR the very first day I was sworn in as Congressman in October 1963. I had been assigned to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee where he was already a ranking and most respected member. His warm reception of me as a freshman member on the committee, his wise counsel, and his sharing of his vast knowledge in all areas of conversation is something I shall never forget. Even after I left his committee to go on Appropriations, I continued to seek his advice and judgment which he freely gave. He was a good friend, an outstanding conservationist, and a most distinguished Member of Congress. I shall miss him.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the House has been shocked and saddened by the untimely death of one of its foremost Members, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR of Johnstown, Pa.

As a colleague from western Pennsylvania, I had come to know, admire, and respect this man who stood tall among his colleagues both in physical stature and in legislative accomplishment. He rose to be a leader among us and was dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation. He will be sorely missed as a friend, as a colleague and a legislator.

The most gifted of orators among us will experience difficulty in finding the appropriate words to truly express the depth of our feeling for JOHN P. SAYLOR. In a broader sense, however, the most fitting eulogy will come from future generations of Americans who will be able to enjoy the natural beauty of America which will be preserved in its natural state because of the Wilderness Act, legislation which was authored and so ardently supported by JOHN P. SAYLOR.

During his 24 years of service in Congress, JOHN P. SAYLOR authored many

bills and has known the satisfaction of many accomplishments for the betterment of his fellow man. But particularly in the field of conservation has JOHN P. SAYLOR demonstrated his love for his country and his concern that all Americans can enjoy the rich heritage of the beauty of the majestic mountains, the dense forests, and the mighty rivers, which will be preserved for all time.

I join with my colleagues in extending my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Grace D. Saylor and her family.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and sorrow that I join with my colleagues today in reflecting upon the life of JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR, late a U.S. Representative from the State of Pennsylvania. However, it is only fitting and proper that we would pause to pay tribute to him, for few men who have served as Members of this body have done so in a more dedicated and truly distiguished manner as he.

JOHN served Pennsylvania's 12th District illustriously; and it was an honor and a privilege for me to have had, during my entire tenure of office here in the House, such an outstanding individual as JOHN SAYLOR both as a colleague and a friend. Needless to say, he will be greatly missed by me personally, as well as by others, for the sound and careful advice he so often offered to those of us who knew him and served along beside him.

While there is sadness in the Chamber as we mourn JOHN'S passing, the indelible stamp he left on the Congress will never be lost. His place on both the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee will be difficult, if not impossible, to fill. The loss of his knowledge and understanding of, as his dedication to, the field of conservation is immeasurable, particularly in light of the many problems in this area which presently face this Congress and this Nation.

JOHN SAYLOR will be missed; our respect and admiration for him and his life's work can best be shown by a firm dedication to those purposes to which he gave so much of himself.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing profound sorrow at the death of our good friend, JOHN SAYLOR.

As dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation and ranking minority member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, he displayed a true zeal and dedication which made him a conscientious public servant and a great credit to his country. During his long and distinguished career, JOHN SAYLOR led the fight for conservation and environmental quality years before they became popular issues. His diligent efforts in seeking benefits for coal miners and the American Indian will remain an eternal plaudit to this outstanding legislator.

I shall always cherish his sprightly wit, tireless energy, and genuine willingness to extend the warm hand of friendship to his junior colleagues. On many occasions I was the benefactor of his vast experience and wise counsel.

JOHN SAYLOR will be sorely missed by the Nation, this body, and the people of Pennsylvania's 12th District. I extend my heartfelt condolences to his wife and family in their time of grief.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I join the members of the Pennsylvania delegation, and especially my colleague, HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, who has requested this special order, in paying tribute to Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, a great American and a distinguished Member of this Congress.

JOHN was a ranking minority Member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I got to know him when he appeared on numerous occasions before the House Administration Committee, on which I serve, with reference to legislation receiving consideration in the Commerce Committee. I always marveled over his intimate knowledge of the details of all of the bills before his committee and over his legislative expertise.

JOHN had a very real concern for conserving and preserving our Nation's natural resources, and he felt this way long before environmental quality became a fashionable issue. As a Member of the Interior Committee, he was a prime mover behind such landmark legislation as the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Act.

He was also a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and has always been recognized for the deep interest he took in the welfare of those who fought in all of our wars. During his service in the Congress, he was a steadfast supporter of more adequate benefits for all our veterans. Many will recall that he gave the first American flag to be raised on Iwo Jima, and the raising of that flag has now been immortalized with the Iwo Jima statue near Arlington Cemetery.

JOHN SAYLOR was a popular Member of the House of Representatives, and I know that all of the Members of this body admired him for his sincerity and dedication to his responsibilities in the Congress. He was a patriotic American and a warm human being. He loved his country and contributed immeasurably to her continued strength and security.

His death has saddened all those who were privileged to know him. He will be missed by the people of Pennsylvania, whom he served so well for 25 years, by those of us in the Congress, and by his many friends.

Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the Saylor family on their great loss.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, some men seem to shrink in stature during the course of many years of public service, while others seem to grow and become more sensitive to the needs of their fellow man and more resilient to battle and adversity. JOHN P. SAYLOR was among the latter.

He served his fellow man with dignity and distinction. Rarely have I seen a man more dedicated to helping others; seldom have I seen a man more widely respected by friend and adversary alike and more sought-out for advice and guidance.

Today we mourn the death of JOHN P. SAYLOR, but we should also celebrate his life.

Born, raised, and educated in his beloved Pennsylvania, JOHN SAYLOR learned early in life the miracles of nature and the travesty of man. He witnessed the rape of thousands of acres of the earth's masterpiece, and felt the pain of helplessness known only to those who can see beyond the present. He suffered the nightmare of reality while reaching out for the seemingly impossible. But the impossible never stayed the way of JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN SAYLOR became the patron of conservation long before conservation became a popular issue. He was incensed at man's abuse of nature, and in the face of vested opposition and mass disinterest, set about to rectify man's assault on the environment. This took rare courage and a strong conviction, especially mindful of the industrial makeup of his district, where steel and coal provided employment for thousands.

Among the long line of accomplishments in his public career, the ones in which he took the most pride were those that protected and preserved Mother Earth for future generations of Americans.

As a freshman Congressman, I regret that my friendship with JOHN SAYLOR could not have been longer. But as a freshman, I can attest to the warmth and compassion he exuded in helping to make my transition from private to public life much easier. I can attest to the courage and conviction he displayed as the dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation. I can attest to the concern and unselfishness with which he represented his congressional district.

The Congress and America were richer for having JOHN SAYLOR. The service he rendered to Pennsylvania and his congressional district is immeasurable. Rarely in a lifetime are we privileged to know one who possesses the qualities and attributes which mark great men. JOHN SAYLOR was such a man.

I pay tribute to this great American today. We shall all be wanting without JOHN P. SAYLOR.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I knew JOHN SAYLOR only 10 months, which, for a freshman Member, have been a period of frantic initiation, orientation, and readjustment. In this hectic session, when the time to consider the perplexing problems was meager, this man gave guidance to the novice and comfort to the initiate. Where my interest was real, he intensified it. Where I was lacking, he stimulated. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he gave to conservation a new dimension and imparted to his colleagues the zeal to develop that dimension. And more—he showed us all the sheer beauty of a life of integrity and dedication to public service.

Ten months, Mr. Speaker—I wish it had been 10 years.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of a most respected colleague and friend, JOHN P. SAYLOR of Johnstown, Pa., will be felt deeply by all of us who have had the opportunity to serve with him in the Congress. His leadership in the field of conservation, which brought him national recognition from the National Wildlife Federation

and the Izaak Walton League of America, earned him high esteem among his colleagues who looked to him for counsel. Although I have known and worked with JOHN SAYLOR for over 17 years, it is difficult to find words to convey my sympathy to his wife, Grace, and their children, Susan and John, Jr., for I know JOHN'S death brings such a great loss to both his family and the people of Pennsylvania whom he has served since 1949. I would say only that JOHN SAYLOR'S contribution to his constituents and his country has enhanced the role of all Congressmen indeed and gives praise to his stewardship in behalf of all the American people. While we share in his loss, we also share in an association that we will warmly remember and always be thankful for having known.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who worked with and admired the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, his death came as an unexpected and shocking blow at a time when his valued and dedicated services sorely will be missed by his constituents and by the Nation.

While the breadth and depth of his accomplishments are known in the Congress of the United States, I think his colleagues should be aware of the respect and esteem in which Mr. SAYLOR was held throughout Pennsylvania. For an individual Congressman to merit such widespread homage is indeed a remarkable tribute.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials and columns which indicate the extent of the sentiment over the death of this wonderful man and great public servant:

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Oct. 30, 1973]

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN SAYLOR

Long before conservation gained its current popularity, Rep. John Saylor of Johnstown worked hard for the cause in Congress. The 65-year-old congressman, senior Republican member of Pennsylvania's delegation to Washington, died of a heart attack Sunday in Houston, Tex.

Mr. Saylor, while a stalwart Republican and a fiscal conservative, was his own man. He often differed with the "union line," yet enjoyed labor support at election time. He didn't hesitate to differ with his party, if necessary, on conservation matters or on benefits for his district (Cambria, Somerset, Indiana, Jefferson and Armstrong counties and a portion of Clarion).

A big man with a commanding presence and a strong voice, Mr. Saylor had a knack for endearing constituents to his work on their behalf. A combination tough guy and earthy congressman, he had an exceptionally good ear for the rustlings of his coal region constituency. Despite a slight Democratic edge in his district, he regularly racked up 2 to 1 majorities.

That often required a delicate balance on his positions (he usually ranked near the center in rating of both liberals and conservative groups). Yet Mr. Saylor always stated his case in the strongest possible terms. When others hemmed and hawed, he came out point-blank.

He could be the GOP's leading conservationist in the House, and at the same time advocate repeal of gun control laws. One of 15 in the House to vote against the Equal Rights amendment, Mr. Saylor demanded equal tax treatment for the unmarried as well as the married.

No one ever mistook him for one of your effete Easterners. He drove back and forth to Congress with the window rolled down in good weather and bad. His coal constituency won't see his like again.

[From the Johnstown Tribune Democrat, Oct. 30, 1973]

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. SAYLOR

In governmental and environmental circles of the United States, the death of Rep. John P. Saylor of Johnstown will certainly be felt. Even more so, however, will the people of his congressional district notice his absence.

Over the years since his first election to the House of Representatives back in 1949, Rep. Saylor has risen to the point where he was the fourth-ranking Republican member of the House in terms of seniority and 35th in rank overall; also, he was the dean of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation.

For years, he had been one of the nation's leading conservationists—a role that brought him prominence among environmental agencies and groups and even to serious consideration by President Richard M. Nixon for the post of Secretary of the Interior.

Those roles, though difficult to fill, eventually will be assumed by others in governmental and in private life.

It will be more difficult, though, to maintain Rep. Saylor's record of personal service to the people of this congressional district, the 12th, which covers Cambria, Somerset, Indiana, Armstrong and Jefferson counties and part of Clarion. Throughout his long tenure in the House, Rep. Saylor developed and solidified close ties to the electorate, the people, of his district.

[From the Johnstown Tribune Democrat, Oct. 30, 1973]

SAYLOR'S PASSING IS NATION'S LOSS

(By Clayt Dovey)

For Johnstown the weekend brought the shock of yet another of its leaders lost. This time it was Congressman John P. Saylor, taken suddenly and unexpectedly in death after surgery at St. Luke's Hospital in Houston, Tex. John Saylor's passing is a stunning loss to his family and friends who have always known him as an energetic and robust individual. To his constituency it marks the loss of an almost legendary representative in Washington, D.C. We haven't known any other congressman in this congressional district since 1949.

But, the Johnstown legislator's absence from the scene will be felt far beyond the limits of this political district. Saylor had established himself across the country as a friend of the land. By land I mean not just the nation which he served with distinction in and out of uniform, but the countryside. Saylor well understood the meaning of the word ecology decades before most of the grinding zealots who have been recently seized with the need to save the environment.

RECOGNIZED NEED

He loved the countryside from coast to coast and top to bottom, its mountains, prairies, seashores, timber, swamplands, lakes and rivers. He recognized the need to preserve much of its natural state, to develop a sound program of recreational use of it and to protect it from indiscriminate and wasteful exploitation by effecting a proper compromise between preservation and utilization.

John Saylor was a quarterback in conservation before there was a front line to protect him. His presence was felt across the United States in conservation matters. Every Cambria Countian, every Pennsylvanian and every American is indebted to Saylor and his compatriots for standing firm on environmental issues long before it was the vogue to do so. You had better believe that those of us who embrace the outdoors as a great treasure are the benefactors of his labors. And so will be our children, and their children, and theirs.

John Saylor never vacillated. He was consistently for conserving what was important to our national heritage. He will be sorely missed in sober environmental councils over the 50 states.

[From the Valley News Dispatch, Oct. 30, 1973]

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. SAYLOR

The sudden passing of Rep. John P. Saylor of Johnstown, who represented portions of the Alle-Kiski Valley in Congress for 25 years, leaves a big void in Pennsylvania's congressional delegation.

Mr. Saylor first entered congress a quarter century ago shortly after the end of World War 2. Eventually he became the senior congressman in the state delegation and one of the nation's foremost advocates of conservation. His position on a number of important committees in the House brought him to national attention.

He was the author of the Wilderness Act, designed to save land from development and he was an early backer of antipollution legislation. He also sponsored legislation establishing the Office of Coal Research, designed to find more use for coal. He was a prime mover in the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

Mr. Saylor also was the senior Republican member of the House Interior Committee. He was on the Veterans Committee, the National Parks Centennial Committee and the National Forest Preservation Committee.

As a politician he managed to survive in a district where organized labor is a potent force. He was able to attract and hold votes which often go to the Democrats. That he represented his district well is attested to by the fact that he was returned to the Congress so often.

While we did not always agree with Rep. Saylor—he was hawkish on the Vietnam war, for one thing—we believe on balance he was a good congressman who will be missed.

[From the Punxsutawney Spirit, Oct. 30, 1973]

WE LOSE A FRIEND

The unexpected death Sunday of Congressman John P. Saylor, of Johnstown, was a distinct shock to residents of the Punxsutawney area.

We have lost a good friend and a benefactor of note.

Saylor was instrumental in many of the achievements of the Jefferson County area in recent years. He helped cut through the red tape in Washington to make possible the housing projects in the county and principally the urban renewal project in this city.

The senior Republican in the Pennsylvania delegation in the House of Representatives and a veteran of 25 years in Congress, Saylor was known as one of the nation's first environmentalists. He was a retired U.S. Naval Reserve captain, a 33rd degree Mason and served with distinction the 469,000 persons in the 12th District composed of Cambria, Indiana, Armstrong, Clarion and Jefferson counties.

Veterans, particularly, may miss Saylor's aid in the nation's capitol. As a senior member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee he resolutely pursued increasing benefits for the men who fought in our country's wars. In recognition of his interest in the environment he was a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the National Forest Reservation Committee and the National Parks Centennial Commission.

But it was a man and a personal friend that John Saylor counted most to the people of this area. A regular visitor to Punxsutawney he listened to his constituents with interest and compassion. The big and the small were all the same to him.

A special election will be required to fill the vacancy created by the loss of this leader. We can only hope that area politicians will,

in selecting a successor, keep in mind the qualities of John Saylor and make an effort to find a replacement who can match his standards and elicit from the constituency the same strong support he enjoyed, and rightly so.

Filling Saylor's shoes will be a man-size Job. WOC.

[From the Indiana Evening Gazette, Nov. 2, 1973]

JOHN P. SAYLOR WILL BE MISSED

No man can receive greater honor than that bestowed by his peers.

The United States House of Representatives Monday morning made that supreme tribute to our Congressman, John P. Saylor.

Following the formal announcement to the House of Representatives of Congressman Saylor's passing last Sunday in St. Luke's Hospital in Houston, more than 30 of his colleagues rose to praise the deceased as a farsighted conservationist, an effective legislator, a respected gentleman, and a genuine friend.

Forty-four of the members of the House of Representatives were named to attend Mr. Saylor's burial services yesterday in Johnstown.

Congressman Herman T. Schneebeli, of Williamsport, who first met Mr. Saylor while they were students at Mercersburg Academy in 1924, announced the Congressman's passing and expressed sorrow at the loss of a real friend.

House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford likened our Congressman to a Teddy Roosevelt for his qualities as an individualist and an ardent conservationist.

Among the accomplishments achieved under Congressman Saylor's leadership during 25 years in the House were the Wilderness Act and the Land and Conservation Act as well as the Office of Coal Research and the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. He was a cosponsor of the bills to admit Alaska and Hawaii as the 49th and 50th states.

"John Saylor," Mr. Ford continued, "followed in the footsteps of such great conservationists as Gov. Gilford Pinchot and President Teddy Roosevelt."

The fallen Congressman was praised for his concern for the needs of his constituents and at the same time being acutely conscious of the national interest.

And tributes were made by more recent members of the House, citing our Congressman as the one who welcomed them with warmth and assisted them in their early days as co-members in the House.

Congressman Saylor was honored in life by receiving such acclaim as the National Wildlife Federation's Conservationist of the Year Award for 1964 and the Izaak Walton League's Founders Award in 1970.

His service to the people of the Congressional District he represented was testified to time and time again when he was the most popular vote getter in election and after election.

The recitation of his work as a Congressman is a considerable tribute.

John P. Saylor's greatest tribute, however, may well come as untold millions of Americans enjoy the facilities of nature's wonders preserved because there was a "big man" in Congress who saw the need for conservation long before the word ecology came into the public's vocabulary.

He will be missed.

[From The Cresson-Gallitzin Mainliner, Oct. 30, 1973]

A DEVOTED REPRESENTATIVE

Congressman John P. Saylor who died Sunday morning in a Texas hospital of a heart attack was an able representative who served the people of this area well.

He was always available to discuss problems of his constituents. Despite his demanding schedule at the Nation's Capitol he would take time to communicate with his electors back home.

When necessary, he made trips into cities and municipalities served by him to personally check on matters requiring action by the federal government.

In addition he was a leading proponent of conservation and took a personal interest in veterans affairs and was responsible for much legislation in these fields.

In the true tradition of American politics, Rep. Saylor was a devoted and capable servant of the people during his nearly 24 years of public service.

SERVICE WAS HIS LIFE

Although the relationship of Cambria and Somerset counties is interlocking in many areas, it was not until this year that the two were in the same congressional district—at least within the memory of most of us.

The process of redistricting created the change, and when the results of the election were tallied, John P. Saylor became this county's representative-elect.

For more than two decades this man has been a part of the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress. In the brief time that he was Somerset County's representative, residents of this area have learned that he was always ready to serve.

Congressman Saylor was vitally interested in Route 219 and did all he could to bring to fruition this highway. When the idea of developing "priority" national highways was enacted, he was a prime mover in the plan to have route 219 included in the new designation.

Although the highway has been named the North Star Way, this newspaper would like to suggest that if ever a name change is considered, that it be called the John P. Saylor highway. It is not that we dislike the present designation, but that we feel the name change would be fitting because of the interest this man had in its being built.

Among Congressman Saylor's other interests was improving the environment, and to this end he was author of the Wilderness Act of 1969.

Coal mining is an important industry in Pennsylvania's Twelfth Congressional District, so it is not surprising, that he sponsored legislation to discover more ways to make use of this form of energy, which is so abundant in this area. That same year he was a prime mover in the passage of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

Long tenure in Congress is not unusual, particularly when the representative is from a district which has a majority of the party which elected him.

In Congressman Saylor's case, however, he was a Republican from a district with a Democratic majority. His devotion to serving his district was such that members of both parties supported him, for they knew that he was a good man to represent them in Washington.

These words from President Nixon to Mrs. Saylor tell us why this unique situation developed: "His Pennsylvania constituents came to trust him implicitly for faithful representation of their interests and needs and we in Washington to count on him for unflagging legislative responsibility, independence and integrity."

No matter how efficient his successor may be, the fact remains that much time must pass before Somerset County will have a representative in Washington with as great an influence as we had prior to the time Congressman Saylor answered his last roll call.

At a critical time like this, his voice is needed, but instead of spending much time on our regrets about his departing this life, let us offer a word of thanks for the many years of service he rendered to those who were his constituents.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, indeed today is a day of deep sorrow and grief, not only for those of us who had the privilege to serve with this great man in Congress, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, but also to the people of Pennsylvania and the Nation. For, the death of my friend and colleague, Congressman SAYLOR, marks the end of a distinguished career for one of America's truly great public servants.

Throughout a lifetime of dedicated service to his constituents, JOHN was an outstanding Member of Congress whose unwavering friendship and solid advice will always be treasured as much by me as any of those whose lives he touched during his 34 years of service in Washington. His legislative efforts in the fields of conservation, coal mine health and safety, and aid to the American Indian will forever remain as landmarks to progress in the Nation's history.

Today, as we celebrate his life and mourn his death, it is incumbent upon all of us to review with the deepest respect his many fine qualities, his years of service, his advice, friendship, diligent work, and unparalleled wit which characterized so well the life and memory of JOHN SAYLOR. He will certainly be missed in the House of Representatives, in our State of Pennsylvania and in his hometown of Johnstown.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Millie, and I join the Congress of the United States and thousands of our fellow Americans in extending our deepest sympathy to JOHN'S wife, Grace, his son, John P. Saylor, Jr., and his daughter, Susan.

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying respect to the memory of JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR and extending my sympathies to Mrs. Saylor, his children John and Susan and his two grandchildren.

Those passing through the halls of the Rayburn House Office Building and those of us meeting in the House Chamber will definitely notice the absence of the congenial Representative from Pennsylvania. Those of us on the Hill will miss his quick wit and friendly presence, while those who did not have the opportunity to know him personally will miss the fruits of his legislative labors. All who have been involved in environmental affairs have heard mention of Representative SAYLOR, who coauthored the Wilderness Act as well as the Land and Water Conservation Act, and who was instrumental in the establishment of the Piscataway Park near George Washington's Mount Vernon residence.

Americans who have benefited directly from the work of Representative SAYLOR run the gamut from coal miners in Appalachia to American Indians in New Mexico, and of course residents of Alaska and Hawaii owe him thanks, as he was a prime factor in the drafting and passage of legislation calling for their statehood.

I consider it my good fortune to have served in the 93d Congress with Representative SAYLOR, and I appreciated the opportunity of working with him earlier this year during private pension reform hearings in Pittsburgh conducted by the General Labor Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. I am certain that all Americans, particularly those of Pennsylvania, consider it most advantageous to have been so ably represented since 1949. We will

miss him, but we will not forget the invaluable contributions he made to our Nation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, again I join with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and other colleagues in expressing my sincere regrets at the untimely death of our beloved colleague, JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN was a man who was truly outstanding in every sense of the word. He was a good Congressman in the best sense of the word. He was a man whose work will live on for many years to come, because he contributed greatly to the important and the enduring accomplishments of the Congress.

It was my privilege to share his friendship and to know him well during the entire period of his service here. I admired him greatly, and I, too, shall miss him very much. I knew the color and drama of his personality as well as the outstanding qualities and capabilities he possessed, both as a person and as a legislator. He was the living symbol of the quality of endurance, of ruggedness and forthright honesty, and of legislative leadership.

Representative SAYLOR was a leading conservationist and the ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. We have heard from the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) of his great dependence on the keen intellect, the sound judgment and the legislative ability of Mr. SAYLOR in the work of that committee. Many years before the issues of conservation, natural resources, and environmental quality came to be fashionable, Representative SAYLOR was helping to shape wide national policies for these vital concerns. The coauthor of such bills as statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, the Wilderness Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Act, Congressman SAYLOR also had pushed for benefits for coal miners and the American Indian.

He played an important role in the establishment of the C. & O. Canal National Park and the Piscataway Park in Maryland, across the river from Mount Vernon. Recently he was instrumental in the approval of legislation to restore and maintain the deteriorated Congressional Cemetery, where many Members of earlier Congresses and other notables of early America are buried.

Congressman SAYLOR was also a member of the House Veterans Committee and he was well versed in matters pertaining to veterans' affairs. He was one of the original members of the 1976 Bicentennial Commission, but had to give up his work because of the press of other duties. Nevertheless, he continued his strong support of the Commission for he very much wanted to see a creditable celebration in 1976.

For good reason his Pennsylvania constituents trusted him implicitly for faithful representation of their interests and needs, but his contributions was national in their scope. The House has lost one of its ablest and most respected Members.

My sympathy and my prayers are with Mrs. Saylor, and their family in their bereavement.

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, I first worked with JOHN SAYLOR when I came to Congress last January. I went to Mr. SAYLOR, who was a member of the Committee on Committees trying to get his support for the committee assignment of my choice. He convinced me that with my background I should serve on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He was most convincing and I agreed that Interior was indeed a better choice.

As time went on I found that the assignment was to provide me with the invaluable experience of working with one of the most dedicated men on Capitol Hill. As ranking member of the House Interior Committee, Congressman SAYLOR was not only a fine teacher of the intricacies of the Interior jurisdiction, but also provided the fatherly advice essential to the survival of any freshman. In the short period of our association JOHN SAYLOR helped me over the unpredictable course of my first months, he smoothed my rough edges, and probably saved my learning many lessons the hard way. He has taught me not only the lessons of the Hill, but also lessons of humanity that I shall always appreciate.

I offer at this time a tribute not only to a respected and capable Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, but also to a colleague whose many contributions to our committee and the Congress will be missed.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the death of Congressman JOHN SAYLOR saddens all of us. As a new member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I found Mr. SAYLOR to be an outstanding example of what one person can do to help preserve the environmental quality of our country. He was a leader in conservation legislation. But, more than that, he was a leader in how to get things done. He was a man of vision and a man of action. He saw the need in our country for wilderness and he coauthored the bill to preserve it. He saw the need for outdoor recreation for our people, and he helped create the Land and Water Conservation Fund to assist in providing it. His interests were never parochial—he worked to preserve our country's heritage for all of the people and for our future generations.

Those of us who worked with Mr. SAYLOR on the House Interior Committee will miss his wit and wisdom, his wonderful way of punctuating a fierce fight with a gentle barb. I admired him professionally and liked him personally. His career was heroic; his achievements monumental.

Mr. SAYLOR'S legacy is his legislation. His memorial is in the parks and wilderness areas of our country—and in the minds of those who knew him.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues today in paying respect to JOHN SAYLOR, whose untimely death has robbed us, and the Nation, of an outstanding public servant.

Congressman SAYLOR was held in universal high regard on both sides of the aisle. He was knowledgeable and personable, and had a well-deserved reputation for "doing his homework" on legislation before the House. He understood the workings of Congress, and he had a tremendous grasp of the legislative process.

His contituents, and the entire State of Pennsylvania, have lost a legislator who represented them with devotion and skill. His leadership in the cause of conservation dated back many years, before it became a popular issue. Every American who loves the outdoors owes a debt to Congressman SAYLOR, who dedicated himself to preserving the natural beauty of our land.

I extend my deep sympathy to John's wife and children, and to his host of friends, in their bereavement. I know their grief is tempered by the knowledge that he enjoyed a long and fruitful life.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of JOHN SAYLOR, this body, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and this Nation, lost a man of unparalleled personal and leadership qualities.

JOHN was a man of compassion, goodwill, and foresight. As a ranking minority member of the House Interior Committee, he led the Nation for a number of years in the fight to preserve our country's environment. He was known as Mr. Conservation and received a number of conservation awards for his fine efforts including the Conservationist of the Year Award from the National Wildlife Federation in 1964 and the Founders Award of the Izaak Walton League of America in 1970. JOHN played a leading role in enacting the Wilderness Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and many other pieces of conservation and environmental legislation which today protects our forests, waters, and wildlife. He also assisted in establishing numerous national parks across this Nation and his service on the National Forest Preservation Commission and the National Parks Centennial Commission will remain as a lasting tribute to JOHN'S hard work and deep concern for the environment.

JOHN'S able leadership and legislative talents went far beyond the environment. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, he worked for national cemeteries for veterans and expanded medical care for veterans. JOHN himself ably served this Nation in World War II. The first American flag given to the marines at Iwo Jima, now memorialized in the Iwo Jima statue near Arlington Cemetery, was given to those marines by JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN'S mastery and knowledge of a variety of legislative issues was always impressive. In addition to his deep concern for the environment and veterans affairs, JOHN cosponsored the legislation establishing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii; worked long and hard for coal mine safety; deeply involved himself in Indian affairs; and was instrumental in including significant amendments to the Alaska pipeline bill.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN SAYLOR will be sorely missed by this body, and I join with many other Members of the House in extending my deepest personal regret at his death to his family and to his State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the untimely death of my good friend and colleague, JOHN SAYLOR.

As JOHN and I pursued our common goal of perfecting a sound structure of veterans benefits as members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I came to know him well. I have profited from his wisdom and experience. I have been enriched by his humaneness.

Those who knew JOHN SAYLOR as the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Interior have recalled his ardent interest in ecology and the environment. He has been called Mr. Conservationist by those who are familiar with his leadership in this important field.

Those who are familiar with his efforts on behalf of the Nation's veterans know that JOHN SAYLOR could well have been called Mr. Veteran. His aggressive articulation of his views made him a most effective champion of the veterans benefit program.

His efforts on behalf of the Nation's veterans have long been recognized by the major veterans organizations. Just a short time ago, the AMVETS presented their coveted Silver Helmet Award to JOHN SAYLOR as the Member of Congress who had contributed most to the welfare of veterans. This award was richly deserved.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's veterans have lost a great advocate, the Congress and the people of Pennsylvania's 12th District share the loss of a dedicated Representative and I have lost a dear friend.

To Mrs. Saylor and their children, I extend my heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will not be the same without our respected colleague, JOHN SAYLOR. It was my good fortune to know JOHN and to work with him on a number of legislative matters pertaining to conservation and natural resources.

Whenever one thought of a conservation issue, the next question was how did JOHN SAYLOR feel about it. His opinion was widely respected. He was always in the forefront of those seeking better conservation practices and the enlargement of those lands set aside for future generations to enjoy.

His honesty, forthrightness and devotion to the causes he believed in are certainly worthy of emulation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, in a most literal sense, JOHN SAYLOR was a leader—a man ahead of his time.

When he came to Washington, he was concerned with conservation, wilderness, and responsible land use and land policies. That was in 1949—long before the environment became the popular, sweeping movement it is today.

I would simply like to say that he was a man who did what he believed in, and believed in what he did. He was a man who could deal with the complexities of public land law.

I regret time did not allow me to be more than a brief acquaintance of such a man.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Congressman SCHNEEBELI, for securing this time today in order that we might pay tribute to our departed friend and colleague, JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN is probably best remembered for his outstanding contributions to the field of conservation in America. However, I will remember him best for his very sincere interest in our veterans. I had the privilege of serving with him on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and we also served on three of the same subcommittees. JOHN SAYLOR always exhibited a deep and abiding concern for our veterans and always wanted to make certain that we were doing everything possible as a nation to benefit our former servicemen. During the height of the Vietnam war he joined with other members of the committee in an attempt to update our veterans laws in order to make sure that when these servicemen and women returned home they would receive the benefits to which they were entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss JOHN SAYLOR'S leadership on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, but most of all I will miss him as a friend and adviser.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to JOHN P. SAYLOR, one of the finest Members of the House of Representatives. He was a dedicated and conscientious Congressman who labored tirelessly to serve the people in his district and the Nation as a whole.

As one of the Nation's foremost conservationists, he helped to awaken the Nation to the need for conservation and was instrumental in leading the Congress to enact laws to protect and conserve our limited natural resources. He helped to lay the groundwork for the progress we are now making to protect the environment. All Americans owe JOHN SAYLOR a vote of thanks for his leadership and dedication.

JOHN SAYLOR will be remembered not only for his accomplishments in environmental matters but also for his compassionate concern for the welfare and security of all Americans.

My wife, Melba, and I extend our deepest sympathies to the Saylor family in their hour of sadness.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, conservation lost one of its brightest lights in the untimely and universally mourned death of the good friend of all mankind, Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR, ranking member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It was my privilege to sit and work with him on the Veterans Affairs' Committee. He was far-sighted and dedicated to the needs of those who served their country.

But more than that, JOHN SAYLOR was a conservationist of the highest order.

He spoke, practiced, and originated legislation for conservation, for the preservation of our natural resources, and recreational opportunities before some of today's vocal activists were born.

He has never relaxed his efforts nor surrendered his leadership.

As a mark of his effectiveness and the esteem with which he was regarded by his fellowmen, he was most justly named "Conservationist of the Year" by the National Wildlife Foundation in 1964.

I will miss the leadership and wise counsel of JOHN SAYLOR. My colleagues, our Nation, and our entire planet will feel the loss of his passing.

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, although this is my first year as a Member of Congress, in the short time that I was associated with JOHN SAYLOR, I came to know him as a gentleman who had great love and respect for his country, family, colleagues, and all matters related with his work in Congress.

With the passing of JOHN SAYLOR, it is a loss to us all because of the characteristics of hard work and genuine personal warmth which he possessed. His concern for the welfare of his constituents and his fellow Americans will be remembered by all of us in the House. The work and dedication which Congressman SAYLOR exhibited toward Interior and Insular Affairs has been progressive for all Americans concerned with adequate recreational areas and the preservation of our natural resources. Conservation was a subject very near to JOHN SAYLOR'S work and very dear to his heart.

Throughout his life he was honored publicily for his unselfish work toward causes be believed in. Personally, I also respected his determination to do his best for the people of the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania and the citizens of our Nation. Today, I join with my colleagues in mourning his loss from our presence.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the American people have lost a truly foresighted legislator with the passing of our respected colleague, JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania.

His constituents from the 12th congressional district will discover it a difficult task finding a man of his caliber and vigor to represent them in the House.

We who were his friends and fellow Members will remember with pleasure his wit and sound advice but feel his loss keenly for the absence of a sage and able intellect in our midst.

JOHN SAYLOR was one of the few men who saw quite early the importance of preserving our wild and untouched lands against the erosion of commercial expansion.

He was the coauthor of the Wilderness Act, the Land and Water Conservation Act, and sponsored numerous other legislative initiatives to preserve and protect the untamed beauty of our natural resources.

He will also be remembered for his untiring efforts on behalf of veterans and for his compassion for miners and American Indians.

In fact, the aggressive, commonsense approach that this rugged American applied to all he did won him the respect of all those with whom he came into contact.

JOHN SAYLOR served in Congress for nearly 25 years.

He served the Nation, his district and his colleagues in a manner which will bring everlasting credit to his name.

From this time onward his service will offer a model for those who will follow him and, in these troubled times, those whom he has left behind to pick up the fights that he fought.

Mrs. Boland and I wish to extend our

deep and heartfelt sympathies to Mrs. Saylor and her children during this time of sorrow.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of my friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, late a Representative from Pennsylvania. In his more than 24 years in the House of Representatives, he gave to his constituents and our country dedicated and distinguished service.

JOHN, in his concern and devotion to the American people, exemplified the model of the sincere, dedicated and conscientious public servant. Throughout his 24 years as a Member of this body, he continued his courageous drive for the betterment of the American people and the American way of life. This Nation is certainly a better place and our land and waters are in a cleaner and better condition today than they would have been without the knowledge and effective work of Representative SAYLOR.

He was a man of profound convictions and represented his district and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania admirably. JOHN earned and deserved the admiration and respect of all of us who served in the House of Representatives with him. He will be missed by the people of his district, his State, and his colleagues in the Congress.

To his wife and children, my family joins me in extending our condolences and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in this tribute to the late JOHN P. SAYLOR with a deep sense of sorrow and loss. The House has lost one of its finest Members, and millions of Americans have lost a hard-working champion of conservation.

In more than 20 years in the House, JOHN worked hard and effectively to preserve our Nation's wilderness lands for future generations of Americans. He devoted himself to the environment long before it became a popular cause throughout the Nation, opposing massive public works projects which would have defaced great scenic treasures, and writing such landmark conservation measures as the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund laws. He was the first Member of the House to win the National Parks Association award for distinguished service on behalf of national parks and monuments, and he was also honored with top awards by the National Wildlife Federation and the Izaak Walton League. There is not a State in the Union whose residents have not benefited from Representative SAYLOR'S efforts as ranking Republican on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Less known but equally effective were his activities on behalf of the miners of his district and the veterans of our Armed Forces. He sponsored legislation establishing the Office of Coal Research and was a leading supporter of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. Many veterans organizations have praised him for his service on the House Veterans Affairs Committee in helping to obtain increased benefits for war veterans.

Those of us in the House who had the privilege of working with JOHN SAYLOR will long remember the expertise and dedication which served as an example to us all. And throughout America stand living memorials to his presence—the parks, wilderness areas, and scenic wonders which he loved and fought so hard to preserve.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened by the sudden, tragic death of my friend and colleague, JOHN P. SAYLOR.

As a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I had the privilege of working with JOHN closely for the 5 years I have been in Congress. That he was an intelligent and effective Member of Congress goes without saying; he was an expert legislator, highly respected in the House and consistently looked to for guidance and expertise on matters relating to the conservation of our natural resources.

More than that, though, JOHN was a warm, fine human being whom I was proud to call a friend. I was one of the Members who flew to Johnstown to attend JOHN'S funeral and offer the last respects of the House, only to be prevented from landing due to poor weather conditions. As the plane circled and we hoped for an opportunity to set down, our thoughts naturally turned to JOHN SAYLOR. Though the occasion was a tragic one, we could not help but be heartened by considering his probable reaction to such a predicament. There was no question but that JOHN would have had us all in high spirits.

JOHN SAYLOR was a good man, large of stature, large of heart. He loved and served well his country and his countrymen and I believe that this love was returned.

To his wife, Grace, his daughter, Susan, and his son, J. Phillips III, I offer my heart felt condolences. We will all miss JOHN greatly.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow and great regret that I learned of the untimely death of our colleague from Pennsylvania, JOHN SAYLOR. For the past 3 years it has been my pleasure to serve with him on the Interior Committee and in that time I came to appreciate him as a person and his effectiveness as a legislator. It was in his position of ranking minority member of this committee that he made some of his greatest contributions to the law of the land, including cosponsorship of the Wilderness Act and of the Land and Water Conservation Act.

I came to appreciate particularly keenly both his knowledge of conservation issues and his willingness to fight for the principles in which he believed when we worked together recently in committee on the Alaskan pipeline bill. His support of some of my proposed amendments in subcommittee, in full committee, and in the conference committee was instrumental in achieving the inclusion of significant parts of them in the final reported version of the legislation.

It is indeed a major loss for the Congress when it loses a Member like JOHN. He was extremely knowledgeable and dedicated and was also able to maintain a sense of humor. I regret the death of our able colleague and offer my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, JOHN SAYLOR was a great man who spent his life in service to others.

We all know of JOHN'S leadership in the field of conservation and of his endeavors to protect the Nation's scenic and natural resources. But in doing so, he looked first and foremost to the needs of the 12th District of Pennsylvania.

The Reverend Regis H. O'Brien, TOR, of St. Francis Seminary, Loretto, Pa., a long-time personal friend of our late colleagues, in delivering the funeral eulogy, in my mind expressed so accurately the feelings of all of us.

Referring to JOHN'S stature, he said, "the greatest tribute that could be paid to JOHN is that his heart was as big as his frame."

"JOHN SAYLOR," he said, "was a great man who achieved national and even international fame." The priest said our colleague was unique in politics because "he made no empty promises and took the utmost steps to secure that which he promised. His career could be described in one word—impeccable."

The grief of his devoted wife Grace, and of Phillips and Susan, is shared by all of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with JOHN. May our profound respect for his memory sustain and comfort them in their great loss.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that we take note of the passing of our friend and former colleague, the late JOHN P. SAYLOR.

JOHN SAYLOR served in the House for more than two decades and, during this time, he continualiy proved himself a dedicated representative both for the interests of his constituency in Pennsylvania and the Nation as a whole. As a freshman congressman, I had the privilege of serving with him on the Interior Committee and recall my high regard for his avid interest in the area of conservation, long before it had come to the fore as a matter of public concern.

JOHN SAYLOR will long be remembered as one of our outstanding congressmen—one who brought to his office a wisdom and judgment that distinguished his career in the House of Representatives. To his family and friends I extend my sincere sympathy and condolences.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the late Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR. I speak with sadness of the shocking loss his death has been to me personally, as well as to his family and friends, and all those who have known and worked with JOHN in these past years. It would be repetitious to cite the many, many instances when he has displayed creative leadership in the House, and his contributions in the field of conservation and the environment are of inestimable value to our Nation. Indeed, the Nation suffers when it loses such a man—a man whose imprint will be long felt across the land.

I feel very fortunate to have known JOHN for more than 15 years, and to work with him. His memory will serve as an inspiration for many years to come.

My family and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and loved ones. JOHN P. SAYLOR will be deeply missed, for the House has lost a truly dedicated servant, a great man.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, all of us of this House are deeply saddened at the passing of our distinguished colleague, JOHN SAYLOR. For 24 years he has been faithful in the service of his country, devoting all his talents and energies to the competent fulfillment of his duties. It has been a distinct privilege to serve with him these several years in the House of Representatives. Mr. SAYLOR distinguished himself as the ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. His presence on these committees and in this legislative body will be very much missed.

I extend to his family, friends and constituents my deepest sympathy. May they derive some consolation from the knowledge that their loss is shared by many friends and acquaintances.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our very distinguished fellow Congressman, JOHN SAYLOR of Pennsylvania.

I had the privilege and pleasure of serving with Congressman SAYLOR on the Interior Authorizing Committee for 2 years and in the years following when he served on the Interior Appropriations Committee.

I was particularly pleased in having the advice, counsel, and good judgment of Congressman SAYLOR many times. He was an outstanding Member of this House, an outstanding public official, and his service to the Nation in the fields of conservation and resource management will be a permanent part of our national structure.

All Americans have lost a great citizen and worker for them. My deepest and sincerest sympathy to his charming widow and to the State of Pennsylvania for the loss of our very beloved friend.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today in tribute to JOHN SAYLOR, Member of Congress and friend. His death represents a personal loss and creates a great void in this body whose stature he enhanced by his service to the Nation.

JOHN SAYLOR had all the attributes of legislative leadership. He had the vision and informed concern which led him to espouse the cause of the environment long before it became fashionable. With these he combined a grasp of the facts, determination, and persuasive powers—rooted in the respect in which he was held by his colleagues—to see this concern translated into concrete accomplishment.

Thus he helped shape such legislative landmarks as the land and water conservation fund, the Office of Coal Research, the Wilderness Act, the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, and a number of other measures dealing with conservation and the environment over the years.

He was the first Member of Congress to receive the National Parks Association Award, in 1954, and in 1958 was the first recipient of the National Conservation Award from six leading conservation organizations. In the years since he has been honored by such organizations as the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, and the Sierra Club.

I shall always value my recollections of working with JOHN in efforts ranging from legislation to project endangered wildlife species to the fight to retain user fees for recreational facilities on federally owned land. We lost that last one, but I understand that shortly before his death JOHN was preparing to reintroduce legislation to continue that fight.

Recognition accorded JOHN by the National Federation of Independent Business for his espousal of economy in government and by Americans for Constitutional Action demonstrates that his brand of conservationist convictions is wholly in keeping with conservatism.

The same may be said for his warmth as a person, and the compassion which he brought to his duties on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which also brought him due recognition.

JOHN also was keenly aware of the need for reforms in this body, and was unrelenting in his insistence that legislative committees be given a fair share of competent staff responsible to the minority.

Several Members have already spoken in the days since JOHN'S death of his spirit of cooperation. I shall always recall with gratitude his willingness to travel at great inconvenience to Colebrook, N.H., and deliver a speech to a conservation group, at the request of this Member, so junior to him in terms of service. This readiness on the part of a senior Member to exert himself to lend assistance and encouragement to a newer Member was a source of warm regard JOHN could inspire.

Mr. Speaker, at the time President Nixon nominated GERALD FORD to the post of Vice President, I hailed that action as a most worthy choice. At the same time, I took that occasion to remark that it represented a too-rare instance of recognition of the capabilities and capacity for service among some career Members of the House. Too seldom is the attention of the Nation at large directed to our more outstanding Members, unless association with controversy thrusts them into the limelight. The works of the JOHN SAYLORS among us thus too often go unrecognized by the general public.

But those who record the real contributions of the two and a half decades he served in the Congress will mark his accomplishments. JOHN SAYLOR has honored his constituency, the Congress, and the country by his achievements.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the late Congressman JOHN SAYLOR of Pennsylvania was not only one of the most respected Members of the House of Representatives, he was also one of the most popular Members of this body because he was, above all, a fine and decent and warm-hearted human being.

He was generally regarded as one of the outstanding conservationists in the House, even before he became ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which also has responsibility for much conservation legislation, I frequently consulted with JOHN SAYLOR on such issues, along, of course, with the Merchant Marine Committee's own legislative star in this field, Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL of Michigan.

But I will remember JOHN SAYLOR in many, many other ways as well—primarily as a man of deep humanitarian attitudes who had the courage to take strong and forthright and completely independent positions on legislation intended to help the poor and jobless and the disadvantaged people of his District and of this whole country. When it came to a choice between party regularity and human values—as it frequently did during the years that JOHN SAYLOR was in the House—he could usually be found voting for legislation to help those who most needed help, because he was acutely aware of the problems of the aged, the sick, the jobless and the helpless.

I shall never forget the day in 1957 when JOHN SAYLOR was the only Republican Member of the House of Representatives to vote on a crucial teller vote in support of a food stamp amendment I had offered to a pending agricultural bill, the first time this issue ever came to a vote in the House. Interestingly enough, it was JOHN SAYLOR'S fellow conservationist, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, who "bent" the House rules just a bit that day to make a speech commenting on JOHN SAYLOR'S lonely and courageous action as the only Republican to go through the line on tellers to vote in favor of a food stamp program. As the Members know, teller votes were not recorded in those days, and much good legislation could be killed in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union on anonymously cast teller votes.

JOHN SAYLOR not only voted for food stamp legislation in the days when every other member of his party in the House was opposing it, but he joined me in testifying before the House Agriculture Committee, which was generally hostile to the idea in those days, and he spoke on the House floor for my food stamp bill when it was defeated in 1958 and passed in 1959, and again in 1964 when the present program was finally authorized by law.

Prior to the enactment of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, President John F. Kennedy and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, in 1961, at my urging, instituted a small number of test food stamp projects; and, when this program began to prove its value and was expanded into other areas of the country, still on a pilot project basis, I was delighted to join JOHN SAYLOR in urging the White House and the Department of Agriculture to include the Johnstown, Pa., area of Mr. SAYLOR'S district among the tests projects. And after watching this program in operation in his district, Congressman SAYLOR went before the Agriculture Committee and later before the House to describe in eloquent terms the differences in the effectiveness of food assistance when given under the food stamp program compared to the

then widespread program of direct distribution of some surplus foods, such as powdered eggs and dried milk and canned lard and dried beans and an occasional tin of canned beef and gravy, and so on.

In later years, JOHN SAYLOR joined me in criticism of abuses which were often winked at under the program, and legislation which sought to turn the food stamp program into a substitute for adequate social welfare programs. He was softhearted but hardheaded, and a bitter foe of cheating and waste. And I admired him for that, too.

I shall miss a good friend and a conscientious public servant, a man we were privileged to have as a colleague.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of our friend and colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR, distinguished Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, has saddened us all and left a place in the House of Representatives that will be hard to fill.

JOHN will be remembered as "Mr. Conservation," as one of the leaders of an environmental movement the importance of which most of us were not as quick as he to recognize. As ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, JOHN put long hours and dedicated effort into the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Wilderness Act, and the preservation of national parks, including Piscataway Park in Maryland. The beauty of the land he helped to protect will be an appropriate memorial to him.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, JOHN pushed through legislation providing national cemeteries and medical care for veterans. He also fervently supported the rights of the American Indians and Alaskan Natives, and was instrumental in the passage of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act.

There is never enough time to do the things we want to do once we find them. But JOHN SAYLOR managed to accomplish more in his lifetime than many of us ever can, and I am grateful for the legacy he left us.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the loss of this House in the passing of JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR is a personal loss to me as to many other Members.

JOHN SAYLOR was my friend. He liked south Texas, the area I represent. He liked the people from my district who visited me here. He liked the deer head mounted in my office, although he was given to sly suggestions that if he had shot the deer it no doubt would have been a bigger one. And it probably would have been.

JOHN SAYLOR thought big. He was a big man—not only physically but also in his understanding of other people and their problems and concerns. As ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he often used his position to assist me in my efforts to bring about the construction of needed reclamation projects in my district. He was a tower of strength in helping handle legislation of great importance to the people of south Texas.

Before I came to Congress, where my friend had served since 1949, he had much to do with enactment of the small reclamation projects legislation during President Eisenhower's administration. This legislation has been a great boon to my area, as I told JOHN SAYLOR after I came here and knew him.

This was a man who made a tremendous contribution to his country, his good work extending far beyond the Pennsylvania district he represented so outstandingly. I miss JOHN SAYLOR and will always remember him as a good friend and a forceful legislator.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of our beloved colleague JOHN P. SAYLOR has plunged us all into a darkness of spirit.

Long before "ecology" became a household word, JOHN SAYLOR was stepping to the tune of the different drummer that he heard, warning us of the wrong we did to our land in the name of progress.

It was my pleasure to put my shoulder behind many pieces of legislation sponsored by JOHN SAYLOR. Then, with shoulder to shoulder we fought many a legislative battle together.

Imbued with a deep sense of purpose and dedication, he was a "force" to be reckoned with as the ranking Republican member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. His hand was evident in every piece of legislation emerging from that committee.

The environment was only one of the concerns to which JOHN SAYLOR lent his great talents and boundless energy. Helping our Nation's veterans was another cause close to his heart. As one who shared his deep and abiding interest in assisting those who gave so much when called to the service of their country, I can only say, with profound sadness, that a strong voice on behalf of our former military men and women has been stilled with his death.

JOHN SAYLOR'S hard work in those two areas and others was noted and appreciated. He was widely honored and cited. But nowhere was his dedication more greatly appreciated than in the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania where his constituents mourn his passing. There, as here in this Chamber, his loss is deeply felt.

At this time, I join with my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy and that of my wife, Corinne, to JOHN'S wife, Grace, and their children John and Susan, and the rest of the Saylor family.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at a time in American history when so many dedicated and talented people are needed to provide leadership and inspiration we can ill afford to lose men such as Congressman JOHN SAYLOR on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 89th Congress and again in the 93d. His leadership on conservation matters was an inspiration to all of us on the committee. Moreover, his great fund of knowledge in the areas within the committee's jurisdiction was of enormous help to the less well informed members.

JOHN SAYLOR would have provided great wisdom to the Congress in the difficult decisions we now face, weighing the need to protect our environment against the exigencies of an energy shortage.

In short, JOHN SAYLOR will be sorely missed in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and in the House itself.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure to know the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOHN SAYLOR, for the last 5 years. I admired and respected him greatly as did all Members of the House. His leadership in many areas—especially that of environment—set high marks for all of us. The legislation that he brought about will be a living memory to his ability, his dedication and the great respect with which all Members regarded him.

However, there was another side to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. As a younger Member, he appeared extremely gruff and hard-bitten to me. At first, I tended to shy away from him, not being certain as to his reactions. One day riding over in the subway I was smoking a cigar. The wind caught the ash and of all things, it landed on a new pair of double-knit trousers that JOHN was wearing. For a while I thought that my world was coming to an end. After much apologies, including a written letter to JOHN and an offer to get him a new pair of pants, I learned that there was indeed another side to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He was gracious, kind, and had a wonderful sense of humor. Many times after that incident he would kid me about my nickel cigars and ask me if I was working for the garment industry. I learned, as many other younger Members had learned, that this was a true gentleman, a man who would fight for what he believed in but also someone who was very human.

All of us have lost a wonderful friend and a great Congressman. I am sure most of us in the Congress only hope that we can be half as well respected and half as well liked as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOHN SAYLOR. Marcia and I send our thoughts and prayers to his family.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain there is a feeling of great regret and deep sorrow in the hearts of every Member of this body due to the untimely death of our dear friend and colleague, JOHN SAYLOR.

My deepest regret is that I did not get to know JOHN better in my short time here in Congress.

JOHN SAYLOR spent nearly a quarter of a century in service to his country. He will always be remembered as a distinguished legislator, an ardent conservationist, a prophetic innovator, a community stalwart, and a fine American.

The Statehood of Alaska will be his abiding memorial. His vision was great, his labors were unselfish and his dedication was complete. Such a man always stands tall in the eyes of his fellow Americans and such a man never dies.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, JOHN SAYLOR is gone, but the influence of his wisdom and character on this country will be felt for decades to come.

It was my good fortune to be his friend, and to fight at his side in most of the major environmental battles of our time. The last time we shook hands was the week before his death; we had just finished the final meeting of the confer-

ence committee to decide the fate of the Alaska pipeline controversy.

In that meeting, as in every other he attended, he was a dominant and powerful presence. He had a direct—if sometimes salty—way of expressing himself; no one ever doubted where JOHN SAYLOR stood. And he had a sense of irony and a natural wit which was a joy to experience. He could make his point with wit and occasionally biting humor. In his hands these were powerful weapons.

History will surely mark the 1960's as the time America awoke to the ravages to the environment. And when future generations list the men and women who led that awakening, JOHN SAYLOR's name will be one of those at the top. Consider the landmark legislation of that time; the Land, Water and Conservation Act, the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Clean Air Act of 1963, the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, Clean Air Amendments and Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, the Air Quality Act of 1967, Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the list of major measures in the fields of conservation and environment goes on and on, and JOHN SAYLOR was a major sponsor of most of them.

JOHN SAYLOR was no armchair sportsman. He loved the outdoors and liked nothing better than to enjoy firsthand the streams and woods he sought to save for future generations.

He possessed legislative skills, a keen legal mind and an ability to find compromise that could move an important bill forward when stalemate threatened. He was truly one of the finest legislators of this era.

This country owes JOHN SAYLOR a great debt for his devoted public service. He leaves behind a tremendous legacy in the wilderness he worked so hard to preserve.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of our great friend and distinguished colleague, JOHN SAYLOR, is a severe blow to the Congress and the Nation. While I did not know JOHN as closely as many of my senior colleagues, I counted it a rare privilege to serve with him and observe his leadership in so many areas of national concern.

All of us are aware of the invaluable contributions that he made toward conservation and providing for a cleaner environment. While we are the beneficiaries of his leadership and counsel here in the House, those who will benefit most from his great works, will be future generations of Americans. As the ranking Republican on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, there is no question that his dedication to a beautiful America, and a clean America is a legacy for our children and their children.

He indeed was a prophet in his own time, and he received awards and honors for his pioneer work in conservation and the environment too numerous to mention. He was richly deserving of this recognition. Certainly, those of us from the Western States will never forget his thoughtful concern for our conservation problems. We had many opportunities to thank him, and during this tribute to his memory, I want to thank him once again. Truly, when we think of JOHN SAYLOR, it will be in the company of men like Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. When future recognition is given to America's great conservationists, another name is in order, that of JOHN SAYLOR.

At this time, I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and their children. They have lost a devoted husband and father, and his colleagues have lost a devoted friend.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives lost JOHN SAYLOR, truly it lost one its giants.

JOHN SAYLOR was driven by an intense desire to render big service to his country. We saw that desire fulfilled again and again through his continual and arduous efforts.

JOHN SAYLOR was No. 1 when it came to conservation. It was a position he gained over years of dedication, not a shallow thing. We owe the existence of many of our wilderness and park areas as well as major conservation legislation to his efforts.

He also had a large concern for our veterans, and over the years was a continually successful leader in efforts to secure for our veterans things which were rightfully theirs.

JOHN SAYLOR's big heart was evident in his battle for black lung legislation and other legislation concerned with helping people in need.

I had an opportunity to make a trip with JOHN and his wife, Grace. In the long hours we spent together talking and relaxing, I saw again the depth and breadth of this man's concern. He was a warm human and a big man in every way. He was fearless, courageous, and strong willed. And he was a constant credit to the people of Pennsylvania, to this body of Government, and to his country.

I shall miss him greatly.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow and sadness that I heard of JOHN SAYLOR's death. He came to Congress, in a special election, 1 year before I did. We had much in common—his district and the district I had then had much coal mining. I learned much from him.

He was a strong, forceful man. Some say he was outspoken. Yes, he was; but he always was pleasant in making his point.

"BIG JOHN" was what we called him, and, indeed, a big man he was—physically and mentally.

The Congress and the American Republic are poorer because he is gone, and all who knew him will miss him.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to realize that our able colleague from Pennsylvania is no longer with us.

JOHN P. SAYLOR had already been a Member of the National House of Representatives for 8 years when I took the oath of office for the first time. During the years that have elapsed since we became colleagues, I learned to respect him not only as an able, dedicated, and conscientious legislator, but as a good and loyal friend to whom one could always go for constructive counsel and worthwhile assistance.

After honorable service in the U.S. Navy during World War II, he continued to serve his community and his State as a businessman, an attorney, and a civic leader. During the crisis-filled years from 1949 to the present, almost a quarter of a century, he was a Member of this great body.

I had the privilege when I first came to Congress of serving with him on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which he became the ranking minority member. During that time the committee was working on the Alaskan and Hawaiian Statehood legislation. I thus developed early in my career a great respect for his ability and drive in getting things done. He fought hard in the Congress and as a member of the committee, not only for the conservation of our God-given natural resources, but for an equally important fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the life and career of our departed colleague should serve as an inspiration to others. His loved ones can take consolation in the knowledge that he did his best for his community, State, and Nation.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of JOHN SAYLOR's recent and untimely death. I know it is a real loss not only to his family, but to those of us who served with him and watched his many contributions to vital pieces of legislation.

As a freshman Congresswoman, I found JOHN SAYLOR to be a wise and able teacher, one who was always ready to share his wisdom and the knowledge he had gained over his many years in the Congress. Graciously on many occasions, he was willing to take valuable time to assist me in pursuing legislation. I shall forever be grateful to him for his help.

I know that all of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will miss him dearly. The Congress and the country have benefited from his outstanding service and his high goals.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we were all deeply saddened by the news of JOHN SAYLOR's passing on October 28. Prior to entering the hospital in Houston for his operation, JOHN went before his constituents on television to fully explain the nature of his illness and the operation. In reading the transcript of that announcement, I was particularly struck by JOHN's strength, courage, and forthrightness in the face of this most serious problem. These were character traits which we had all come to recognize and respect in JOHN SAYLOR during his long career of service in this body, and I think we all expected that these traits combined with his fighting spirit would carry him through this serious operation and return him to us. Indeed, we were all encouraged by the news of his condition and progress immediately following the operation and were therefore shocked when we received subsequent word of his heart attack and death.

Mr. Speaker, I have known JOHN SAYLOR since I first came to the Congress in 1961, and my respect and admiration has grown over these last 13 years, as has our friendship. JOHN had served this body with distinction since coming to the Congress in 1949. He was an imposing figure in physical stature and has left a tall mark in terms of his contributions to the Nation, particularly in the area of conservation. As the senior Republican on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, JOHN was one of the most respected Members of this body, not by virtue of his seniority

and power alone, but rather by virtue of the intellect, knowledge, and diligence he brought to that job and therefore the substantial contributions he was able to make in the area of legislation. JOHN SAYLOR will perhaps best be remembered as a legislator for coauthoring the Wildernes Act and the Land and Water Conservation Act. He also sponsored legislation to establish the Office of Coal Research, and played a key role in the enactment of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. JOHN SAYLOR'S great contributions to conservation were recognized in 1964 when the National Wildlife Federation named him "Conservationist of the Year;" and in 1970 he received the Founders Award from the Izaak Walton League.

I will most remember JOHN SAYLOR as both a bulwark of the Republican Party in the House and nationally, and as a man who recognized the need for bipartisanship in addressing national problems, especially in the areas of energy and the environment. I will also remember JOHN as a good friend with a great abundance of good humor and amiability which go a long way toward explaining his effectiveness in this body and the large measure of respect he commanded on both sides of the aisle. We will all deeply miss his towering presence in the Congress.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I join with our fellow Members in the House today in paying tribute to our late colleague, JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania.

It was my privilege to serve in this body with JOHN SAYLOR for the past 2½ years. I was aware of his great dedication to conservation legislation almost from the beginning of my service.

It can be said that no Member of the 93d Congress can point to such an outstanding record of achievement in behalf of the ecology of this country as that compiled by JOHN SAYLOR.

All Americans are indebted to him for his unwavering commitment to the preservation and proper development of our natural resources. It was unimportant to him where such resources existed—whether it was the Grand Canyon in Arizona; Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado; the C. & O. Canal National Historic Park in Maryland; or the Piscataway National Park across the Potomac from Mount Vernon. All these—and hundreds more—bear the imprint of his interest and efforts.

For all his dedication to conservation, however, Congressman SAYLOR never neglected his own constituents in the 12th District of Pennsylvania nor his other congressional responsibilities. As a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs he actively supported the National Cemeteries Act which established a national policy for the burial of veterans.

JOHN will be remembered, too, for cosponsoring the statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii and working tirelessly for their passage. He worked diligently, also, for the improvement of Indian conditions and the safety and health of coal miners.

Unknown to the many thousands who visit the site annually, it was JOHN SAYLOR who gave the marines the first American flag to be raised over Iwo Jima which led eventually to the creation of the famous monument near Arlington Cemetery.

Future generations will benefit from his untiring efforts in behalf of the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, both of which he coauthored and actively supported. Those of us who were privileged to serve with JOHN in this and preceding Congresses will have benefited even more that he worked among us.

To his wife and the other members of his family, I join with my colleagues in extending our deepest sympathy.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in any organization made up of several hundreds of individuals, only a relative few stand out above their peers as authorities in an area of importance to all. The House of Representatives is no different. While all of us may be recognized for our accomplishments by our own constituencies, only a few House Members are readily identified with a particular cause of concern to all Americans.

One legislator who stood clearly apart was our late respected colleague, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania. The name JOHN SAYLOR became synonymous with commitment to environmental quality for our Nation during his 13 terms as Representative of Pennsylvania's 12th District. As ranking Republican on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, he constantly did his best to insure that the committee's legislation reflected a proper environmental course for the Nation. His efforts were of particular benefit in shaping legislation during the past several years when there was a critical need for sound leadership in meeting the country's ecological needs.

JOHN SAYLOR was a man whose special talents made him the right man at the right time for the job that needed doing. All of us in Congress, all the American people, and those he so ably represented in Johnstown and all of his district, are grateful for all he did. He has left a rich legacy for future generations of Americans who, through his work, will live in an America which will retain and regain, where possible, the freshness, greenness, and beauty that first attracted Americans in earlier generations.

Mrs. Steiger joins with me in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. Saylor and JOHN'S family.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, during this period of acute moral and political upheaval, few have provided as shining an example of what America stands for as did our late colleague, JOHN SAYLOR. A wise, dedicated individual who directed his talents into any area which he deemed essential to the goodness of our great Nation, his presence is sorely missed by all of us.

JOHN SAYLOR'S achievements in the area of the environment began long before the current emphasis on ecology became fashionable. Strongly committed to the preservation and maintenance of our natural heritage, he pressed successfully for the Wilderness Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the establishment of national parks, and other legislation of a similar vein. He also worked hard to gain statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, to establish national cemeteries for veterans, and for coal mining safety.

These actions constitute but the tip of the iceberg in any attempt to portray the lasting contributions JOHN SAYLOR made to our country. Of more profound importance is the spirit of fair play, moral rectitude, and dedication to the welfare of the United States which permeated his entire life. He inspired all of us to reach for the highest goals.

My family joins me in extending to Mrs. Saylor and her family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN SAYLOR was a man who knew fully the dimensions of his job, and he met his responsibilities with honor, distinction, and good humor. His devotion to the citizens of his district and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will always be remembered by those he served and by those of us who served with him.

Today, we face the monumental problem of preventing our delicately balanced environment from becoming irreversibly damaged. JOHN SAYLOR long ago recognized today's environmental difficulties. He actively sought measures to protect our environment from eventual destruction. Indeed, we owe a great debt to the foundation he built for environmental consciousness and for his far-reaching and productive efforts in this important area of concern.

We will deeply miss our good friend and colleague. The House has lost one of its finest Members. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the life of JOHN SAYLOR—a distinguished lawmaker and a truly great human being.

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we all lost a great friend when we lost JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania. He was more than a great Congressman. JOHN was a friend and had a warm friendly smile for everyone on the floor.

Being from Texas, I have always been keenly interested in the Interior Committee. I have kept up with JOHN'S leadership for the development of our natural resources within this country. JOHN SAYLOR was always 10 years ahead of the times while pushing for greater utilization of America's resources for the future.

We extend our warmest and deepest sympathy to his family. His firm voice and sound position will always be remembered by all of his colleagues in Congress. JOHN P. SAYLOR has contributed so much to his country through the years that he served in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that it was impossible for me to be on the floor yesterday afternoon to participate in the special order in eulogy to our departed colleague JOHN SAYLOR. I was glad Mr. SCHNEEBELI was thoughtful enough to get permission for all Members to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of our distinguished friend, JOHN SAYLOR.

When I came to Congress in 1959, it was my privilege to be assigned to the two committees on which JOHN SAYLOR served. With our identical committee service, on Interior and Insular Affairs and on Veterans' Affairs, I had the privi-

lege of becoming well acquainted with our departed colleague.

On the Interior Committee as far back as 15 years ago, JOHN SAYLOR was ranking minority member. Of course we had difficulties and problems on that committee which called for differences by the minority from the majority viewpoint, but I distinctly recall that while JOHN SAYLOR was firm and straightforward he was not partisan. In those days committee membership included some well known personalities—the late Adam Clayton Powell, former Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall, General Anderson of the Montana National Guard, and my seatmate of those days the distinguished QUENT BURDICK, now in the other body. JOHN SAYLOR was the committee leader of his side of the aisle. He contributed to all of the worthwhile legislation that was reported from that committee during the years of the 86th and 87th Congresses.

As a fellow member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee one of the highest and most exceptional tributes that can be paid to JOHN SAYLOR is that he was one member who talked exactly the same way when the door was closed for an executive session as he did at a public session when the committee was hearing representatives of the various veterans' organizations present their cases on veterans' legislation. The legislative representatives of all of our major veterans' organizations paid a tribute to JOHN SAYLOR when they described him as a man who never talked out of both sides of his mouth.

As I recall many days of pleasant association with JOHN SAYLOR, my mind goes back to a trip headed by our chairman, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Aspinall, and including some members of the old Mines and Mining Committee—the late Gracie Pfost, the late Judge Saund and others. We went over into the deep-pit coal mining area of east-central Pennsylvania. We all remarked at the insistence of JOHN that we had work to do. He seemed to be pushing the subcommittee all through the day to finish the job. Even in those far-away days his objective was to improve coal mine safety.

JOHN was a humanitarian in the finest sense of the word. He was liberal in the best usage of that term. I think he might have preferred to be described as a progressive legislator.

There are so many good and fine things that ought to and should be said about our dear departed friend: He was held in affection and admiration by all of us. We were all saddened by the news of the loss of our late beloved colleague. I happened to be one of those privileged to attend the memorial services in Johnstown. There I observed the best evidence of the high regard and great esteem for JOHN SAYLOR by his constituents. The church could hold only a fraction of those who came to honor him but the streets of that city were lined all through the business district by those who wished to pay him their last respects.

JOHN was a man of courage; he was independent; he did what he thought was right; he contributed much to the welfare of his district, his State, and his Nation. He was one of this country's great conservationists. I am glad that I have had the privilege to be a colleague of JOHN SAYLOR.

We extend our heartfelt sympathy to his gracious and lovely wife Grace and his children John Jr., and Susan.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my esteemed colleague, Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR. Those who love the natural beauty of this Nation lost a good friend and powerful voice when he was taken from us.

His concern for our environment preceded the hue and cry heard in recent years. Floridians have been aware of JOHN SAYLOR's conservation record for many years through his work to preserve Big Cypress Swamp as a watershed and scenic area. He is also know to Floridians for his concern for the ecological balance of the Everglades National Park when it was threatened by the proposed southeast Florida jetport. I personally know of his interest in conservation of the unique environment of Florida through his work to preserve the lovely beaches, and through legislation which both of us sponsored to protect the scenic beauty of the Oklawaha River in north Florida from use as part of the proposed Cross Florida Barge Canal.

Thus the Nation, Florida, and I will miss this champion of conservation who served so ably as the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mrs. Burke and I join with the many, many others, who knew JOHN SAYLOR, in lamenting his untimely death, and the loss of his voice from our midst.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow and a sense of personal loss that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague JOHN P. SAYLOR.

It has been a privilege and honor to serve with JOHN SAYLOR these past 11 years. He was a fine man, an effective legislator, and a friend for whom I felt the deepest affection.

Our country will best remember JOHN as a champion of conservation. Long before the word ecology assumed its current import, JOHN SAYLOR called on us to weigh the environmental consequences of our actions on future generations. Foresight is a rare quality among men and it earned for JOHN the admiration and gratitude of the Nation.

I will miss JOHN as an able colleague and trusted friend and I offer my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my feelings of profound sorrow and deep loss over the death of our former colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR, who for 24 years served the people of Pennsylvania with both sagacity and dedication.

JOHN SAYLOR will undoubtedly be best remembered for his lifelong commitment to the preservation of the environment. Through his work as the ranking minority member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Commitee, he served to uphold the interest of conservation by his authorship of such important legislation as the Land and Water Conservation Act and the Wilderness Act.

Congressman SAYLOR's efforts were not limited to his constituents in Pennsylvania. Many people in the Washington metropolitan area owe a great deal to JOHN SAYLOR for his instrumental work in the establishment of the C. & O. Canal National Park, and Piscataway Park in Maryland. In addition, he was active in getting legislation to restore and maintain the Congressional Cemetery where many earlier Members of Congress are buried.

Congressman SAYLOR's work did not go unnoticed over the years. In 1964, he and the coauthor of the Wilderness Act, Congressman Aspinall, received the coveted Conservationist of the Year Award from the National Wildlife Federation. In addition, SAYLOR was the recipient of the Founders Award of the Izaak Walton League of America in 1970.

There were other aspects of JOHN SAYLOR's life which were equally as distinguished and worthy of notice. JOHN SAYLOR had the distinct honor of presenting the first American flag to be raised by the Marines at Iwo Jima. This presentation led to the famous photograph which is so beautifully duplicated by the Iwo Jima statue near Arlington National Cemetery.

Representative SAYLOR's sponsorship of legislation showed a consistent concern with the welfare of America and her people. He sponsored legislation establishing the Office of Coal Research, as well as being a major supporter of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act. In addition, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, his expertise inspired many of the important pieces of legislation which have emerged from that committee over the last 24 years.

For many of us, JOHN SAYLOR represented the epitome of what a Congressman should be. His diligent work on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania earned him the respect and admiration of all his colleagues. He will be particularly remembered for his outstanding wit and colorful vocabulary.

The Congress will undoubtedly suffer from the loss of JOHN SAYLOR. His leadership both in the Interior Committee and on the floor as one of the senior Republican Members will be greatly missed.

As a fair and lasting tribute to JOHN SAYLOR, let us in the Congress continue his commitment to the preservation of the environment. In our quest toward solving our great energy problems let us not sacrifice environmental interests in the process.

The 12th District of Pennsylvania has lost one of its best friends. The State of Pennsylvania has lost one of its most distinguished members, and we in the House have been deprived of the services of an exemplary public servant.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 28, the Congress lost one of its finest and most dedicated Members with the death of the Honorable JOHN SAYLOR of Pennsylvania. Mr. SAYLOR was a Member of Congress for nearly 25 years, and in that time, not only served the people of Pennsylvania, but also served the interests and well-being of all American people.

JOHN SAYLOR was instrumental in much major legislation. He coauthored legislation for the statehood of Alaska and Hawaii and he pushed measures in behalf of the American Indian, but we will remember him particularly for his efforts concerning conservation. He was

coauthor of both the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Act.

Along with his work in conservation, JOHN SAYLOR'S achievements covered many other fields. He was involved in the church and veterans' affairs, and was a trustee of several private schools and hospitals.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sympathy to his family. JOHN SAYLOR was a distinguished Member of this body, and we shall all miss his presence.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to the memory of our late colleague, the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, who served so capably on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Representative SAYLOR was most diligent in the discharge of his committee responsibilities. He will always be remembered for his meritorious service to our Nation, and particularly his contributions as an avid conservationist. His testimony before my Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment has helped us achieve enactment of laudable air pollution control legislation. His efforts on behalf of the Nation's National Park System earned him the distinction of being the first recipient of the National Conservation Award and the National Parks Association Award.

JOHN SAYLOR was truly dedicated to public service, and lived up to the full measure of his responsibilities. He leaves rich memories for all of us in public office.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rogers joins me in expressing our most profound sympathies to Mrs. Saylor and to JOHN'S children and grandchildren, with the hope that time may in some measure dim the grief they now feel.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of JOHN SAYLOR the Congress has lost an outstanding Member, the Nation has lost a distinguished and dedicated lawmaker, and the Virgin Islands have lost a very good friend.

Congressman SAYLOR was a leading figure in legislation important to the territory, including the 1954 Virgin Islands Organic Act, the bill providing for an elected Governor, and the congressional delegate bill. An editorial in the largest Virgin Islands newspaper, the Daily News, honoring the Congressman noted:

> While his critics were vocal in condemning him because of his stand in refining legislation that would allow for the rights of the minority political faction in the islands, he nevertheless continued to pursue his course of more self government for the islands, tempered with a sane approach on how it could be best accomplished in an orderly manner.

The editorial concluded:

> Although we have disagreed on some issues, The Daily News, friends of the Congressman, and even his critics, mourn his death, for he was a true friend of these islands, and one who was extremely active in helping to extend to these islands meaningful measures of self government.

I first met JOHN SAYLOR in 1956 at which time I was serving as a member of the Virgin Islands Legislature. I will always remember, with the utmost gratitude, that upon my election to the Congress, he went out of his way to welcome me and to share his experience and knowledge as I took up my legislative duties. During the time it has been my privilege to know Congressman SAYLOR I was tremendously impressed by his commitment to the protection of our land and water resources, his coauthorship of the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills, and the Wilderness Act, and his efforts on legislation which would benefit American Indians and coal miners.

As we memorialize his accomplishments and comfort his family, let us also draw inspiration from JOHN SAYLOR'S contributions to the preservation of our natural heritage, for this is a legacy which will enrich the lives of the American people for generations to come.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest eulogy to JOHN P. SAYLOR is the distinguished record of hard work and accomplishment he leaves behind him in the House of Representatives. History will document that record in the context of time, placing it in perspective for future generations. We can, at best, add but a personal footnote to the history he helped write.

To those of us who knew him well, JOHN was one of the strongest personalities in Washington. In every sense of the word, he was a "big" man. His physical stature, itself impressive, was augmented by his ramrod military bearing, his confident long-legged gait, his booming voice and his naturally grand manner that had a way of transforming even a simple greeting into a special occasion. Wherever he happened to be, whether in a meeting, a conversation, a discussion, or a debate, JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania was the commanding presence.

He was strong-willed, magnificently opinionated, and had a memory worthy of the pachyderm that symbolizes his party. He was the kind of man you instinctively wanted on your side of an issue, not only for the strength of his argument as he recalled background details and recited legislative history, but for the tenacious strength of his conviction as well.

He possessed both personal and political power; yet he was living proof of the saying that big men can afford to be gentle. He knew how to twist arms, all right, and his armtwisting was effective; but he also knew when to let up on the pressure. In trying to sway opinion he never compromised friendship nor infringed on personal dignity. He was, in short, a gentleman.

One of the lesser-known facets of his work in the Congress was his role in shaping the direction of America's relations with our Indian citizens. In my capacity as ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I developed a healthy respect and admiration for JOHN SAYLOR'S knowledge and deeply rooted convictions in this field.

In the early 1950's, he had been a Member of the House of Representatives just a few years when his own party developed and implemented the policy of "termination" of Indian tribes. He believed this policy to be wrong, and he fought it. He fought it in caucus, in committee, on the floor of this House and in the White House itself. At one time, he publicly criticized President Eisenhower, in person, for having supported the policy. And, although he lost the battle at that time, he lived to win the war.

I was present at an historic occasion, Mr. Speaker, on October 16, 1973, when JOHN SAYLOR'S judgment of that question was vindicated in this Chamber. Twenty years after the termination policy had been promulgated over his objections, I joined him here in successfully steering through a bill that repealed that policy and reinstated one of the tribes that had been grievously injured by it, the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin. That bill was approved by a vote of 404 to 3, Mr. Speaker—and that was the last official action of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the floor of this House.

In recognition of his long career of legislative work on behalf of the Indian people, the Menominee Tribe introduced a resolution at the national convention of the National Congress of American Indians in Tulsa, Okla., just a few days following his death. That resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas: The Honorable John P. Saylor, Congressman from Pennsylvania, passed away on October 21, 1973, and
>
> Whereas: Congressman Saylor had been for 24 years an ardent and outspoken foe of the infamous termination policy, and
>
> Whereas: Congressman Saylor in 1953 fought the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 108, the Congressional expression of the termination policy, and pointed out that this policy was unjust, unworkable and a travesty on Indian rights, and
>
> Whereas: Congressman Saylor in 1954 strongly opposed the adoption of the bill terminating the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, predicting on the floor of the House of Representatives that the bill would cause irreparable damage to the Menominee Tribe and would sooner or later have to be repealed, and
>
> Whereas: Nineteen years later, in 1973, Congressman Saylor co-sponsored a bill to repeal that termination act and to restore the Menominee Tribe to full federal recognition, and
>
> Whereas: In his capacity as ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Congressman Saylor worked diligently for passage of this bill, and
>
> Whereas: On October 6, 1973, Congressman Saylor personally steered this bill to an overwhelming 404 to 3 vote of approval on the floor of the House of Representatives, thus fulfilling the prediction he had made in 1954, and
>
> Whereas: Congressman Saylor made it very clear that this vote represented not only an approval of the Menominee Restoration Act but a rejection once and for all of the policy of termination, and
>
> Whereas: The Menominee Restoration Bill was the last piece of legislation handled by Congressman Saylor before his untimely death,
>
> Now therefore be it resolved by the National Congress of American Indians in convention assembled: That we do hereby express our condolences to the family of Congressman John P. Saylor and do also express our gratitude, and the gratitude of all our peoples, to this public servant whose illustrious career has been of inestimable value to humankind in general and to Indian peoples in particular. We are grateful that he lived to see his predictions come true, and that he was granted the privilege in his final days of correcting the mistakes made by his peers two decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will add only that all of us will sorely miss JOHN P. SAYLOR,

and that in losing him we have lost one of the great fighters of our time.

Thank you.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the sadness expressed here by my colleagues concerning the untimely death of JOHN SAYLOR. As we all know, he was regarded by his colleagues as a man of unquestioned integrity. He was an able and highly respected Member of this body. His sound judgment and his leadership on many legislative matters were recognized by Members of both parties.

As a legislator JOHN SAYLOR excelled in the field of conservation. He wanted to keep rural America beautiful. He was an ardent lover of the American wilderness and its preservation.

It will be difficult indeed to fill the shoes of this distinguished American. His many years of faithful service in the Congress will leave an imprint that will last a long time. To JOHN'S survivors I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the totally unexpected and shocking passing on October 28 of our distinguished colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR, has deprived this great body of one of its finest Members and me of one of my closest friends.

JOHN SAYLOR served his Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and his country well in many capacities over his long and fruitful life: as a young lawyer in Johnstown in 1934; as city solicitor of Johnstown in 1938; as a combat naval officer in the Pacific during the Second World War and finally as a Member of the House for the last quarter century.

As a representative of the people and his Commonwealth, JOHN was a tireless and dedicated champion of their rights and interests.

His legislative record is highlighted by his support for the establishment of the Office of Coal Research and the passage of the Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

Long before conservation became as popular as it is today, Mr. Speaker, JOHN SAYLOR realized its importance. He fought vigorously to prevent the building of dams in the Grand Canyon and for preserving the integrity of Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado. For his many efforts he was widely praised and honored with many important awards.

Mr. Speaker, it was a mark of the man and his life that Members here from both sides of the aisle held him in the highest esteem. It was my pleasure and singular honor to have served with JOHN for all of his many years. I am sure his memory is cherished by all who knew him and that my sense of personal loss is shared by many in this Chamber as well as in the other body.

To Mrs. Saylor and the Saylor family I extend the Rooneys' deepest sympathy and prayers in their sad loss.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of JOHN P. SAYLOR, this House lost one of its most outstanding, dedicated, and conscientious Members.

During his nearly 25 years of service in this House, he always spoke with candor and a consistency of frankness. There was never a moment's doubt as to where he stood on a particular issue. It was my pleasure to converse with him frequently over the years and though we might have disagreed at times on particular issues. I could never have quarreled with his consistency and tenacity for a cause. Such attributes made JOHN SAYLOR a strong force behind the issues he championed.

At this unsettled moment in our country's history, we will all miss the steadying influence of men such as JOHN SAYLOR, a Congressman who had an unwavering concern for the people he represented and who saw fit to return him to every Congress since he was first elected in 1949.

He also found time to participate in and contribute to the activities and concerns of the Pennsylvania delegation in the House, of which group he was the senior Republican. Mr. SAYLOR also served as vice chairman of the Pennsylvania Congressional Steering Committee. In both these positions his advocacy was always on the side of what was good for the people of his home State, regardless of the stance of partisan politicians.

JOHN SAYLOR served with great distinction on two committees of the House, including the Veterans' Affairs and Interior and Insular Affairs, the latter of which he served as ranking Republican. During his tenure he was recipient of numerous conservation awards and had long been noted for his leadership in ecological preservation.

Mr. Speaker, words are never enough to convey the sense of loss we feel at the passing of a man like our colleague from my own Pennsylvania delegation. There are others here who will express it more eloquently than I. I know, though, that each of us can say in this short time the few things that are most important in the hope that our words will preserve the spirit and ideals of the man, JOHN P. SAYLOR.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JOHN SAYLOR.

I remember, as a freshman Congressman, working with him on legislation to protect the wolf. It did not take me long to realize that JOHN SAYLOR was one of the most knowledgeable voices in the Congress on conservation matters. His dedication to those kinds of efforts was total, and his commitment to the protection of this Nation's heritage—its lands and its wildlife and its native Americans—is known throughout the country. I am especially grateful for his efforts, over a long period of time—in behalf of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin.

I was honored to serve in the House with JOHN SAYLOR for 4 years. He will be long remembered by those of us still here.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in eulogizing our former colleague and friend, the Honorable JOHN SAYLOR. For 24 years, Congressman SAYLOR served his constituents from the 12th District in Pennsylvania, his country, and his colleagues. He was a dedicated public servant who was a leader and a creative man.

It was my privilege to know JOHN SAYLOR and to work with him in the House during the past 12 years. His special interests in the environment and veterans affairs had a marked impact on much legislation passed by Congress. As a result his efforts will be remembered by future generations.

I join his friends in extending personal sympathies to the family of our late respected colleague, JOHN SAYLOR.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the tributes being paid this afternoon to our late colleague JOHN SAYLOR, indicate the high regard in which he was held by Members of the House. JOHN was known by us, his colleagues, as he was by conservationists in all parts of the Nation, as a man dedicated to perserving our natural assets. The innumerable bills bearing his name which have been enacted into law are testimony to the diligence and leadership which he brought to that vital national concern for almost a quarter of a century. Certainly, our most meaningful tribute to JOHN will be to build on his record of untiring efforts to conserve and enhance the natural qualities of our environment.

My admiration for JOHN also stemmed from his forthrightness and conciseness. I recall the times I would briefly sit down with him to discuss his committee's legislation which was on the floor. He would succinctly summarize the good points as well as those parts with which he disagreed. I always appreciated his openness and frankness. It was a privilege to have known him and to have been his colleague.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of Mrs. Whalen and myself, I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Saylor and her family.

May JOHN rest in peace.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I note the passing of our colleague and my dear friend, JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR.

His long period of service to his country began in 1938 with his election as city solicitor of Johnstown, Pa., and continued with his years as an officer in the Navy during World War II. Upon his return from the Pacific theater he resumed private law practice, to be called upon again to serve his country, this time in the capacity of Republican candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives.

Because of his admirable candor, he won that special election easily, as he also won every subsequent election from the 82d through the 93d Congresses. His constituents must have seen what we in Congress saw; that JOHN SAYLOR was a public servant dedicated to the best interests of his constituents and of all Americans.

From his position as ranking minority member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee he directed many conservation measures toward final passage. His deep concern for the conservation of our natural resources was particularly timely in this era when we are faced with a dwindling supply of energy resources and growing concern for the quality of our environment. JOHN SAYLOR was a man who was deeply concerned about the kind of world he would bequeath to his children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best tribute to him would be our rededication to the

determination, courage, and sense of purpose which JOHN SAYLOR so nobly exemplified.

Mrs. Rooney and I extent our deepest sympathy to his family. May their comfort be the knowledge that he served his country very capably.

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its most respected members with the death of my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman JOHN SAYLOR.

I was greatly saddened to learn of his passing for he was a great inspiration to me and to many Members of this House for his work in the areas of conservation and preservation of our valuable natural resources. As the ranking Member of both the Pennsylvania delegation and the House Interior Committee on the Republican side, he was a source of leadership and admiration for his colleagues.

Congressman JOHN SAYLOR will be sorely missed by those, including myself, who knew him well.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in honoring the memory of our friend, JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania. He was a dedicated and hard-working public servant.

As ranking Republican on the Interior Committee, JOHN developed and maintained a strong commitment to the preservation of our natural resources. His efforts in this regard should be appreciated and praised by all Americans, especially in this time of dwindling resources. Nowhere in the Congress was there a man more aware of the growing need for conservation nor more dedicated to meeting this need than JOHN SAYLOR.

Our sorrow is compounded because in this time of national crises this country needs more men like JOHN SAYLOR. We can ill afford to lose such men, who serve their country honestly and well.

Mrs. Hanna joins me in expressing our sympathy to the Saylor family.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the loss of one of our most distinguished House Members, and my close personal friend, JOHN P. SAYLOR of Pennsylvania.

JOHN was a man of rare vision and determination, whose legacy is written in countless clear-flowing streams, and in national parks and protected natural areas across America.

One of the Nation's foremost conservationists, he dedicated his life to preserving our natural resources. His career here in Congress is one of sustained effort and personal involvement in what he so clearly recognized as one of the Nation's highest priorities—preservation of our quality of life.

Back in 1956, when I was struggling to get the first national water pollution control bill through Congress, JOHN understood the full urgency of this legislation long before the Nation as a whole had even recognized water pollution as a problem. He stood squarely beside me in those early days, when the going was toughest. And with each succeeding amendment, down to the 1972 Clean Water Act which revolutionized the program and charted the Nation's course toward clean water by 1985, JOHN was our invaluable ally on the House floor.

My own State of Minnesota owes him a special debt of gratitude; for his deep personal commitment and direct, energetic involvement helped make Voyageurs National Park a reality on our Canadian border.

If I may indulge in personal reminiscenses, I would like to put that story on record.

The bill to establish Voyageurs, the Nation's 37th National Park, came before the Interior Committee, on which he was ranking minority member, very late in the 91st Congress—too late, many felt, for action that year.

Backers of the park had spent literally years developing support at home, preparing the legislation, holding the hearings. We knew that if the bill did not pass that year, we would be hard put in the 92d Congress to recapture the momentum needed for passage.

I enlisted JOHN SAYLOR's help in setting up the subcommittee and full committee meetings to approve the bill. As a result, Voyageurs was acted on, reported out of committee, and signed into law.

Incidentally, once the committee was back in session, the members also approved the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historic Park. Washingtonians and Marylanders, and we whose families spend so much of our time in the Nation's Capital, are also indebted to JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN was a great man for his time and for all time; a man who never lost sight of the fact that this country is only as great as the land which sustains us; its people only as strong as their determination to protect that land; its spirit worthy of world leadership only when it can be refreshed in the beauties of nature.

He has done far more than his allotted part in keeping America great and strong, and would have done much more had death not taken him.

In his passing, the Nation has sustained a great loss, mitigated only by the legacy of protected lands and clear waters which JOHN P. SAYLOR leaves behind him.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania delegation and the House of Representatives lost one of their ablest and most admired members with the death of JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR on October 28. He was the senior Republican member of our delegation, but his friendships extended far beyond party lines, and his passing brought sorrow to all of his colleagues.

At the time of his death, he was a valued member of the House Veterans Committee and the ranking Republican on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, where he led conservation efforts long before protection of the environment became a popular issue.

He sponsored the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Act. These measures have become landmarks in the struggle to save our woods, water and wildlife. He vigorously supported the bill which established the Office of Coal Research and was a major backer of the Coal Mine and Safety Act of 1969. He opposed the building of dams in the Grand Canyon and was a leader in the struggle to preserve the ecological integrity of Dinosaur National Monument in Utah and Colorado. He helped establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Park and the scenic Piscataway Park in Maryland, across the Potomac from Mount Vernon.

For his distinguished efforts in this field, he was presented with the Conservationist of the Year Award by the National Wildlife Federation in 1964. He was given the Bernard M. Baruch Prize, in 1969, for "contributing most to the field of conservation," and the Founders Award of the Izaac Walton League, in 1970. Mr. SAYLOR was an active member of the National Parks Committee and the National Forest Preservation Committee.

Born in Somerset County, Pa., he attended the public schools of Johnstown, and was graduated from Mercersburg Academy, Franklin and Marshall College, and Dickinson Law School. He practiced his profession with the firm of Spence, Custer, Saylor and Wolfe in Johnstown, where he maintained his home throughout his career.

During World War II, he served as a U.S. Navy communications officer in the Pacific. He took part in the invasions of Iwo Jima and Okinawa and was present in Tokyo Bay at the surrender of Japan. He later became a captain in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

In 1949, he won a seat in Congress in a special election to fill the seat of the late Representative Robert Coffey, who had been killed in a plane crash. At the time of JOHN SAYLOR's election, his district was Pennsylvania's 26th, in the western part of the Commonwealth. His district later became the 22d, and, in 1970, the 12th. He gave unstinting service to the people in his district, just as he rendered unwavering loyalty and devotion to his country.

In a telegram to Mrs. Saylor, the Governor of the Commonwealth, the Honorable Milton Shapp, expressed the high regard for this legislative leader felt by all who had the good fortune to know him:

> Congressman Saylor was a great Representative of the people of his district and of the Commonwealth. I could always count on his support for any measure that would benefit the people of Pennsylvania.

JOHN SAYLOR could indeed be counted on always to strive for the best interests of all Americans, just as he could be counted on to perform his legislative duties with ability and dispatch, counted on to treat his colleagues and constituents with unfailing courtesy, and counted on for good will and humor in trying circumstances.

His widow, Grace, his son, John, his daughter, Susan, and his two grandchildren, may take deep pride in the distinguished record of a life well lived by this eminent and beloved Pennsylvanian. My own family extends most heartfelt condolences.

Speaking personally, for a moment, I came to know JOHN SAYLOR when I was a junior member of the "other" party. It was soon apparent that it mattered little on which side of the aisle I sat insofar as he was concerned. His offers of help and his thoughtful advice were not mere courtesies. They were as real and open as JOHN SAYLOR himself, was strong and solid.

He was a unique being: large and outspoken and yet possessed of a depth of human feeling seldom seen in the fast paced life of Washington. He was an influential Member of this body not so much because of the power he possessed, nor solely due to his intellectual capacity, but most of all because of the substance of the man he was. This influence was a blessing among us and, I feel, it will remain with us long.

Words are inadequate tools of expression when someone you feel strongly about passes away. I am glad this good man touched my life. I respected him. I will miss him.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, each of us in our own way was profoundly sorrowed by the passing of JOHN P. SAYLOR. Each of us lost a fine and gallant friend, a stout companion and a loyal and beloved associate.

In serving with JOHN for 21 years I have been privileged to serve in the Congress I was associated intimately with him as a fellow member of the minority of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He served that committee for more than 24 years, having been appointed to it when he entered Congress in 1949.

During those turbulent years the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee handled much legislation of great import to the Nation, its natural resources and its people. JOHN SAYLOR was ever a leader in many debates which preceded the compromise and resolution of that legislation and the issues which unlay them. When I opposed him I found him a brilliant, resourceful and unrelenting opponent. When I shared the battle camp with him I found him a kind, able and congenial ally. But whichever side either of us found ourselves to be on, it was that side which our conscience told us was right.

Because of his zeal and devotion there are many lasting monuments throughout the United States to JOHN SAYLOR'S memory. There are great dams on our western river; there are reclamation projects pouring food to American markets; there are wildlife refuges and wild rivers preserved; there are wilderness areas for posterity to enjoy.

America's Indians are healthier and their lot today is a better and happier one because of JOHN SAYLOR'S devotion to duty. America's public land is better managed and its water and power resources better utilized for that very same reason. There exists for the benefit of our land and for arid lands throughout the world advanced desalting techniques and a healthy desalting industry because JOHN SAYLOR ceaselessly and successfully insisted that there should be. It was JOHN SAYLOR as much as anyone in or out of the Congress of the United States that saw to it that Hawaii and Alaska were transformed from territories to States by admission to the Union. And, so also he strived to improve the people and the land of the remaining territories of the United States and of those of the islands of Micronesia that the United States administers under trusteeship from the United Nations.

In addition, hallmark legislation was either written by JOHN SAYLOR or improved by him before its passage in many areas affecting the Nation's environment and the utilization of its natural resources. JOHN SAYLOR'S last monumental task was to create and insure enactment of the Alaska pipeline legislation in which there was coalesced his lasting concern for the environment and his dedication to man's use of nature's resources. This legislation was a masterful creation which finely balanced each of these considerations and served them both.

There is another experience than the Congress which JOHN SAYLOR and I shared and that is in the service of the U.S. Navy as fellow officers during World War II. Sometime in 1944 JOHN found himself assigned the attack transport U.S.S. *Missoula* and I to a sistership, U.S.S. *Dickens*. These two ships were in turn assigned to the same division of assault transports taking part in the war in the Pacific. JOHN'S ship and my ship steamed in formation within 500 yards of each other for almost 2 years. We shared together the experiences of the battles of Iwo Jima and Okinawa. We steamed triumphantly together into Tokyo Bay on V–J Day to land the U.S. occupation forces on the beach.

It is ironic that operations were such in those World War II days in the Pacific that, even though JOHN and I were so close together in experiences, we never actually met each other until we both were in Congress together. I wish we had. I could not miss him more, but I could have shared with him even morec losely the distant memories of those years of battle at sea.

Now that JOHN SAYLOR is gone those who still remain will seek to follow his example and his leadership. That is the tribute he would want most. That is the tribute he will receive because he was an inspiring leader and a man of brillance.

Mrs. Hosmer and I are terribly sorry that JOHN is gone. We will miss him sorely. We extend to his wife Grace and his fine family our most profound sympathies and our love. Although the burden that Grace bears because of JOHN'S passing is heavy, she must find solace in knowing that it is shared by so very many of her fellow citizens throughout the Nation who knew, loved, respected and admired JOHN P. SAYLOR as a compassionate man and as a splendid servant of the people.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal sorrow that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late JOHN SAYLOR of Pennsylvania. His able leadership and expertise in conservation matters will long be remembered by Members of Congress. The Americans who care about clean water, clean air, and an unspoiled nature owe JOHN SAYLOR an immense debt.

He was a pioneer in conserving natural resources and protecting the environment. He was an "environmentalist" long before the word became a popular political slogan and he stood proudly by his leadership in that field even where it was not a popular political asset. He coauthored the Wilderness Act as well as the Land and Water Conservation Act to preserve our forests and streams. In 1964 he was presented the National Wildlife Federation's "Conservationist of the Year" award. My own State of Utah owes JOHN SAYLOR a special vote of appreciation for his efforts to save the Dinosaur National Monument.

It was my privilege to serve with JOHN SAYLOR on the House Interior Committee, where he was ranking minority Member, and where he for many years helped shape virtually every piece of legislation reported by that committee. His leadership transcended party lines and he was able, at times, to draw almost every committee member into an alliance to protect our country's wilderness areas.

As the most junior of members on the opposite political aisle on the Interior Committee, I found early that I could learn a great deal from JOHN SAYLOR. And in committee meetings, I listened to him carefully, and agreed quite consistently with this remarkable man. I sought him out, regularly, on the floor of the House for private conversations. He was unique—a veteran of 25 years service, which made him wise—yet he remained in many ways a rebel, a new thinker, a man whose fertile mind was unfettered by institutional hangups. He understood the value of fresh thought in this great House. He sought out different approaches to problems and rejected an automatic response to anything. He laughed at himself—his keen sense of self-deprecating humor did not permit compliments on his achievements.

The last conversation I had with him was on the House floor some 3 weeks before his death when I sought his political advice—the only Republican whose thoughts I asked for. John spoke of the great respect for the institution of the House, which he called the democratic body. He was a real public servant. He will not be forgotten because his heritage here was genuine and will live on in wilderness areas throughout the country.

JOHN SAYLOR was also a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He worked tirelessly for the welfare of our veterans and was instrumental in passage of the National Cemeteries Act. I might add that it was JOHN SAYLOR who gave the U.S. Marines the first American flag to be raised on Iwo Jima.

I offer my deepest sympathies and respect to his wife, Grace Saylor, and to his entire family, and suggest that they have a great deal of which they should be truly proud.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and a great sense of loss that I learned of the untimely death of our colleague, JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN left a wonderful legacy to all of us—a legacy composed of service to his constituents for over a quarter of a century, unexcelled leadership in the conservation field, sincere dedication to solving the problems of his district and his Nation, and a genuinely warm capacity for friendship and loyalty.

Perhaps he was best known nationally for his achievements in conservation and through his work on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Personally, I

will always think of his equally fine work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, where I had the privilege of serving with him for 15 years.

As a veteran himself—who had given the marines the flag raised over Iwo Jima, on the occasion later commemorated at Arlington Cemetery—he was both knowledgeable and concerned about veterans' welfare, and a champion of progressive veterans' legislation.

I am proud to say that JOHN SAYLOR was a personal friend. He invited me to speak in his district on several occasions, and I had the opportunity to meet his lovely wife and family.

He was a friend of the postal employees, and their friendship and gratitude toward him were evident at a gathering I addressed some time ago in Johnstown.

Another time I witnessed the mutual high regard of JOHN SAYLOR and ethnic groups, when he invited me to a Polish Constitution Day celebration in his district.

JOHN SAYLOR has left a place that will be hard to fill, but his legacy of accomplishment and friendship has permanently filled a space in the hearts of his constituents, his country, and his colleagues. Deepest sympathies go to his wife Grace and to his family. JOHN SAYLOR will be greatly missed.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to express fully the friendship I have shared with JOHN SAYLOR for over a decade.

During my service in the Congress while JOHN SAYLOR was the ranking Republican member on the House Interior Committee, four major conservation areas in northern California have been added to the National Park System.

Point Reyes National Seashore, the Redwood National Park, King Range National Conservation Area and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area will remain for all time as tributes to the foresight, wisdom, and dedication to the cause of conservation of JOHN SAYLOR.

JOHN was his own man in every way. I do not think that anyone who ever met him has doubted his independence and his objectivity. JOHN would make up his own mind on every issue and when he had made his personal decision would pursue it effectively and fairly.

As an effective advocate for those principles in which he believed so strongly, he became a leader in the Congress and saw the realization of innumerable goals he had set for himself and his country.

For many men death marks an end to an era. JOHN SAYLOR'S era is only just beginning. He has rightly been recognized as one who has been most responsible for bringing the need for conservation to the attention of the American public. To me, JOHN SAYLOR will stand alongside the great conservationists in our history, John Muir and Gifford Pinchot. Today the cause of conservation is bright because it has the attention of the public mind.

In every way JOHN SAYLOR leaves a legacy that insures he will never be forgotten. I will never forget his friendship. Like our giant redwoods, JOHN SAYLOR stood straight and tall. He was truly a giant in the forest of great men.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, evidence of the high regard in which our late and distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, was held far beyond the boundaries of his home State of Pennsylvania is the following editorial of November 6, 1973, from the La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus.

I insert the text of this editorial at this point in the RECORD:

FOR NATURE FIRST

Conservationists, and most assuredly the Indiana Save the Dunes people, should have stood in reverence for a moment last week upon learning that U.S. Rep. John P. Saylor, R-Pa., had died at the age of 65.

Saylor was preaching conservation, anti-pollution legislation and preservation of the ecology long before these causes became so fashionable among Americans.

He was the author of the Wilderness Act, designed to save unspoiled lands from commercial development.

A resident of Johnstown, Pa., Rep. Saylor early recognized the changing role of coal mining, which had been a foundation of the economy of Pennsylvania.

He sponsored the legislation that established the Office of Coal Research, and without him, the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 probably would not have made it.

How did Saylor, a Pennsylvania congressman, figure in the preservation of Indiana's Dunes?

Save the Dunes people know the answer. Indiana's National Lakeshore proposal was not getting much support in Congress, particularly from those who should have been most interested—Indiana's congressmen.

It was Pennsylvania's Saylor in the House who responded to Illinois' Paul Douglas' appeal from the Senate, and helped materially to steer the National Lakeshore park bill through its initial stages.

Saylor had seen first-hand the devastation wrought upon Pennsylvania lands by mining practices undertaken without any plan for repairing the damage.

He had also witnessed the sprawling urban growth after World War II, and the effects of that unplanned development around cities like Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

So it was that Pennsylvania's Johnny Saylor, like Illinois' Paul Douglas, could see the importance of saving the last remaining Great Lakes sand dunes.

Rep. Saylor was one of the "out-of-staters" in Congress who battled to save the Indiana Dunes. Not many from Indiana, particularly in the lower house, would stand up to be counted for that cause.

They wouldn't then. But they have since to their credit, had some second thoughts on the subject—most of them at least.

We're grateful that Rep. Saylor responded to his principles and supported the cause of the dunes in Indiana, as he did many another conservation projects across the U.S.

His stance did not make him particularly popular at the time with some of his Hoosier colleagues in the House. But he has been largely vindicated.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR has taken from this body a distinguished and respected public servant.

Since entering the Congress in 1949, JOHN SAYLOR has been in the vanguard of the conservation movement. Feeling at one with the land he loved, he helped educate the Congress and the American public in the need to protect our valuable natural environment long before the ecology movement gained popular support. Through his efforts as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, important conservation bills such as the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Act were enacted into law.

Some of us remember other accomplishments of this dedicated man. For the past 3 years, I had the privilege of serving with JOHN SAYLOR on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Throughout this time, he strongly advocated measures which would assist those Americans who have served in our Armed Forces. As a World War II naval officer, he knew the hardships and personal sacrifices which our veterans have faced and diligently worked for the best possible benefits for all of them, young and old.

While JOHN'S constructive achievements and personal triumphs cannot mitigate our sadness at his passing, the knowledge that his contributions will endure should prompt others to continue the work which he started and helped along.

I join with my colleagues in mourning his passing and expressing my condolences to his family.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a truly great Congressman, JOHN SAYLOR. He was held in high regard by Members on both sides of the aisle. He will be missed by not only his family and friends but by the Nation. He indeed served the Nation. His concern and interest in the cause of conservation brought to him a national reputation as one of the country's leading conservationists. He fought for popular and unpopular causes with equal vigor. If it meant serving the cause of conservation the fact that the advocacy was unpopular did not in any way deter him. He was admired and respected for his unwavering convictions. Indiana is indeed grateful to him for his strong and consistent support of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. He viewed this project as one of national interest and concern and without hesitation joined in the fight to establish the Lakeshore over the objections of those who would have destroyed those beautiful Indiana Dunes for selfish economic reasons. But that was JOHN SAYLOR and we loved him and respected him for being what he was. We shall miss him as a colleague and as a concerned American.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I felt a deep sense of loss and sadness on learning of the untimely passing of JOHN P. SAYLOR.

I have had the pleasure of knowing JOHN since 1963 when I first came to Congress. Since that time I have held the greatest respect for his strong leadership, and his dedication to the welfare of this country.

As ranking minority member on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, JOHN was a leading advocate of environmental quality. The State of Colorado owes a particular debt to JOHN SAYLOR for his outstanding work on the environment and his authorship of such major pieces of legislation as the Wilderness Act. Coloradans have always taken tremendous pride in the State's beautiful mountain ranges, vast wilderness areas,

and crystal clear waters and streams. They have JOHN to thank in large measure for his great work in assuring that this beauty will remain for many future generations to enjoy.

JOHN SAYLOR will be sorely missed by all those who had the opportunity to know him and work with him. He left this Congress and this Nation with a fine example of honest leadership and forthright determination that we would be very wise to follow.

Mrs. Brotzman joins me in expressing our most deep and heartfelt sympathy to the family and friends of JOHN SAYLOR.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR was a big man. Physically, he stood above the rest of us. His voice was always loud and clear, whether debating on the floor or in committee or expressing his generous sense of humor and sharp wit. He was also big when it came to fairness, integrity, dedication, and work. During his 24 years in the House as a Representative from Pennsylvania, he guided into law numerous pieces of landmark environmental legislation.

But most of all, JOHN SAYLOR had a view of this country that was larger and more far reaching than that of most Americans. Many years before people were aware of their environment, when conservation was just a narrow concept involving birds and animals, and when few citizens could have explained the meaning of ecology, JOHN was aware of the need to protect and preserve the natural resources of this Nation. He was an original sponsor of the Wilderness Act to save our woods, water and wildlife for future generations, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. He fought against the construction of dams in the Grand Canyon and Hells Canyon, and to preserve Dinosaur National Monument. He was a defender of the Piscataway Park to protect the Potomac Basin and a leader in the struggle to create the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park here in Washington. His vision and hard work as an environmentalist brought him well-deserved national recognition and numerous awards.

Now as we find ourselves suffering from an energy crisis and from drastic pollution of our air and water, it is especially tragic that we should lose the leadership of JOHN SAYLOR. If all of us had the kind of foresight and concern that he possessed, we might not be in this situation. However, we can certainly all learn from and remember his great contributions. His example of dedication to environmental protection should encourage us to strive to fill the large footprints he has left and to follow the path he forged toward preserving the natural resources of the country for future generations.

I extend to his wife, Grace, and to his children, Susan and John, Jr., my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sense of loss on the untimely death of our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR.

Mr. SAYLOR's leadership in the field of conservation is well-known to all of us and to the Nation for which he did so much in the protection of scenic and natural resources. His 25 years of service of the Congress were marked by a foresight and zeal in the field of conservation that were truly inspirational to those of us privileged to serve with him on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS SAYLOR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL WORK SCHEDULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, last week there was discussion on this floor as to whether it is appropriate for this House to adjourn for an extended Thanksgiving vacation at a time of alleged national and international crisis. On Thursday, after giving assurances of the timing of the Vice Presidential confirmation, and his intentions to handle other needed legislation prior to sine die adjournment, the majority leader said he would ask for, or move for, a 10-day recess with the agreement of the minority leadership.

I am pleased that the disagreement over the recess has produced a better definition of our work schedule for this year, but despite these assurances and this agreement, I still believe that our responsibilities are not being met by a 10-day vacation now.

The Minneapolis Tribune on Saturday carried a poll showing that 69 percent of Minnesotans believe Congress performance is only "fair" or "poor." The headline on the article said—

Congress Gets Good Job Rating From Only 24%.

I doubt if a 10-day congressional rest period will cause the public confidence to increase. I think it would be especially unfortunate if the motion to adjourn for our vacation is slipped through without a recorded vote. I, for one, want a chance to vote against the 10-day recess.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last April I introduced a bill, H.R. 7310, that would establish a National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resources, as I have always believed that we should utilize to the fullest our linguistic and cultural heritages. At this time I would like to place in the RECORD an article by Dr. Jacques Wilson, chairman of Latin American Studies at the University of West Florida in Pensacola. Dr. Wilson's article emphasizes the need for passage of this legislation, especially now when our Nation is becoming more involved in the world community:

NATION MUST MAINTAIN FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

(By Jacques Wilson)

Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez, D—San Antonio, Texas, recently introduced a bill in the House of Representatives calling for the establishment of a National Commission for the Preservation of Foreign Language Resources. This measure (H.R. 7310) would create a small consultative group to advise in the formulation of policies to identify, preserve and improve this nation's foreign language resources. In addition, it would evolve active programs for the conservation of these resources and serve as consultant and coordinator to national and state professional educational associations for the development and implementation of activities designed to preserve and identify these same resources. It will also develop and maintain what amounts to a data bank of this country's non-English language resources.

Congressman Gonzalez's proposal has never been more timely. Never before in this nation's history has there been such a pressing demand for individuals qualified to communicate with the world community in their native tongues. Man's destiny—indeed his very survival—is to an unprecedented degree dependent upon his ability to develop effective intercommunication in the family of nations. The vital questions of our time, as we have seen repeatedly, cannot be resolved by military force. Survival today depends increasingly on the ability to communicate effectively with other peoples in their native languages, on discussing problems and issues without the admittedly imperfect tools of translation and interpretation.

National interest forced us to utilize our non-English language resources to meet World War II commitments. Thousands of speakers of non-English languages were pressed into service to accomplish such tasks as teaching languages, preparing radio and press releases, intercepting radio transmissions, censoring mail, and hundreds of duties too numerous to mention here. The nation suddenly realized the value of this hidden resource possessed by our non-English speakers.

Concomitant with the utilization of the non-English language skills of these citizens, our nation's educators began to question the effectiveness of foreign language instruction at all levels of the educational structure. It became immediately apparent that the reading and translating objectives of foreign language instruction in high schools and colleges did not produce the skills and aptitudes needed by our nation. A rarity indeed was the foreign language student who developed the proficiency approximating that of a native speaker. Few were the high school students able to understand the foreign language they had studied when spoken by a native speaker. Fewer yet were those able to converse intelligently in a foreign language.

While we needed non-English language resources in Czechoslovakian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Arabic, Portuguese, Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish, Italian, Tagalog, Mandarin and

Hindi to name but a few, we discovered that most secondary school and college curricula offered: Spanish, French and German. Very few school systems or institutions of higher education helped those who spoke non-English languages to preserve the linguistic and cultural heritage of the ethnic group to which they belonged. Our twentieth century educational philosophy was a reflection of an 18th and 19th century ideal—that the United States is a melting pot; that we embrace those who come to our shores as equals—but they must forget their past, their culture, their traditions, their heritage and become homogenized copies of Babbit on Main Street, U.S.A. Our 19th century culture developed what amounted to an ethic that the individual who spoke with a "foreign" accent (whatever that really means) had not quite become fully Americanized. Those who spoke a non-English language at home were looked at with suspicion and as slightly un-American.

Teachers and educators reflected the prevailing opinion by systematically discouraging pupils and students from using or preserving the language and culture of the ethnic group to which they belonged. The school's rejection of the home language, of those who spoke languages other than English, subconsciously denigrated their culture. Our local and state educational policies were monolingual and monocultural. We were a safe, secure continental island, separated from the rest of the world by broad oceans. In our dealings with those from abroad, we used English, and in many cases still do. Yet, as Joshua Fishman in his study "Language Loyalty in the United States" points out, at the national level America has rarely implemented policies to "hasten the linguistic and cultural enfeeblement of the immigrant groups. . . . Immigrant minorities were never forbidden to organize and maintain their own communities, organizations, schools, or publications."

After the end of World War II, the momentary recognition given those who possessed non-English language resources subsided. Some forward-looking educators and linguists, capitalizing on the advances in foreign language teaching methodology pioneered by the Army Language School and other such projects, began conducting research in the development of foreign language teaching materials, the training of foreign language teachers, and the updating of our school and college curricula. In general, foreign language teaching returned to the pre-World War II rut from which it had given promise to emerge. With the exception of a few cosmopolitan urban centers in the nation, our value systems still reflected a degree of mistrust of those who spoke another language than English. If not quite un-American, they certainly were not as "fully" American as those of Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking, protestant, ethnic origin. For most, the idea of cultural pluralism was an anomaly rather than an ideal.

The advent of the first Russian Sputnik jarred the nation's leaders from their complacency. Since then this country has made some significant advances in expanding its reservoir of foreign language skills. Under the authorization contained in the National Defense Education Act and other legislation, basic research into the nature of language and how it is learned was subsidized, and thousands of teachers received intensive upgrading of their own language proficiency. Thousands of scholars were given opportunities to pursue advanced study in hundreds of languages classified as "critical" or "exotic" in terms of national need.

The language teaching profession, Congress and the U.S. Office of Education worked together in the 1960's to expand our non-English language resources. Millions were spent developing and implementing well-designed programs. Many of the gains of the past decade face an uncertain future today as foreign language requirements in schools and colleges are lessened or eliminated. The roots of ethnocentricism are deep; the winds of neo-isolationism sweeping the country Valkyrian—nostalgically seducing many to the Valhalla of "Fortress America."

This nation has millions of individuals who speak other languages. Some are completely bilingual; others have yet to learn English. Each year many migrate to our shores and bring with them additional non-English language skills, language resources which are desperately needed. The nation's attitudes to these resources have changed but little since the 19th century. With the exception of a few bilingual schools, non-English, non-Anglo-Saxon ethnic groups are still pressured to forget the past, to forget their cultural heritage, to forget their language. No systematic program exists to identify and inventory these resources. No agency or branch of government is charged with the responsibility of encouraging social, educational and political associations, educational institutions and educational systems at the state and local level to develop programs to preserve these priceless resources in our national interest.

In a democratic society such as ours, educational policy, whether at the national, state or local level, should be based on the needs and well-being of the individual as well as the needs of the state. The failure to dignify the home language and culture of children from non-English speaking homes has damaged the self-concept of speakers of other languages. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that those who went through such an experience reach adulthood without acquiring literacy in their mother tongue. In such cases, the home language is practically useless for any professional or technical purpose where language proficiency is important. A valuable resource is wasted; but more importantly, an individual was psychologically damaged in the process. Instead of bicultural, bilingual children, we produced generations of citizens most of whom wind up as linguistic cripples, neither functional in their home culture nor the dominant culture of our nation.

It is my strong conviction that Congress should take the initiative, pass this legislation and establish a National Commission for the preservation of this nation's non-English language resources. Congresman Gonzalez's vision and foresight are to be applauded. Through the proposed commission's statements, policies and programs it can insure not only the preservation of an important strategic national resource, but serve as a valuable counterpart to existing programs for the development of foreign language skills. It can truly be said—it makes little sense to spend countless millions to teach people language skills in one segment of the population, while unwittingly our system works systematically to stamp out these same, as well as other non-English language skills, in other ethnic groups.

Can we be less than cultured men in supporting this legislation? As Matthew Arnold stated, "The great aim of culture is the aim of setting ourselves to ascertain what perfection is and to make it prevail."

BEYOND RHETORIC—THE REAL NIXON ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it must be said that in a time of national crisis, a little bit of partisanship goes a long way. For that reason, I was disturbed that the latest Nixon energy message carried with it the suggestion that the Congress is really to blame. Such a suggestion is both a diversion from the kind of bipartisanship which should be sought now and an egregious falsehood.

For the fact is, as I stated on the floor last Thursday, this ostrich administration had pretended for 2 years that the energy crisis did not exist. Their defaults have put us in such a vulnerable posture that the Arab's "oil weapon" will inevitably have a devastating impact on our lives and our economy in the months immediately ahead.

For 2 years, the warnings of Congressmen of both parties were scorned by the White House. Administration "experts" scoffed at suggestions that we put the country on an energy diet. As late as this summer administration spokesmen, including Secretaries Morton and Shultz, delivered testimony before my subcommittee in opposition to a multi-billion-dollar energy research and development bill—the same program he now tells the country the Congress is holding up. The President's so-called Project Independence could have been law today but for his own intransigence.

A measure of Mr. Nixon's confused, wrongheaded approach to energy is that he has sent the Congress no fewer than four separate energy messages in a single year, each carrying different themes and vastly different conclusions. This is no policy; it is a nonpolicy which has prohibited meaningful legislative response.

Here is a summary of what the Nixon administration has told the American people and the Congress this year about our energy position.

THE 1974 BUDGET MESSAGE

In January, Mr. Nixon released figures which called for an energy research increase of only about 20 percent, or a mere $772 million, less than this country spends on the construction of a single aircraft carrier and less than one-tenth of the military research budget. His figures were greeted with howls by Congress, industry, and the utilities—all of whom begged for at least $100 million more.

ENERGY MESSAGE NO. 1—APRIL 18, 1973

With great fanfare, the President announced that energy R. & D. funding for 1974 would be increased by 20 percent over 1973. He added that we must apply our vast scientific and technological capacities both public and private to utilize our current energy resources more wisely and develop new sources and new forms of energy. Yet the proposed R. & D. funding was no larger than had been indicated in January in spite of strong criticism that it was inadequate. In particular, geothermal energy was barely increased at all to only $4 million, solar energy while tripled to $12 million was still a minimal amount compared with a

vast potential and nonpolluting nature of the source, conservation of energy funding was only increased $2 million to $9 million total, and transmission and storage of energy was actually decreased from $6 million to $3 million.

ENERGY MESSAGE NO. 2—JUNE 29, 1973

In June, the President finally increased the energy R. & D. budget for 1974 by $100 million and declared that the answer to our energy difficulties lies in developing new forms of energy. The allocation of the $100 million additional was to be announced by September 1 in the study by the AEC. In fact, after the AEC made its recommendations, OMB then sat on the results until October 11, so that less than 8 months remained until the end of the year to spend the money which is clearly an insufficient time interval to expand the program. Much of the additional money thus will probably not be spent until later years due to all this delay.

The President also announced that a $10 billion, 5-year R. & D. program would be initiated. It soon became evident, however, that the $10 billion included present programs which would have been $5 or $6 billion anyway. This was the same program he had been attempting to kill in the Congress.

ENERGY MESSAGE NO. 3—OCTOBER 11, 1973

The details of the $100 million additional energy R. & D. funding were finally released on October 11. It turned out that energy R. & D. had been redefined so that vaguely related programs were now included in the R. & D. category, which bloated the total budget to $1 billion instead of about $870 million, and the incremental $100 million had thus become $115 million. This had the effect of increasing the presently projected energy research for present programs over the next 5 years so that the new money necessary to achieve a $10 billion program was reduced still further. By this time, Congress had already appropriated $90 million more for energy research so that the $115 million figure included only $25 million of new money. Other points to note include: First, it was announced that the nuclear fusion budget would be substantially increased, and only that week the President had suggested leap frogging the breeder reactor and going directly to fusion. However, in fact, the fusion budget presented cut the funding by $2 million from what Congress had already appropriated; second, solar energy which had been increased to $15 million by the AEC, from the originally suggested $12 million, was cut back to only $13 million. The logic behind cutting back solar energy research funds at a time when solar energy presented the prospect of unlimited nonpolluting energy is difficult to fathom.

ENERGY MESSAGE NO. 4—NOVEMBER 7, 1973

Spurred by the Arab oil embargo, the President finally admitted an energy crisis really existed. He suggested a series of steps to immediately conserve fuel, and asked for legislation which would permit more stringent actions later if necessary. Unfortunately for the country, he was wrong again. The immediate suggestions are inadequate; they are either too slow; that is, the conversion of industry to coal or an accelerated nuclear power program, or they are too modest; that is, 50-mile-an-hour speed limits for Government transport, and airline flight cutbacks of 10 percent which might have only 100,000 barrels per day effect, or voluntary actions which are not likely to be effective until monetary incentives to save are added.

This means that in the coming months as our supplies shrink due to limited imports, our consumption will continue at nearly normal rates, which will reduce inventories necessary for the winter quarter.

Some of the requested legislation has merit, such as limiting commercial hours, permanent daylight savings time, and higher gas taxes or gas rationing. But inexplicably his request was merely for standby authority, presumably not to be used until the gas pumps are dry and the pipes frozen. The point is that now is the time to cut back rather than allow all the shortage to accumulate in the first quarter of the year.

And so we are still faced with an administration that does not seem to perceive the full dimensions of the deep trouble we are in. The President is talking about a shortage of 2 to 3 million barrels of oil this winter. Nonsense; it will be far greater, perhaps 6 million barrels per day. A deficit of this magnitude has such grim consequences that all efforts should immediately be directed towards mandatory conservation, rather than wasted in bland assurances that we "face no suffering this winter."

The President had better get a grip on the problem; he has not yet after four separate energy messages. Shifting the blame to the Congress would not heat a single home or hospital or keep a plant open. And such an effort will further divide a country that wants leadership, not partisanship.

WHY NO U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SWEDEN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Nixon has just decided to send an American ambassador to Cairo. This is a wise move. But why not also send an ambassador to Sweden?

In the last 10 years, the Egyptians have publicly insulted the United States on many occasions. Their head of state, for example, publicly advised the United States to "go drink from the sea." Sweden, while steadfast in its criticism of the U.S. presence in Southeast Asia, has remained a friend of this coutnry.

So let us send an American ambassador to Stockholm. Incidentally, Dr. Henry Kissinger could then look Liv Ullman in the eye again.

PUBLIC REACTION OVER ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I was both amazed and concerned by what I heard. There was the widespread belief that the current energy crisis was a sham and a political ploy devised by the President to divert attention from the Watergate and related matters. While I agree that the President's energy message, in part, was a response to Watergate charges, my own study and that of many other Members, indicates that he is on solid ground in projecting severe fuel shortages this winter. I just wish that this insight and his efforts began 1 year ago instead of waiting until the middle of October.

Knowing of this growing public cynicism about President Nixon's motivations, I called upon the President last week to set a good example. I told the President—

> Since success in meeting the energy crisis requires both effective governmental action and citizen participation, I am requesting that you remain in Washington and forgo the warm sunshine of Key Biscayne and San Clemente during this winter period. If our people must shiver this winter, our public officials cannot be expected to do less.

The importance of personal example and constructive governmental efforts were underscored by a perceptive column in the Sunday Hartford Times by Editor Charles Betts.

In response to Mr. Betts' call for action, I have today asked the Secretary of Defense to detail what war games, air shows, and nonessential maneuvers will be canceled in order to conserve fuel. Further, I have contacted Dr. James Fletcher, the head of NASA, asking him to stretch out the space program projects to get us over the current crisis.

I believe that my colleagues will benefit from reading Mr. Betts' column and I enter it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Nov. 11, 1973]

LET US ALL SACRIFICE AT THE TOP, TOO

(By Charles A. Betts)

Well, once again, my leaders in Washington are calling upon me to sacrifice so we can all get through the winter without freezing to death.

Pardon me if I look upon this heartfelt appeal with a certain degree of cynicism. Now, don't misunderstand me. I'm willing, indeed eager, to cooperate for the national interest when necessary, repeat necessary. And I think the vast majority of Americans are too.

We are, that is, with one big proviso. That is that the same ground rules apply across the board to everybody without regard to rank, stature, position or political pedigree.

In other words, I don't want to be sitting around shivering a little in my extra sweater with the thermostat down to 65 degrees and learn that Richard Nixon and his entourage are winging it to Camp David, Key Biscayne or San Clemente for a cozy week-end in the mountains of Maryland or some fun in the sun in California or Florida.

When Nixon asks the nation to cool it, literally, I for one want Nixon to keep his abode right there in the White House. For that matter what do you say we close down Camp David, San Clemente and Key Biscayne for the duration of the crisis?

I bring all this up specifically because I think government is all too prone to con us "general public" folks while government leaders and/or special interest people somehow seem to feel above the common herd.

Remember the beginnings of the wage-price freeze mess? Everybody was supposed to be frozen in salary and then raises were limited to 5.5 percent. But much of big labor told the Nixon Administration, "nothing doing." And so contracts were signed calling for increases far in excess of 5.5 percent while in many cases you were being told you couldn't get more than that figure.

I have a couple more ideas too, while I'm contemplating my 65-degree house and 50-mile-per-hour speed limit to conserve energy.

For starters, why do we have to go ahead with the Skylab program? Imagine the energy expended to prepare for those space missions, let alone run them off.

If the energy crisis is bad enough in this country, and apparently it is, for my President to ask me to go along with this whole emergency program, then I say it is bad enough to suspend the whole space program until things ease off.

In addition, I won't care particularly to read about any military exercises while I'm cooperating with my leader to save fuel. No rumbling of tanks around Europe in any NATO training. No big military air shows. No maneuvers for the National Guard. No fleets steaming around for kicks.

For that matter Air Force One, itself, can stay still for all of me save for necessary trips in the highest priority of national interest and security.

I sincerely hope we succeed in the President's goal to develop United States self-sufficiency in energy by 1980. I also sincerely hope that we don't have to backtrack too far in the gains we have made over the past few years in pollution control and overall protection of the environment.

From all I have heard about the energy crisis the ecology movement is in for back-seat treatment now and in years to come. I believe when the immediate crisis is over, we should strive again for a working balance between energy and environment.

Meantime, I'll gladly do my part. But I want no part of my leaders taking it out of my hide while they go on with an attitude that sacrifice is just for the peasants.

RAIL ORGANIZATION AND INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 10 minutes

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House passed H.R. 9142, the Regional Rail Reorganization Act, last Thursday, November 8. I hope the Senate acts promptly on its version of this bill, so that we can keep the trains running. Rapid final congressional action on this bill is needed if severe reductions or even termination of rail service is to be avoided. Such a course of developments would be disastrous to the State of Indiana, as well as to the nation as a whole.

IMPORTANCE OF NORTHEAST RAILROADS

The facts of the situation are well known. Since 1967, six major northeastern railroads have filed for bankruptcy. One of them alone, the Penn Central, operates a 20,000-mile system covering 16 States, including Indiana. It accounts for 70 percent of the Nation's passenger service and 20 percent of its freight transportation, including everything from raw materials and heavy manufacturing goods to foodstuffs.

The importance of the northeast railroads to the Nation is enormous:

Forty-six percent of all intercity freight moves by rail, and more than 50 percent of that total originates or terminates in the Northeast.

Thirty-six percent of all manufactured products that move by rail originate in the Northeast.

While 9.8 percent of all agriculture products that move by rail originate in the Northeast, nearly 13 percent of such products terminate there.

THE BILL

As several of my colleagues pointed out in the RECORD on October 1, the declining fortunes of the Northeast railroads are not going to be reversed without some Government involvement. The extent of this involvement should be limited, but short-term assistance will be needed to keep the railroads operating until the long-term effects of restructuring the industry can take hold.

H.R. 9142 provides the type of short-term aid that is needed. A new agency, the Federal National Railway Association—FNRA—is created under the bill to act as the principal planning and financing vehicle for the reorganization and rehabilitation of the bankrupt northeastern railroads. After studies are made of these railroads' physical properties, financial position, competitive situation and other relevant matters, final determinations of the quantity and quality of rail service to be provided by these carriers are to be made and will appear in a final system plan.

In accordance with the principal objective of assuring adequate rail service in the region affected, the bill directs the planners to formulate a financially self-sustaining rail system and yet one that gives due consideration to the public services aspects of rail transportation. The system is to be operated by a new private, investor-owned carrier corporation that is to carry out the final system plan.

For the purpose of providing financial assistance to the new corporation, the FNRA is authorized to issue up to $1 billion of its obligations with the guarantee of the Secretary of Transportation. The bill also authorizes the appropriation of $85 million for the interim relief of bankrupt railroads pending implementation of the final system plan, and establishes principles of employee protection which are customarily found in mergers and consolidations in the railroad industry.

The Government financing in the bill is quite small when compared with the great economic importance of continued rail service. It is estimated that termination of Penn Central service alone would substantially increase national unemployment, reduce national productivity by 3 percent, and increase inflationary pressures throughout the Nation. The use of alternate transportation systems, especially trucking, would aggravate air pollution, further clog highways, and increase use of petroleum products at a time when fuel resources are already stretched thin.

IMPORTANCE OF BILL TO INDIANA

Indiana has more miles of Penn Central track—2,845—than any other State except for Pennsylvania and would, frankly, be crippled by a reduction or termination of service. This track constitutes 45 percent of the State's total.

The Penn Central network in Indiana services all of the major industrial regions of the State, and has a total employment of almost 11,000 Hoosiers. It serves almost 3,000 freight customers in Indiana, and had operating revenues in 1971 in the State of more than $206 million. Last year, it paid out wages and salaries to Hoosier employees totaling $103 million.

Obviously, Indiana has a vested interest in maintaining the operations of the Penn Central and other northeast railroads. Indiana's five most important industries—agriculture, steel, automobiles, mobile homes, and electricity—are all dependent on Penn Central service. According to a recent study of this matter by the Indiana Department of Commerce—

> The loss of the Penn Central could disrupt the Indiana economy enough to produce conditions of unemployment worse than those of the Great Depression.

A shutdown of just a month's duration is estimated to result in a loss of $138 million in manufacturing output and 300,000 unemployed—an unemployment rate of 23.5 percent—because of plant shutdowns and reductions.

Mr. Speaker, these are dramatic figures. They indicate the urgent need for enactment this year of regional rail reorganization legislation like that embodied in H.R. 9142. This bill provides a workable, balanced and comprehensive proposal for relieving the Northeast's rail crisis. We must not delay in providing this relief.

RULES OF EVIDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 6, 1973, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered favorably reported the bill H.R. 5463, to establish rules of evidence for certain courts and proceedings.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 17 of the Addendum to the Rules of the Democratic Caucus for the 93d Congress, I am hereby inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notice of my intention to request, following the expiration of 4 legislative days, the Committee on Rules to report to the House a resolution provid-

ing for a "modified closed rule" on the bill H.R. 5463. The rule I will be requesting would provide in effect that after an extensive period of general debate not to exceed 4 hours, on the bill, further consideration of the bill for amendment would be postponed to a time certain to give Members an opportunity to draft and to insert in the RECORD any amendments which they proposed to offer to the bill. Those amendments, if offered, would not be subject to amendment on the floor, and article V of the bill, the "Privilege" article, would not be subject to amendment. Such a rule would I believe, best permit the House of Representatives to work its will on this important and complicated piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Would the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would like to echo the sentiments of the gentleman from Missouri. I hope the Committee on Rules will grant this kind of a rule on the very technical rules of evidence which the gentleman's subcommittee spent at least 9 months on. The proposed rule would in no sense restrict any Member who has an amendment to any section of the bill, but it would require advance notice of such an amendment. I think this is a very sensible rule to seek when the bill concerns such a technical matter as the codification of the Federal rules of evidence.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman from New York, who is the ranking Republican member on that subcommittee and who played a very active part in this legislation, for his contribution.

I would say, as he has said, that I would want to take an extensive period of debate so that all Members might have an opportunity to become familiar generally with what we have done and have an opportunity to question the committee.

Then put this over so that proposed amendments could go in the RECORD as to all sections except as to the privilege section, and we have pretty well left the law of privilege pretty much in its present state.

This is our intention, so that all Members may know what the committee has done, and they will have the opportunity to offer amendments to all sections except the privilege section, and yet it can be done in an orderly fashion because it is an exceedingly technical piece of legislation.

ON PERMANENT DAYLIGHT SAVING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to extend daylight saving time to the entire calendar year. This is one of the proposals recently advanced by the President for energy conservation. It seems to me that the benefits of extending daylight saving time far outweigh the continuation of the present system. I think it makes even more sense to have daylight saving time during the winter than it does for the summer months. People would be encouraged to shop after leaving work because of the additional hour of daylight. It would certainly be advantageous to schoolchildren. Greater use would be made of recreational and cultural facilities since outdoor activities could be continued for an extra hour.

As we look ahead to the increased demands upon our energy sources, the reasons for changing to year-round daylight saving time become all the more important. This would be one of the wisest energy conservation moves we could make and at no cost or loss to anyone. In fact at the moment the most significant effect of the daylight saving time extension is the potential for energy savings in the consumption of electricity.

According to the National Safety Council, the rate and severity of traffic accidents is the highest just after sundown. Therefore, when standard time is in effect, commuters are forced to return home during the hours of greatest hazard and at a time when they are more fatigued and least alert. With the extension of daylight saving time, that additional hour of daylight should make it possible during most of the winter months, for commuters to reach their homes before the onset of darkness.

Another key benefit would be the reduction in street crime. Statistics indicate that robbery, mugging, and purse snatching are most frequent during the early evening. With the extra hour of daylight saving time at a time when most of the work force is en route home, criminals would be less apt to threaten these individuals returning to their homes and families.

I urge early and favorable consideration of this legislation by the Congress.

LABOR-HEW CONFERENCE REPORT

(Mr. PERKINS (at the request of Mr. MELCHER) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974. I support that conference report. In particular, I support the title I "hold-harmless" provision contained in that report.

The conference committee has done the best job it could in dealing with an outdated, inequitable formula and has brought us the best compromise possible for distributing title I funds this year. I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD two charts showing the increased grants for title I which will result if the conference report is adopted. The first chart shows the increases by States, and the second chart shows the increases for the 30 largest school systems in the country:

COMPARISON BETWEEN TITLE I LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ALLOCATIONS IN FISCAL YEAR 1973 AND THE LABOR-HEW CONFERENCE AGREEMENT BY STATE

State	Fiscal year 1973	Conference agreement[1]
Alabama	34,549,166	36,231,420
Alaska	2,415,066	2,757,142
Arizona	8,134,242	9,354,378
Arkansas	20,963,618	21,793,010
California	111,618,375	128,361,131
Colorado	10,237,378	11,680,683
Connecticut	11,747,931	13,510,121
Delaware	2,323,748	2,672,310
District of Columbia	10,096,368	11,610,823
Florida	24,111,072	27,433,768
Georgia	40,573,812	42,841,265
Hawaii	3,715,263	4,272,552
Idaho	2,719,220	3,062,802
Illinois	69,554,901	79,657,703
Indiana	18,773,439	21,241,592
Iowa	14,601,661	15,402,643
Kansas	9,147,430	10,166,938
Kentucky	32,212,788	33,817,801
Louisiana	31,322,489	35,609,869
Maine	5,633,673	6,478,724
Maryland	19,380,669	22,250,234
Massachusetts	24,893,505	28,627,531
Michigan	51,768,916	59,517,077
Minnesota	20,897,155	22,738,709
Mississippi	35,922,629	37,866,737
Missouri	23,367,302	25,209,867
Montana	2,865,542	3,235,543
Nebraska	7,187,530	7,797,808
Nevada	923,899	1,040,322
New Hampshire	2,007,413	2,308,525
New Jersey	44,232,287	50,867,130
New Mexico	7,393,185	8,502,163
New York	196,835,764	226,356,413
North Carolina	51,556,663	50,634,889
North Dakota	4,101,267	4,360,156
Ohio	42,248,122	48,337,485
Oklahoma	16,629,246	18,435,642
Oregon	8,421,321	9,684,519
Pennsylvania	64,998,125	74,747,843
Rhode Island	4,873,849	5,604,926
South Carolina	29,853,231	30,881,808
South Dakota	5,470,551	5,713,175
Tennessee	31,273,191	31,659,555
Texas	67,675,754	74,232,589
Utah	3,894,921	4,447,225
Vermont	2,093,957	2,398,856
Virginia	31,522,692	33,229,975
Washington	13,445,639	15,462,485
West Virginia	17,319,813	19,241,835
Wisconsin	17,340,875	19,761,936
Wyoming	1,170,817	1,325,974

[1] The conference agreement on H.R. 8877 provides for an appropriation for title I of $1,810,000,000 with a 90 percent State "hold harmless" to fiscal year 1972, a 90 percent LEA "hold harmless" to fiscal year 1973, and a 115 percent LEA maximum to fiscal year 1973.

COMPARISON BETWEEN TITLE I LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ALLOCATIONS IN FISCAL YEAR 1973 AND THE LABOR-HEW CONFERENCE AGREEMENT FOR THE 30 LARGEST SCHOOL SYSTEMS IN THE COUNTRY

County or school district	Fiscal year 1973	Conference agreement
New York City	134,740,582.14	154,951,669.42
Los Angeles	45,181,297.68	51,958,492.33
Cook (Chicago)	43,938,358.89	50,529,112.72
Wayne (Detroit)	22,254,319.17	25,592,467.04
Philadelphia	20,752,432.16	23,865,296.98
Harris (Houston)	6,314,749.31	7,261,961.70
Dade (Miami)	3,691,322.37	4,162,220.72
Baltimore City	10,592,231.38	12,181,066.08
Dallas City	4,168,752.92	4,794,065.85
Cuyahola (Cleve.)	9,792,840.15	11,261,766.17
Washington, D.C.	10,096,368.00	11,610,823.20
Pr. George's Co	1,649,999.30	1,897,499.19
Milwaukee City	5,039,171.73	5,795,047.48
San Diego City	5,505,345.98	6,331,147.87
Shelby (Memphis)	3,809,596.13	4,381,035.54
Baltimore Co	792,571.18	911,456.85
Duval (Jacksonville)	2,197,440.74	2,527,056.85
Fairfax Co., Va	466,052.09	535,959.90
Montgomery Co., Md	693,519.85	797,547.82
St Louis City	1,099,472.92	1,264,393.85
Orleans Par (No)	4,306,926.30	4,952,965.24
Franklin (Columbus)	3,607,667.35	4,148,817.45
Marion (Indianap)	3,078,421.07	3,540,184.23
Broward (Ft Laud)	1,387,232.27	1,595,317.11
Hillsborough (Tampa)	1,865,058.26	2,144,816.99
Denver	3,256,609.66	3,745,101.10
Suffolk (Boston)	7,515,927.26	8,643,316.34
Davidson (Nashville)	1,473,443.71	1,694,460.26
Jefferson (Louisville)	3,197,069.83	3,676,630.30
Atlanta	4,538,289.34	5,219,032.73
Fulton Co	3,750,862.01	4,313,491.31
De Kalb Co	787,427.33	905,541.42

It is my understanding that Congressman QUIE will offer an alternative tomorrow to the committee's title I hold-harmless agreement. I believe that that alternative must be opposed on three grounds.

First, it will lead to great confusion among local school districts about their title I grants. We have already changed the allocations to local school districts twice this year, and the Quie amendment will change them again.

I believe that we should uphold the conference agreement which contains the same allocation as we made in the second continuing resolution. Half the school year is almost over, and it is not fair to change the local allocations again.

Second, the Quie amendment will lead to more funds going to wealthier areas. For instance, Fairfax County, Va., will double its title I allocation under the Quie amendment over what it will receive under the conference agreement. Montgomery County, Md., will have a 25-percent increase in its allocation. This increase to Fairfax County will be at the expense of the poor rural school districts in southwestern Virginia. The increase in Montgomery County will be at the expense of the poor rural areas on the eastern shore of Maryland. Fairfax County and Montgomery County obviously have need for additional money; but as some of the wealthiest school districts in the country, their needs should not be taken care of at the expense of some of the poorest school districts in the counrty.

Third, the Quie proposal will lead to the AFDC part of the formula being enormously influential this year in determining local school districts' title I allocations. Under the present law, school districts receive title I funds for children counted under the census who are from families with incomes under $2,000 a year and for children whose families receive over $2,000 a year in AFDC payments. Since only those children on AFDC whose families receive more than $2,000 a year are able to be counted as title I children, only the richest States in the country have been able to increase their numbers of title I children every year, while the poorest States are left with only the same numbers of children counted under the census. I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a chart showing how the richest States have benefited from the AFDC part of the formula at the expense of the poorest States:

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A STATE'S WEALTH AND ITS RELIANCE ON AFDC UNDER TITLE I

	Per capita income		AFDC children under title I[1]		
	1970 census	Ranking	Fiscal year 1973	Percent	Ranking
New York	5,000	1	565,968	69.7	3
Connecticut	4,995	2	47,116	65.9	5
Alaska	[2] 4,875	3	4,723	46.6	18
Nevada	4,822	4	2,427	38.4	23
New Jersey	4,811	5	170,877	71.4	1
Illinois	4,775	6	207,393	62.9	6
Hawaii	4,738	7	13,902	60.2	7
Delaware	4,673	8	5,711	40.2	22
California	4,640	9	560,993	70.4	2
Massachusetts	4,562	10	118,674	69.4	4
Maryland	4,522	11	59,407	49.2	14
Michigan	4,430	12	194,106	59.4	8
Kansas	4,192	13	23,011	35.2	26
Ohio	4,175	14	137,774	45.7	19
Colorado	4,153	15	37,295	51.0	13
Pennsylvania	4,147	16	246,945	56.3	11
Washington	4,132	17	53,427	57.9	10
Rhode Island	4,126	18	18,308	58.3	9
Minnesota	4,032	19	45,154	35.4	25
Nebraska	4,030	20	15,812	30.8	28
Indiana	4,027	21	51,115	38.1	24
Oregon	3,959	22	26,326	48.7	16
Missouri	3,940	23	37,152	22.3	35
Florida	3,930	24	25,472	14.8	41
Wyoming	3,929	25	2,213	28.0	31
Arizona	3,913	26	17,624	30.3	29
Wisconsin	3,912	27	46,691	41.7	21
Virginia	3,899	28	50,142	22.3	35
Iowa	3,877	29	29,074	28.1	30
New Hampshire	3,796	30	6,698	47.4	17
Texas	3,726	31	79,326	16.4	39
Vermont	3,638	32	6,325	42.8	20
Montana	3,629	33	5,575	27.4	32
Georgia	3,599	34	45,995	15.9	40
North Dakota	3,538	35	5,150	17.6	37
Oklahoma	3,515	36	30,372	25.6	34
Utah	3,442	37	15,058	54.2	12
South Dakota	3,441	38	6,537	16.8	38
North Carolina	3,424	39	39,056	10.6	44
Idaho	3,409	40	6,570	34.0	27
Maine	3,375	41	19,730	49.1	15
Kentucky	3,306	42	32,334	14.1	42
Tennessee	3,300	43	0	0	48
New Mexico	3,298	44	13,975	26.5	33
West Virginia	3,275	45	14,553	11.8	43
Louisiana	3,252	46	18,778	8.4	45
South Carolina	3,142	47	4,561	2.2	46
Alabama	3,087	48	1,074	.4	47
Arkansas	3,078	49	0	0	48
Mississippi	2,788	50	0	0	48

[1] The first two columns under this heading show the actual numbers and percentages of title I children by State who are from families receiving AFDC payments in excess of $2,000 a year for fiscal year 1973. The last column shows the ranking by State of a State's portion of title I children who are from these AFDC families for fiscal year 1973.

[2] Reduced 30 percent to make purchasing power comparable to other areas of the United States.

EULALIA HOTZ—DEDICATED PUBLIC OFFICIAL

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, a very good friend of mine, Miss Eulalia "Uke" Hotz, announced that she would not seek reelection next year as county clerk of Madison County, Ill., a position she has held for 32 years.

Uke Hotz's announcement, a complete surprise to me, is one which I deeply regret. She has been an outstanding county official who has the respect and affection of everyone who knows her. Uke Hotz has contributed a great deal to efficient county government.

First elected in 1942, Uke Hotz was the first woman to be elected to county office in Madison County. She had previously worked in the office for her father, Joseph Hotz, who was elected in 1922 and for her brother, Norbert Hotz, who took office in 1933. A tradition of 52 years in which the office of Madison County Clerk has been headed by a member of the Hotz family will end with Uke Hotz's retirement.

In 1969, Uke Hotz was the first woman elected president of the Illinois Association of County Officials and is on the Board of Directors of the International Association of Clerks, Treasurers, and Election Officials and of the National Association of Clerks and Recorders. She has been active in civic organizations and is vice-president of the Madison County Chapter of the American Cancer Society.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a November 8 editorial from the Alton Evening Telegraph on Uke Hotz's outstanding service to the public:

SERVICE IS HER LEGACY

Madison County Clerk Eulalia "Uke" Hotz has given stability to an office in her 32-year tenure that most counties aren't fortunate enough to enjoy.

She is known and admired locally, statewide and nationally for her knowledge of election and other law, and her work as a member of the Illinois Election Laws Commission.

The professional staff she has developed through the years handles many complicated tasks with ease.

Uke admits to having educated and exposed many a lawyer, county official, election official, judge, and newsman, including this writer, to the intricacies of the taxing cycle, the government division of the courts, election procedure, county board procedure, and the political process.

Although these people are somewhat prepared for what's ahead Uke and her staff traditionally have taken the training from that point in a successful manner.

Uke's reign has been one of "outstanding service" to the public.

We wish her a happy retirement and hope her successor carries out the legacy of her office.

WILBUR R. L. TRIMPE, PRESIDENT, LEWIS & CLARK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past week it was announced that my good friend, Wilbur R. L. Trimpe, longtime Madison County, Ill., school superintendent has been named president of Lewis & Clark Community College, effective November 20, 1973. The unani-

mous selection of Superintendent Trimpe by the five members of the college's board of trustees comes as no surprise to me. Long known as Mr. Education in Madison County, Wilbur Trimpe has earned the reputation of being one of the outstanding leaders in education in the State of Illinois.

Wilbur Trimpe has had significant impact at the national level. Because of his efforts, school districts throughout the country have been able to participate in the impact aid program that otherwise would not have been eligible to participate in the program.

Wilbur Trimpe has a bachelor's degree from Western Illinois University and a master's degree from the University of Illinois and has done work toward a doctorate at the University of Colorado.

He is a former school superintendent in Bethalto and Havana, Illinois.

He has taught psychology and education at the old Shurtleff College in Alton, Ill., school organization and administration at McKendree College in Lebanon, Ill., education and psychology at Western Illinois University, and school finance, school buildings, and school law at Southern Illinois University.

He is a former administrative assistant to the dean of education at University of Colorado and has taught school public relations, finance, law, and administration at Bradley University, Peoria, Ill., the past 10 summers.

Wilbur Trimpe now lives in Bethalto, Ill., and was active in the effort to form Lewis and Clark Community College in the late 1960's.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I include the November 8 editorial from the Alton Evening Telegraph, praising the choice of Wilbur Trimpe.

CAPABLE, LOGICAL CHOICE

Knowing there was a strong possibility Wilbur R. L. Trimpe would be named president of Lewis & Clark Community College, we expressed reservations based on his age and the danger such a busy job may pose to his health.

We also feel a younger man with more years ahead could produce more continuity in the office.

However, we feel Trimpe is highly qualified as an administrator, educator, public relations man, and in his knowledge of school law. He is an excellent and obvious choice to be president of the college.

All of these skills were put in play in his tenure as County Superintendent, and in the promotion to establish Lewis & Clark College.

He has the awareness and knowledge to step into the post without the more lengthy break-in period an administrator from outside the area would require.

He knows the area, the political structure, the legislative process, and the junior college higher board procedure.

Wilbur Trimpe also is acquainted in his "nonpolitical" way with most residents of the area served by the college.

He has the capability to develop a first-rate administrative structure at Lewis & Clark which could eliminate the bickering, misunderstanding, and strife encountered in formative stages.

We join others in wishing President Trimpe success in his new post.

We look forward to a new attitude at the college which is certain to emanate from his enthusiasm and professional approach.

PUERTO RICAN PERSPECTIVES

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as one who has continually been aware of the problems experienced by our minorities, I try to study as much material as possible on the progress of our legislative programs in this area, on the needs and realities of the situation and on what better approaches we should pursue to accomplish our objectives. For this reason, I was particularly pleased that the following article by José A. Cabranes, published in volume 25 of the 1973 Journal of Legal Education was brought to my attention.

José A. Cabranes is an associate professor of law at Rutgers University Law School in my home town of Newark, N.J. In authoring "Careers in Law for Minorities: A Puerto Rican's Perspective on Recent Developments in Legal Education," for the Journal, Professor Cabranes provides a most excellent portrait of the background, feelings, distinctions, values, social, economic and educational difficulties and aspirations for his ethnic people.

As a resident as well as a Representative from New Jersey, I was quite disturbed to read that according to reliable accounts, New Jersey's Spanish-speaking population of more than 300,000 is served, at the present time, by only three Puerto Rican lawyers. I would also like to draw your attention to Professor Cabranes' explanation of the effect the designation "minority" has on blacks, Puerto Rican, and Mexican-Americans throughout our country. Mr. Cabranes' sensitivity to this issue and his understanding from the Puerto Rican perspective is extremely well expressed. I have found Professor Cabranes' article to be most informative and would like to share his remarks with all the Members of this Chamber this afternoon:

CAREERS IN LAW FOR MINORITIES: A PUERTO RICAN'S PERSPECTIVE ON RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN LEGAL EDUCATION *

(By José A. Cabranes) **

I. WHO ARE THE PUERTO RICANS?

A request to comment upon Puerto Ricans in the American legal profession, and the prospects for careers for Puerto Ricans in the law in the years to come, invites a consideration of some fundamental questions about this increasingly visible and vocal "minority." Who, after all, are these people? And what do they want? These are common enough questions nowadays when confronting people with dissenting politics or merely differing lifestyles. As it happens, they are perfectly good questions—even when accompanied by expressions of bewilderment or exasperation. As far as I am concerned, they are questions too infrequently asked about Puerto Ricans, whose identity tends to be lost in the rhetoric of the "urban crisis" and the problems of the "minorities."

Who, indeed, are these newcomers? They come bearing a foreign culture and speaking a foreign tongue. However, that is hardly unusual in cities that have received earlier European migrations. Yet in two respects these newcomers do arrive under terms and conditions significantly different from those of other groups that preceded them: they are racially mixed and they are citizens of the United States. They are not grateful escapees from the oppression of distant lands to which they will never return. Rather, they are "colonials"—people from a territory that is not an integral part of the American Union, though it flies the American flag[1]—who reluctantly migrate from a Caribbean island for which they will always yearn and to which they may always return.

Like the "colonials" who have migrated to Britain in recent years the, Puerto Ricans' access to the metropolitan state is made possible by the technological revolution in air transportation and—most important of all—by the citizenship granted years ago by distant rulers who neither foresaw nor suspected the possibility of mass migration. Puerto Ricans inhabit many of the nation's urban centers today because earlier generations of Americans chose to experiment with colonialism after the Spanish-American War and, later, to grant colonial subjects United States' citizenship.

That grant of American citizenship was not intended to accord Puerto Ricans living in Puerto Rico the same rights and privileges as United States citizens residing in states of the Union. Indeed, Felix Frankfurter, serving in 1914 as Law Officer of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the Department of War (which administered the island territories of the United States), described the then-proposed grant of citizenship as merely a means of recognizing the permanence of the

---

*This article is the foreword to a book entitled "Careers in Law for Minorities: Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans." The views are the author's and not necessarily those of any person or group with whom the author is affiliated.

**José A. Cabranes is a member of the New York Bar and a resident of New York City. He is Associate Professor Law at Rutgers University Law School (Newark), where he teaches courses in international Law, Conflict of Laws and Administrative Law. He also has taught International Law at Queens College of Cambridge University.

Professor Cabranes was born in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico in 1940 and moved with his family to the South Bronx (New York City) in 1946, where his father was director of a settlement house. He is a graduate of New York's public school system, Columbia College (1961), Yale Law School (1965) and Cambridge University (1967). From 1967 to 1971 he was associated with a New York City law firm and engaged in a general corporate practice and a litigation practice before Federal regulatory agencies. Shortly after joining the law faculty at Rutgers in 1971, Professor Cabranes was elected Chairman of the Board of Directors of Aspira of New York, the Puerto Rican educational and leadership development agency. He also is a founding member (and a member of the executive committee of the Board of Directors) of the recently-organized Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund.

[1] For a convenient account of the acquisition of Puerto Rico after the Spanish-American War, and its political status under the American flag (until 1950), see Pratt, *America's Colonial Experiment: How the United States Gained, Governed and in Part Gave Away a Colonial Empire* (1950). With regard to the constitutional doctrine of territorial incorporation, see *Downes* v. *Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901). See generally, Coudert, "The Evolution of the Doctrine of Territorial Incorporation," 26 *Colum.L.Rev.* 823 (1926). For a brief survey of the island's place in the American constitutional system, see my note, "The Status of Puerto Rico," 16 *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 531–9 (1967).

relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, which would remove "the great source of political unrest on the island" and give Puerto Ricans "a securer technical international standing." The United States Supreme Court held in 1922 that the major constitutional significance of the citizenship granted to Puerto Ricans five years earlier was the right to travel to the mainland of the United States and there enjoy all the rights and privileges of national citizenship.[2]

The Puerto Ricans who exercised that right by migrating to the urban centers of the Northeast in the years following the Second World War came from a culturally defined, but politically and economically underdeveloped, society. Nearly a century before the settlement of Jamestown the ancestors of the Puerto Rican garment and restaurant workers of New York and the migrant agricultural laborers of New Jersey were building a cathedral in San Juan. However, the history of this creole civilization is one of political dependency under two flags. A certain docility before more powerful economic and political forces is a notable characteristic of a people who were Spain's last and most loyal colony in the New World. Today, Puerto Rico's reluctance to embrace national independence places this community of nearly three million people in a class by itself.

Puerto Rico's politics has been, and remains, a painful and seemingly interminable identity crisis—an agonizing personal and political struggle to find a national identity. "Identity" is a subject of pervasive significance in Puerto Rico; and it is equally significant for the migrant to the continental United States.

II. THE PUERTO RICANS IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

How are Puerto Ricans faring on the mainland ("the continent")? And how are they faring in the American legal profession? Precise demographic information on Puerto Ricans in the continental United States has always been difficult to obtain. This is so largely because of the bureaucratic practices and demographic policies of the United States Census Bureau. Indeed, even the number of Puerto Ricans who now reside on the mainland is a matter of uncertainty and controversy.

The Census Bureau has tended to treat Puerto Ricans as it does other "foreign stock" ethnic groups: It counts as "Puerto Rican" only those who were born in Puerto Rico or who had at least one parent born on the island. There is simply no record of Puerto Ricans who are not part of the first or second generations—a fact that has generated considerable political controversy in New York and other parts of the country. For example, in October 1972 leaders of the Puerto Rican community of New York City—the largest of all mainland Puerto Rican communities—charged that as many as 250,000 Puerto Rican residents of that city were simply not recorded by the Census Bureau.[3]

The economic profile of those Puerto Ricans who *are* counted by the Census Bureau indicates that the Puerto Ricans are far and away the most severely deprived major ethnic group in the cities of America. Statistics on New York's enormous Puerto Rican community (about 1 million, or one-seventh of the city's population) suggest the dimensions of the social and economic problems of Puerto Rican communities from Chicago to Boston. For example, between 1960 and 1970 median family income among whites in New York City rose 26% (from $6,365 to $10,378) while among blacks the percentage increase was 24% (from $4,437 to $7,150). However, during this same period of time the median family income among Puerto Ricans rose by only half the rate of increase of non-Puerto Rican white families—13% (from $3,811 to $5,575.)[4]

The statistics on those living below the "poverty line"[5] provide additional evidence of the comparative economic positions of Puerto Ricans, blacks and non-Puerto Rican whites. In 1970, 8.9% of New York's non-Puerto Rican white population was certifiably poor. Twenty-four per cent of the black population of New York City qualified as poor. *And fully 35.1% of the Puerto Rican population—more than 300,000 persons—lived below the poverty line.*

The comparative socio-economic conditions of these three population groups is reflected in statistics on educational achievement. In 1970, 51% of the non-Puerto Rican white adults over 25 were high school graduates. Forty-one per cent of the comparable black population were high school graduates. *But only 20% of the comparable Puerto Rican population were graduated from high school.* The median years of schooling for New York's Puerto Ricans was more than two full grades less than New York blacks (eight and one-half grades for the Puerto Ricans, nearly eleven grades for blacks).

This portrait is mirrored in every available statistical index of social and economic condition. It should surprise no one, therefore, that only one Puerto Rican in a hundred (among adults over 25) had a college degree in 1970, in comparison with 13% and 4% of comparable non-Puerto Rican white and black population groups, respectively. Statistics concerning Puerto Ricans in the legal profession are even more shocking. Puerto Rican professional groups estimate that in New York state—with a Puerto Rican population of more than one million—there are less than seventy Puerto Ricans admitted to the practice of law. If that is an appalling item of information—and it is—one is at a loss for words to adequately describe the situation in neighboring New Jersey. According to reliable accounts, New Jersey's Spanish-speaking population of more than 300,000 is served by three—yes, three—Puerto Rican lawyers.

These dreary facts tell us a great deal about the current state of legal education in the Puerto Rican communities of the continental United States. However, other facts point to a substantially brighter future for careers in the law for Puerto Ricans. For example, there are now more Puerto Rican law students in the continental United States than there are practicing Puerto Rican lawyers. A 1971 survey of minority group students in legal education, conducted in behalf of the American Bar Association by Millard H. Ruud of the University of Texas School of Law, reported a total of 92 Puerto Ricans then enrolled in law school.[6]

If and when these Puerto Rican law students (and their successors) graduate and are admitted to practice, the rate of growth in Puerto Rican bar membership doubtless will seem quite spectacular—as it must always seem when one begins with such a small base. Reports that the number of Puerto Rican lawyers have "doubled" or "tripled" in a short period of time will undoubtedly circulate among bar association officials and law school administrators in the years to come. One can only hope that such reports will not be the occasion for a diminution of interest in the plight of the lawyerless Puerto Rican communities. The rate of growth of Puerto Rican law student enrollment has indeed been significant in recent years. But the Puerto Ricans' enrollment growth rate in the past four years (33%) has been considerably smaller than that of blacks (203%), Mexican-Americans (408%) and Native Americans (356%). Puerto Ricans may be "catching up"—but they apparently are doing so at a slower rate than other minorities. And it will be a long time before there are "enough" Puerto Rican lawyers in our cities. Accordingly, the Puerto Ricans, along with these other minority groups, will be a proper object of concern for the Bar and the law schools for the foreseeable future.

III. PUERTO RICANS AS A "MINORITY": WHAT DO THEY WANT?

The title of this book[6a] suggests the difficulty of generalizing about those groups which now are collectively styled "minorities." Its principal title—*Careers in Law for Minorities*—evokes a sense of identity of interests and goals among those whom it treats; however, the enumeration of the three groups in the sub-title properly suggests that the word "minority," standing alone, is an inadequate description of the communities which are the subject of the book. The editors have shown a remarkable, and altogether uncommon, sensitivity to the diverse perspectives of three groups whose principal common ground is a history of exclusion and a longing for social and economic justice.

As it happens, Puerto Ricans generally do not favor the term "minority." The unhappiness of Puerto Ricans with such broad terms or categories, which group them with other outsiders, is a matter of more than passing interest. The motives which underlie the notorious Puerto Rican reluctance to be a part of social and economic programs for "minorities" are complex and difficult to describe. However, it seems clear that they will in due course find expression in educational institutions which organize "minority" programs and include Puerto Ricans in them, including, of course, the law schools.

Why this apparent unhappiness with the word "minority?" Is this merely an attempt by Puerto Ricans to avoid identification with the other groups that are so identified? Does it express a parochial insensitivity to shared concerns and problems? The reasons *why* Puerto Ricans are troubled by the word "minority" reveal much about the Puerto Ricans as an ethnic group and about the general thrust of Puerto Rican community concerns.

In the current era, the term "minority" has become a code word for blacks, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans. It has different and narrower meanings in different parts of the country. For example, in the Northeast, "minority" usually means blacks and Puerto Ricans. In California and the Southwest, it usually means blacks and Mexican-Americans. The term is offensive to Puerto Ricans, I believe, because it hurts the people it supposedly describes.

First, it divides groups with common interests. It identifies the "minorities" (including Puerto Ricans) as society's outsiders—as groups which, almost by definition, are entitled to something different from the dominant "majority." The Puerto Ricans who have migrated to the continental

---

[2] *Balzac* v. *Porto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298 (1922).

[3] *N.Y. Times*, October 2, 1972, p. 1, cols. 4–5. If this claim is accurate, the political claims of the Puerto Rican community undoubtedly have been substantially underestimated. In any event, reasonable estimates of the number of Puerto Ricans now residing in the continental United States range from 1.5 to 2.5 million. (The 1970 census of Puerto Rico's population reveals that the island has 2.7 million inhabitants).

[4] These various statistics are collected in a comprehensive report of Census Bureau data, *N.Y. Times*, August 17, 1972, p. 37, cols. 6–8.

[5] Namely, a family of four with an income below $3,743. *Ibid.*

[6] Rudd, *1971 Survey of Minority Group Students in Legal Education* (Memorandum to Deans of Approved Law Schools, January 20, 1972).

[6a] The book of which this article is the foreword.

United States have done so because they have sought access to American society. In this sense, Puerto Ricans are in the great tradition of other immigrant groups. They have a keen appreciation of their own heritage and values, but share none of the separatist impulses of some militant black groups. Separatism may be a legitimate concern for those Puerto Ricans on the island who advocate national independence, but it is a *non-sequitur* for the communities composed of people who chose to leave their homeland in order to live on the continent.

The term "minority" also isolates currently certified "minorities" from members of other ethnic groups and encourages the pernicious notion that the white poor and lower-middle classes of "ethnic America" (the new would-be counterpoise to the "minorities") are so well established that they share a common interest with other white "majorities" in opposition to the aspirations of the new "minorities."

The word "minority" hides the peculiar identity and special needs of smaller groups within the "minorities" (such as the Puerto Ricans) and gives a false impression of unity among peoples that are really quite different from one another. The term "minorities" mistakenly suggests that blacks, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans have completely identical interests and goals. The fact is that each of these groups is quite different from the other and each has substantially different historical experiences, cultural values, social problems and political expectations. For example, the preoccupation with race or negritude which is common in many programs for "minorities" is a source of confusion for Puerto Ricans, who are a racially mixed people not readily accustomed to a system which allocates rewards and punishments on the basis of race. If color lines are not wholly absent in Puerto Rican society, they are quite substantially blurred; the American experience with race is utterly foreign to Puerto Rico. Not surprisingly, the Puerto Rican experience with American racial classifications reinforces the Puerto Ricans' sense of identity. Moreover, a Puerto Rican may (and does) avoid the problems of racial classification by asserting the distinctiveness of the Puerto Rican people. Puerto Ricans of every shade are, first and last, Puerto Ricans; and the Puerto Ricans' identity is a source of insulation and protection from the neuroses of the American social environment. Therefore, a "minority program" in which racial conflict or racial exclusion—a strong and negative sense of "them"—is a predominant characteristic, holds little or no long-term attraction for Puerto Ricans.

In any event, as a practical matter the Puerto Ricans generally prefer to assert community claims in their own name because of a widespread belief that Puerto Ricans will be largely ignored in programs designed for "minorities" or "the poor." It is argued that programs which describe their intended beneficiaries in broad ethnic terms derive political and moral advantage—and, perhaps, an augmented "legitimacy"—from that apparent scope of such programs. Despite the use of the Puerto Ricans' numbers and their catalogue of deprivations, it is said that the returns to the Puerto Rican "constituents" of such programs are disproportionately low.

IV. "MINORITY" PROGRAMS IN THE LAW SCHOOLS

Law schools which establish special programs for "minorities" and intend to include Puerto Ricans within their scope would do well to bear in mind the Puerto Rican aversion to words and programs which suggest their inclusion but actually ignore Puerto Ricans as a discrete group. A "minority" financial aid and counselling program racial cast—for example, one that is administered only by blacks, or which is based in part upon an institutional role by a black law students' association or which is geared to the prevalent politico-racial values of blacks—invites Puerto Rican discontent and, invariably, demands for replication of the "minority" program in a parallel, wholly-Puerto Rican organization.

An alternative to *de-ethnicization* of academic and other programs for specially-admitted students is, of course, the establishment from the outset of distinct "minority" programs, in which the limited resources available for "minority" programs are divided on the basis of appropriate ethnic subclassifications. This approach causes a great deal of distress among educators and bureaucrats. ("Where will it all end?") Nevertheless, the rationalizations offered in the first place for a "minority" program—which are beyond the scope of this brief comment—are as readily applicable to claims for programs geared to ethnic subcategories. The Puerto Rican claim for Puerto Rican programs is simple and straight-forward, and merely a logical extension of practices adopted in behalf of (and in response to demands by) blacks: If government programs are indeed to be financed and operated on a racial or ethnic basis, the Puerto Ricans are entitled to their fair—and discrete—share. In other words, if there is merit in a "minority" program which speaks to the values, concerns and anxieties of blacks—and which is administered with these in mind—why should Puerto Ricans not feel that a similar program ought to be established for them? Puerto Ricans may be pardoned if, in these circumstances, they show little tolerance for those who fail to distinguish between them and other "minorities." Law school administrators may be pleasantly surprised to learn that the "politically expedient" solution to such ethnic rivalries is to implement the old-fashioned notion that educational programs at this advanced level ought to be completely color-blind.

Apart from the ethnic or racial complexion of "minority" programs in the law schools, it seems to me Puerto Rican students have rather conventional interests and concerns: they would like to be able to achieve academic success, in order to be able to make some contribution to their community and to share in the various perquisites of an American legal education. For all the reasons suggested above, Puerto Rican students will probably share the view of law school administrators who, according to a recent study, tend to favor remedial and retention measures which are voluntary, non-segregated and open to all law students.[7] Despite a readiness to participate in preferential admissions programs, Puerto Rican law students (and, indeed, all "minority" law students) have no genuine interest in preferential post-admission retention schemes—which can only serve to devalue their educational achievements and brand them as second-class members of the legal profession. The "minority" communities should be—and, I believe, are—properly horrified by any suggestion that ethnicity or race, rather than professional knowledge and skills, will ever be employed as a principal yardstick for measuring professional competence. As the leading Harlem newspaper, *The New York Amsterdam News*, has recently remarked in an editorial on appointments in the health field, "[W]e must insist that blackness, without competence, is no solution to any of our problems and we will not be satisfied with a sop, or idle gesture, in place of appropriate affirmative action * * *."[8] The "minority" communities—which supposedly are now the object of the solicitude of law school administrators—have the greatest possible stake in the quality of lawyers produced by American law schools. If law schools cavalierly graduate Puerto Rican (or black) law students who are incompetent to handle the affairs of clients, the victims will largely be drawn from their own communities. Those concerned with the protection of the lives and rights of Puerto Ricans (or blacks) will not tolerate for long the consequences of any post-admission retention policies which inflict harm upon those supposedly being served.

It should, therefore, be a matter of some concern to Puerto Ricans, blacks and other "minorities" that law school administrators have recently suggested that the programs to increase the number of "minority" lawyers in the United States have been less than successful. These programs, it is said, are at a critical stage. After a period of experimentation with standards of admission, we are informed, American law schools and the Bar must now approach the inevitable "agonizing re-appraisal" of these experiments.

Between 1971 and 1973, Dean Robert B. McKay of New York University Law School has reminded us, "We will see the first substantial number of students who may have been admitted on somewhat different standards graduating and taking the bar examination." As Chairman of the Committee on Minority Groups of the Association of American Law Schools, Dean McKay reported in April 1971 that we ought now to anticipate the proverbial "crunch"—that we ought to expect "a disappointing rate of success on the bar examinations and a substantial outcry at the failure—either of legal education, or of the bar examinations, or both."

One need not hold a brief for the bar examination system to suggest that if the prognosis for minority law graduates is as bleak as suggested by Dean McKay and others, the law schools will have to assume their fair share of the responsibility for the shattered expectations which they themselves aroused. After all, Dean McKay and others have indicated that inherently suspect practices and procedures in bar examinations are now relatively uncommon, and that the real problem confronting the law schools and the Bar is, in the last analysis, the rate of failure of minority students. This suggests that, regardless of the merits of the bar examination system in this country, minority students as a group may simply not be emerging from the law schools with training and skills comparable to their classmates. One obvious and simple solution to the problem will be to alter bar examinations (or the bar examination grading system) in ways that would make admission to practice more readily available to the graduating minority student. This solution has the obvious merit of permitting the law schools to avoid the kind of accountability which they properly owe to the legal profession and to the general community.

Despite the expected diversionary criticism of the bar examination, the law schools must now evaluate their own academic programs and must be ready to take the steps which may be necessary to assure the minority communities, and the community at large, that different or special *admissions* standards do not mean different or special *graduation* standards. The black, Mexican-American, Native American, and Puerto Rican communities are entitled to every possible assurance that those among them who graduate from law school—and to whom they will be expected to entrust their lives and property—will indeed be able to serve their

[7] Academy for Educational Development, *Legal Education Advancement Planning: An Introductory Study of Minority Student Development Potentials* (a study commissioned by the Law Students' Civil Rights Research Council) at 18-20 (December 1971).

[8] *N.Y. Amsterdam News*, October 21, 1972, p. A-4 (editorial).

needs. The provision of legal services to these communities was, after all, the ultimate rationale for special admissions programs; it is simply unthinkable that law schools should accept, even implicitly, the suggestion that their minority law graduates constitute a different, and lower, professional class. It is equally unthinkable that the law schools should admit a large number of minority students and dismiss most of them in due course.

What, then, is to be done? That is, of course, the question of the day—and one that can hardly be answered fully in this paper. My own initial suggestion is that law school faculties and administrators demonstrate the courage and candor shown by the minority law students themselves.[9] At a *Conference on Law Schools and the Retention of Minority* at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, held on February 9, 1972 under the auspices of the Law Students Civil Rights Research Council (LSCRRC), minority law students readily acknowledged that the most important problems confronting the minority student in the law schools (apart from general financial problems and related family concerns) concerned underdeveloped language skills. The major problems were not, as some might imagine, that minority law students cannot "relate" to (or are incapable of coping with) "irrelevant" law courses. The suggestion that "hard law" courses are not "relevant" to the lives of racial and ethnic minorities is, of course, rubbish. It requires no great amount of wit to appreciate the fact that the past and future of Harlem and of El Barrio is bound up in courses such as debtor-creditor law, commercial transactions, negotiable instruments, property, torts and civil procedure—and, let it be said, administrative law, regulated industries and trusts and estates. There seems to be a widespread assumption in the law teaching fraternity that "innovative" law school curricula, which eliminate many of the traditional courses as requirements for graduation and give students a large role in determining the scope and direction of courses and "clinics," best serve the needs of minority students. Any such assumption seems to me to be quite unwarranted, albeit somewhat explicable: there is a tacit assumption that one who favors "freedom" in the political and social order necessarily hankers for "freedom" in education. I share some of the misgivings of an important symposium held in 1972 by persons concerned with access and power for blacks in higher education, which suggested that "innovative" curricula which provide students with great freedom of choice and flexibility may sometimes perform a disservice to minority students:

"The assumption that blacks have had such a rough time in the traditional system that they will be delighted with almost any innovation is unfounded. It will be years befor major innovations are perfected and popularized so that they can benefit the majority of black students. *Meanwhile, blacks want the traditional system to extend itself to be responsive to their needs.*

"Innovative programs which reduce structure and greatly increase freedom leave many students feeling confused and worried. This feeling is particularly intense among blacks who have trouble getting sound advice about curriculum choices and careers through informal channels. When you know it's likely that you'll get lost and you suspect that many of the people along the way aren't interested in helping you reach your goal, you probably aren't too eager to walk uncharted trails." [10]

The rhetoric of "relevancy," curricular innovation and bar examiners' perversity all too frequently are employed as escape devices to avoid facing the cruel, but simple and inescapable, fact that some law students (*including a great many non-Puerto Rican whites*) are not adequately prepared to read and write the language of the law. If that is indeed the case—and the testimony of senior colleagues, personal experiences and the views of minority students at the 1972 LSCRRC conference suggest that it is—the law schools would do well to ask some questions which they usually prefer to avoid. How can a law faculty provide remedial programs in language skills for those in need? Who should be expected to administer and conduct such programs? To what extent can law teachers properly be expected to do such jobs? If law teachers cannot, or will not, undertake remedial language skill programs, who should?

The answers to these mundane and somewhat unpleasant questions, I submit, will determine the success or failure of the well-intentioned and valuable efforts of the nation's law schools to increase the number of minority lawyers.

[9] See, for example, the comments by the author of the study prepared for the Law Student's Civil Rights Research Council (LSCRRC), *op. cit. supra* note 7 at 113.

[10] William M. Boyd, II (ed.), *Access and Power for Blacks and Higher Education* 19 (Report on a symposium of the Educational Policy Center, New York, July 1972).

AMOS RUSIE "THE HOOSIER THUNDERBOLT"

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Indianapolis, Ind., Star magazine for October 21, 1973, speaks for itself. The name, unfortunately, is almost forgotten, but Rick Johnson, the author, has done a masterful job of bringing back to life this all-time baseball great.

AMOS RUSIE: "THE WORLD'S GREATEST PITCHER"

(By Rick Johnson)

Amos Wilson Rusie.

The name sounds rugged, individualistic—qualities of the man.

Today Rusie's name means something to only a handful of people. They recall him as a baseball superstar for the New York Giants in the Gas Light era.

He was the Colossus of Coogan's Bluff, Mr. New York Giant, a burly red haired, right-hander from Indianapolis, via Mooresville, who hurled a sphere of live steam from the pitcher's mound to the plate, in an awesome display of strength.

Restaurants in the Big Town named drinks in Rusie's honor, the vaudevillians, Weber and Fields, included a Rusie skit in their act. Lillian Russell, the belle of Broadway, clamored for an introduction to Rusie and DeWolfe Hopper, a stage performer, counted himself as one of Rusie's friends.

Youngsters saved their pennies to buy a pamphlet titled *Secrets of Amos Rusie: The World's Greatest Pitcher: How he Obtains his Incredible Speed on the Ball.*

Rusie was a man whose raw pitching power overjoyed the fans, made the turnstiles click, when National League teams and baseball were fighting for survival. Rusie made batsmen wince with his speed while his hot temper, stubbornness and desire to do battle, qualities which made him a great pitcher, often left his club owners frustrated and bitter.

Rusie pioneered the "holdout" and was one of the first players of the national game to take baseball management to court to win a point.

When Rusie started his major league career with Indianapolis in 1889, the pitching distance was 50 feet and the plate was a target 12 inches square.

Batters were terrified of Rusie's speed and in his first two years with New York he piled up 678 strikeouts and gave up 551 walks. For the 1893 season the pitcher's mound was moved back to 60 feet, 6 inches. The distance increase was attributed to Rusie's speed by writers of the era.

Rusie's speed was still fearful, but at the new distance his curve ball, which traveled at the same velocity as his fast ball, had time to break. His strikeout total lessened but so did his walks and his effectiveness was without question.

Neither baseball fans, nor players ever saw a man who could throw so fast. Rusie's catcher, to last an entire game, padded his glove with a thin sheet of lead and some sponge, thereby giving the collision of Rusie's pitch with the catcher's glove a distinct sound.

Rusie has been dead since Dec. 6, 1942. His playing career, in all reality, was over before the turn of the century. During that career he made indelible marks on the national game and in his 10 years in the major leagues he won 245 games and lost 174.

He piled up record after record but you won't find him listed in the Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, New York. An oversight?

Congressman William G. Bray (R-Ind.), a native of the Morgan County town where Rusie was born, long has wondered why fame has escaped the pitcher. So have surviving members of the speed-baller's family.

"From all I've been able to learn, Amos wasn't a friendly man, gruff in fact, and he made too many people mad during his career," says Bray. "But that is beside the point He could play baseball, he could pitch like few men before or since, and I'm going to find out why he is not in the Baseball Hall of Fame."

Bray recalls that once Rusie and Bray's father were members of a hunting party and Rusie picked up an old railroad spike, wound up and sent it piercing the side of a wooden boxcar.

John Rusie, a retired state police lieutenant and a nephew of Amos Rusie, has tried to get recognition for the pitcher. He has been supported by his three sisters, Rusie's nieces, Mrs. Jean Giesking and Mrs. Lois Smith, both of Indianapolis, and Mrs. Alice Marsh of St. Louis.

John, who lives in Mexico, a small town north of Peru, recalls that during World War II while he was stationed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, he often went around the Polo Grounds to soak up atmosphere where his uncle had been a star.

"In one of the old taverns near the Polo Grounds, they were still serving a drink called the Rusie Cocktail," he recalls. "I've made studies of some of the pitchers who have been put into the hall. I've read the things which have been written about Amos and I don't see how Amos is always ignored.

"Once I got all the facts together and I was going to see what I could do. But I never found anyone to talk to and I finally just threw all the stuff away."

Mrs. Wanda Rusie Potts of Mooresville learned of his pitching strength through a story her father told. Wallace Rusie was Amos' uncle and once, before Rusie became a baseball star, he was showing Wallace how he could throw a ball.

"Dad said Amos threw a pitch to him he couldn't stop. The ball broke one of Dad's fingers and then cracked a board in the back stop. Dad's finger was permanently crooked and he said from that time he knew Amos would become a great pitcher," Mrs. Potts recalls.

But, in addition to doing some great pitching, Rusie also had some great rhubarbs with baseball management. His career ended in 1907 in a pathetic finale at Cincinnati. From there he migrated from one back-breaking job to another. Only once in his post-diamond years did he get back into the limelight.

He served as head grounds keeper at the Polo Grounds for a while, working for John McGraw.

McGraw, when he played for the Baltimore Orioles, had been the fellow who stood as three Rusie pitches struck him out and remarked: "You can't hit 'em if you can't see 'em."

In Mooresville, May 30, 1871, Mr. and Mrs. William A. Rusie celebrated the birth of their son, Amos. While Amos was still a toddler, William moved his family to Indianapolis, where there was plenty of work for tradesmen—he was a mason and plasterer.

Amos' brothers, William and John, were born in Indianapolis and the family lived in a brick home their father built on East New York Street, near the present Indiana Woman's Prison.

By the time Amos was a teen-ager he'd learned to love baseball but he hated school. He quit school when he was 16 and went to work at the Madden Lounge Factory. Nearly all of his free time was devoted to baseball.

For his age he was exceptionally large and he played the outfield in countless scrub games. He was a good hitter and his throws from the outfield, though sometimes erratic, were so hard and fast few base runners tried to beat them.

He played for one amateur team called the Sturm Avenue Never Sweats, then in 1886 he moved to a bit better team called the Orientals. In 1887 he began playing for the Grand Avenues, the best amateur team in town, and he was their star pitcher.

The Grand Avenue name did not come, as many believed, from the name of any street in Indianapolis. The name was used because the team members purchased uniforms from a disbanding St. Louis team which called themselves the Grand Avenue.

"I discovered I could throw a little," Amos once told a reporter, "and it aroused my interest. I worked hard to learn how to throw a curve ball, but I've got to confess it was years before I mastered it."

There are several versions of how Amos came to play with the Indianapolis baseball club, a member of the National League. One is that Indianapolis players saw Rusie and urged the club owner, John T. Brush, to give him a tryout. Another is that he got to play after hanging around the Indianapolis ball park, which was where Methodist Hospital is now.

Another is that a team called the Indianapolis Athletic Club used Rusie to replace a sick pitcher and, impressed with his performance, urged the National League squad to pick him up.

At any rate, in 1887 Rusie beat the Washington Senators and Boston in two exhibition games for Indianapolis and the next year bested the Chicago Maroons, a strong independent team, 30–0.

He got a contract, with his father's consent, for $300 a month—"That was more than I was making," said Rusie's Dad—played a few games for Indianapolis in 1888, was farmed out to Terre Haute for a while and in 1889 went to Burlington, Ia., for more seasoning.

In June, 1889 the Indianapolis team was scheduled against Jim Mutrie's Giants and Brush and Manager Frank Bancroft summoned Rusie to the Big Town. The perfect picture of a Rube—6 feet, 1 inch tall, 225 pounds, red hair, red flannel undershirt showing—Rusie prompted guffaws when he walked on the mound in New York. But when he fired the first pitch and the batter didn't even see it, the laughter trailed off.

The lead batter later said he never saw any of the three pitches Rusie threw to strike him out on the way to a 4–2 victory. Victories against Boston and Philadelphia followed.

The trip to Boston from New York was made by boat in those days and the veterans took full advantage of Rusie, the greenhorn. One by one the veterans sidled up to him, and in mock fear, told him of the dangers of traveling on a boat. Each teammate warned the only way to be safe was to sleep in a life preserver, which they intended to do.

That night a pair of the pranksters helped Rusie put on his life jacket and then left him sitting on his bunk. The life jacket was so bulky it prevented Rusie from lying down, so he spent a restless night trying to sleep in a sitting position. The next day a rumpled and red-eyed Rusie provoked his teammates to laughter but he took the ribbing with good grace.

By the time Rusie and the Indianapolis club made the circuit of the National League, thousands of words had been written about his ability to throw the fastest pitch ever seen. At St. Louis, after one of Rusie's streaks of steam whistled by the batter stepped out of the box and complained, "That guy ain't no pitcher. He's a cannon."

Rusie pitched 225 innings for Indianapolis in 1889, yielding 246 hits, 116 bases on balls and striking out 109. He finished his first full season in the National League with a 12 won, 10 lost record.

Before the 1890 season began, Amos married May Smith of Muncie. He was then 19 and determined to become a star for the Indianapolis club.

But Indianapolis and Washington were on the bottom rung of the league ladder. In financial trouble, clubs were adopting salary ceilings and National League directors favored reducing the circuit from 10 teams to eight. By 1890 it appeared certain Washington and Indianapolis would go and when, at a New York meeting, the directors decided to drop the Washington franchise, Brush decided to sell his Indianapolis club.

Eight players, including Rusie, went to the Giants for an estimated $60,000. Indianapolis was without a major league team, but Rusie was poised to make history.

For the rebuilt Giants of 1890, Rusie pitched in 67 games, won 29, lost 34, struck out 341, walked 289. He was second in the league in complete games, third in earned runs, fourth in wins, first in strikeouts, first in fewest hits per nine innings, second in total innings worked (549), second in complete games, second in most strikeouts per nine innings and second in games pitched.

In 1891 Rusie had a 33–20 record and the Giants finished in third place. July 31 that year Rusie pitched his only no-hitter against Brooklyn. His 337 strikeouts were tops in baseball, but so were the 262 walks. In other areas he was third or better in the league.

In 1892, Rusie had a 31–31 record, but the Giants slipped to eighth in a 12-team league. Rusie was second in almost all categories for the record book, except walks. He was tops with 267.

Rusie had a two-year contract for $4,500. But he and several other Giant players were released late in 1892. The club hoped to save paying them half a month's salary and an understanding was announced that no other clubs would pick up the players. Then, in 1893, the Giants would be free to renegotiate salaries.

But Cincinnati quickly offered Rusie $4,800 and Chicago offered $6,250 and a $2,000 bonus, which Rusie took. But, through further negotiations, details of which were not revealed, the Giants got Rusie back in 1893 for $6,250. They tried to count the $2,000 Chicago bonus as part of the salary, but Rusie reportedly fought this and kept all the money.

Before 1893 the pitcher could take two steps toward the plate, 50 feet away, before throwing. But for the 1893 season, the pitcher had to stay on the rubber 60 feet, 6 inches from the plate. Rusie won 31, lost 21, led in strikeouts, was fourth in wins and led in five other categories. But the Giants finished fifth.

In the spring of 1894 the Giants signed Charles (Duke) Farrel, an experienced catcher, and Jouett Meekin, a pitcher of doubtful quality from Louisville and Washington. Meekin was from New Albany, which put two Hoosiers on the Giant mound.

And he went on a winning binge beginning July 25 and ending with 11 straight victories. Hopeful, the Giants began a September road trip with a plea to Meekin and Rusie to pitch them into the Temple Cup Series, forerunner of the World Series. Bonuses of $600 were promised.

The effect was startling. Rusie won 36 games and lost 13 and Meekin won 33 against 9 losses. Rusie whiffed 195 and Meekin 133 and sportswriters dubbed them "the Iron Twins."

The effort earned the Giants a playoff with the Orioles for the cup. It was a prize donated to the National League by William C. Temple, Pittsburgh sportsman and former president of the Pittsburgh club.

After a dispute over gate receipts which nearly delayed the match, the playoff was devastating for the Orioles, captained by John McGraw and including Dan Brouthers, Hugh Jennings, Willie Keeler, Willie Robinson and pitching ace Sadie McMahon.

Rusie won the first game, 4–1, Meekin followed with a 9–6 victory. Moving from the Orioles' field to the Polo Grounds, Rusie duplicated with another 4–1 win and Meekin mopped up the meeting with a 16–3 slaughter.

Meekin said he never got his $600 bonus and refused an offered $100. There is no record on whether Rusie even was offered any extra cash.

When Rusie came to New York in 1895 to start training he was met at the station by bands and banners and thousands of cheering fans who remembered his 1894 tour de force. But Andrew Freedman now controlled the Giants and he was as unyielding as Rusie. A clash was inevitable and formed in subtle ways.

Rusie once explained, "Freedman turned over two young pitchers for me to tutor. One was a willing youngster and a good pupil, but the other was a smart aleck. I ignored him and concentrated on the one who wanted to work. It really made Freedman sore."

Rusie admitted he didn't keep a rigorous training schedule. "I found a glass or two of beer refreshing after a game. Beer is nothing that won't come out of your system with a bit of work. But a man can not play baseball and drink whisky," Rusie once said.

Freedman clamped a curfew on his players. Rusie and a teammate, shortstop, William (Shorty) Fuller, were room mates on the road. One evening at Baltimore Rusie went to get the room key and was told Fuller had the key and was gone. Rusie, scheduled to pitch the next day, took a key to another room and went to bed.

The next day Freedman got word Rusie had not been in his room the previous night and levied a $100 fine. Rusie declined to make an explanation for fear of causing trouble for Fuller.

Within days, while Rusie was pitching against Philadelphia, he reportedly thumbed his nose at Freedman from the mound. Freedman responded with another $100 fine and said Rusie wasn't trying to pitch.

Rusie struggled through the year, finishing 23 and 23. The Giants finished a dismal ninth. Meekin also slipped to a 16–11 mark in 1895.

Rusie led the league in strikeouts with 201, was third in innings pitched with 293, fourth in complete games with 42 and first in strike-

outs per nine innings with 4.60. He appeared in 49 games for the Giants.

"Those two fines amounted to $200," Rusie said. "When they sent me a contract for 1896, I refused to sign it unless the fines were restored to me. This Freedman refused to do, so I wouldn't sign and stayed out all year."

Rusie appealed the fines to the directors of the National League. On June 10, 1896, the directors ruled the fines were proper. But Rusie refused to bow.

On November 13, 1896, it was reported that Rusie, after failing to obtain his release from the Giants, filed suit in Federal Court at Chicago, seeking an injunction against baseball's reserve clause.

This clause binds a player to the club which has him under contract and prohibits him from signing with another club until he is released. It also mandates him to honor trade agreements. Rusie asked his release, $5,000 in damages and charged Giant management deprived him of a livelihood.

Baseball management was aghast but Freedman refused to budge. The case was dismissed in Illinois and refiled in Federal Court at Trenton, N.J., and was set for arguments on various motions March 15, 1897.

Rusie was not without a friend in his dispute with the Giant management. In February, 1897, Brush, then president of the Cincinnati ball club, acknowledged that Rusie was putting baseball's reserve clause to a court test but he said even if the clause was declared illegal it would not jeopardize organized baseball.

"A club that lives up to its contract with its players will not suffer. It is the club that will not do what it agrees to do that will have trouble. The Cincinnati Club does not fear anything of the kind. We have always lived up to every condition in our contracts with the players. The New York Club violated its contract with Rusie. An exorbitant and unjust fine was taken out of Rusie's salary. It was but natural that he should protest. Had the New York Club showed any disposition to be conciliatory and do its part toward an adjustment of the trouble, instead of taking a dictatorial and arbitrary stand, it is quite likely that Rusie would have played last season."

Before the 1897 season started club owners, except Freedman and the Boston owner, met at Brush's home in Indianapolis, pooled $5,000 and settled the dispute out of court.

"After the settlement, Freedman still nursed resentment against me," Rusie recalled. "When I appeared in the clubhouse to join the Giants, Freedman had left orders not to allow me to put on a suit. So I watched that opener from the stands. About the middle of the game I went down to the New York dugout. Several fans recognized me and raised a terrific hubbub.

"The next day, Freedman allowed me to appear in uniform, but kept me from pitching for a while. Bill Joyce, our manager, couldn't do anything about it. Well, the club lost those early games and New York fans were in a mood to riot, as they knew about Freedman's fracas with me. Freedman finally relented and I took the hill and broke the losing streak. Freedman and I never spoke to each other after that," Rusie said.

Rusie and Meekin were once more the stars of the Giant pitching staff and the fans hoped for another brilliant season. Then came a mid-season road trip to Chicago.

Rusie, as usual was in control of the game. William (Little Eva) Lange had reached first base. Lange had stolen 84 bases the previous season and was a daring baserunner. Lange continued to sneak away from first base while Rusie worked on the batter. Rusie waited until Lange edged far enough away, and then snapped the ball to first. Lange was out, but Rusie had injured his right arm.

"I felt something snap in my shoulder," Rusie said, "as if a leader had torn loose. For a moment I thought my arm had become paralyzed. I stepped out of the box and the players came and gave my arm a good rubbing. After throwing a few to the catcher my arm felt so much better that I continued in the game. (He won 1–0).

"That night I could not lift my arm to remove my coat and for a few days I had to have assistance dressing. I took off five weeks. When I returned to the firing line, my arm felt okay. The zip in my fast one was still there and my curve cracked and snapped. For the rest of the season everything was fine," Rusie said.

Rusie finished the 1897 season with a 28–10 record, Meekin pitched 20 wins and suffered 11 defeats. New York finished third, 9½ games behind Boston.

Rusie was fifth in winning percentage at .737, second in wins, fourth in strikeouts with 135, second in fewest hits allowed per nine innings, 8.77, and first in earned run average, 2.54.

"The next year," Rusie recalled, "when I tried to pitch, my arm felt dead. I took my turn on the hill, but every effort was followed by nights of torture, during which I walked the floor."

With a dead arm, gutting it out, Rusie pitched 300 innings for the Giants and finished the season 20–11. Meekin slipped to 16–18 and the Giants finished in 10th place.

"Before," Rusie recalled, "I had never been able to get enough work to wear me out. After that game in Chicago I began to feel the strain. Then I regretted I had often gone in and pitched every other day in my earlier days with the Giants, because they could win when I pitched."

Rusie is listed as a holdout in 1899 and 1900, but why seems lost in history. Meekin, meanwhile won 12 and lost 17 for New York and Boston. In 1900 he lost two with no wins and his career was over. Back at New Albany he joined the fire department, retired at 71 and died six years later Dec. 14, 1944, after suffering a fall.

In 1901, Brush, owner of the Cincinnati club, engineered a swap with New York for Rusie in exchange for an unknown minor league player from the Norfolk, Va., team, named Christy Mathewson. Mathewson was to replace Rusie as a Giant legend with his pitching exploits.

Rusie's Cincinnati record was 0–1 in 22 innings. He recalled pitching one game for Cincinnati which ended in a 1-1 tie when it was called due to darkness. He claimed he reported to the club out of shape and was left at home when the club began a road trip and given 10 days to get in shape. Only three days after the club left, Rusie was ordered to report to New York for a Red-Giant series by manager Bud McPhee.

"I have always blamed Frank Bancroft, who was secretary of the club, for putting McPhee up to ordering me on to New York. He knew the New York fans still liked to see me pitch and figured I would draw a better crowd there than any other pitcher would for an opener.

"At any rate, I did not receive the consideration to which I was entitled and I refused to go to New York," Rusie said of his decision to quit the game.

Rusie and his wife went to Muncie where Amos went to work in a pulp mill. When the mill closed, about four years later, Amos, his wife and daughter moved to Vincennes where he took a job in a lumber yard. He then found a job at the old Central Foundry at Vincennes, lugging cast iron sewer pipe around for $1.50 per day. He also dug mussels from the mud of the Wabash River, occasionally discovering a saleable freshwater pearl. He sold the shells to a button factory to augment his income.

He played a few games of baseball for the Vincennes team in the Kitty League. Once Rusie was pitching for the Vincennes team against Princeton when he was knocked out of the box in the fourth inning. The Princeton crowd cheered.

A young reporter went to the Vincennes dugout and found Rusie. "That's life," Rusie told the reporter. "In New York they used to fight to buy me champagne and now nobody even offers me a glass of beer."

Before leaving Vincennes, Rusie said he had received several offers to return to New York to run one saloon or another, but he refused.

About 1911 he moved his family to Seattle, Washington, and learned to be a steamfitter.

In 1921, D. E. Dugdale, a Seattle baseball magnate, discovered Rusie and notified John McGraw in New York. McGraw quickly offered Rusie a job as special officer at the Polo Grounds and the Rusie family moved to New York.

Once more Rusie was the center of attention as writers and photographers hovered about him.

"It's like climbing out of your grave and going to a dance," Rusie remarked of the acclaim. For eight years he stuck to the job but he returned to the Seattle area in 1929 for his wife's health. He umpired a game or two but quit, calling it "an awful job."

Amos and May purchased a five-acre ranch near Auburn, Wash., added 1,000 chickens and settled down. But Rusie was injured in an auto accident July 8, 1934. He was unconscious four days, suffering a concussion and internal injuries. He never fully recovered.

When he returned to the ranch he was unable to resume his duties and could not afford to hire help. As he recuperated interest on the mortgage accumulated and went unpaid. Rusie confided in no one, sought no help and the mortgage was foreclosed.

Deep into the Depression, Rusie and his wife lost their ranch. Royal Brougham, sports editor of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, spotted the foreclosure notice and through newspaper stories, succeeded in rounding up many of Rusie's friends who helped set Rusie up in a small home in Seattle, and assured him of a livelihood as caretaker of the Seattle ball park.

Once during an interview he told a reporter, "No man tried harder than I to make the game a success for the public. I went into every game to win. I regret that some of the changes now in force could not have come sooner. The pitchers were under too hard a strain in my day to last many years. In New York, especially, the practice prevailed of working a winning pitcher as much as he would stand. The crowd demanded it. I was young, I didn't think my arm ever would wear out and I even asked to be allowed to work sometimes when not called upon. Later I paid the price," Rusie said.

"If I could have lasted until the foul strike rule was made I might have been pitching alongside Cy Young, who started about the year I did.

(The foul strike rule was adopted in 1901 and specified that a foul ball not caught on the fly was a strike unless the batter has two strikes. In 1894 a batter was charged with a strike for a foul bunt and in 1895 a batter was charged a strike on a foul tip.)

"When I pitched a batter had to cleanly miss three of 'em," Rusie said.

During a 1939 interview, Rusie reached into an old trunk, in which he stored some of his souvenirs of the game, and revealed a discolored baseball. Handing the ball to

the reporter, Rusie pointed out a series of dark stains on the cover.

"Those are blood stains," he said. "In the eighth inning of a game I pitched in 1893, I split two fingers, split 'em bad. Blood was running all over my pitching hand, but I finished the game. That's the ball I used."

Sometimes Rusie would use his reputation for wildness by putting three pitches just outside, trying to get the batter to bite. If that didn't work, and his control was working, he would send three blinding strikes down the groove. Sometimes Rusie did hit players with his wildness and it was deadly.

"If any other pitcher hit a man, the man swore, limped a moment and went to first base," said catcher Farrell. "If Rusie hit a man the man retired from the game and sometimes went to the hospital."

It happened to Arthur Ball of Baltimore, who put his head before a Rusie pitch in 1898. He was unconscious several hours, hospitalized two weeks and left the team when he got out.

Until he died in December, 1942, Rusie attracted little attention nationally. The Seattle newspapers published pictures of him periodically, showing various groups of youngsters how to grip the ball.

Lou Criger, a catcher for the legendary Cy Young once said of Rusie: "To my mind he was the greatest pitcher that ever stepped in the box and I never expect to see a better one. I am sorry he had to retire when he did, for he was a great drawing card and his work did much to boost the national game toward its present great popularity."

Frank Bancroft, who supervised Rusie's career on two occasions said , "He will go down in history as one of the greatest pitchers that ever stepped into the box."

Duke Farrell, one of Rusie's old catchers said, "Rusie was the fastest of them all. What a star he was and how few there are who will ever approach him. I have seen scores of pitchers come and go and none of them inspired the terror in a batsman's heart that was put there by Rusie."

Cy Young, who won 511 games in his glittering career, when asked to name the leading fast-ball pitchers of all time answered, "Amos Rusie, Bob Feller and me."

Kid Nichols who won 362 games in his 15 years as a pitcher, named Joe McGinnity, Young, Rusie and John Clarkson as the great pitchers of his era. All but Rusie are now in the Hall of Fame.

In a 1947 column Detroit News writer H. G. Salsinger said baseball men such as Connie Mack, Roger Breshnahan, John McGraw and Hugh Jennings always claimed that Rusie was the best fast ball pitcher of all time.

If Rusie died disillusioned, bitter or in despair, no one knew it. He did what he could to boost the game he loved, helping youngsters. Although he was gruff, stubborn and inflexible, he had a heart. He played the game half deaf, with a ringing in his ears, he played with split fingers and a sore arm, ailments which would have finished most athletes.

He loved and cared for a semi-invalid wife until she died in October, 1942. He worked in obscurity, at menial jobs and was uncomplaining. And then, after losing his beloved May, the fight in him was gone, the stubbornness dissolved.

He left behind a record which, by any standard of measurement, deserves better than a blank look and the lame comment: "Rusie. Wasn't he the guy who. . . ." Yes, he sure was.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1570

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1570) to authorize the President of the United States to allocate crude oil and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare; to provide for the delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Interior; and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 628)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1570) to authorize the President of the United States to allocate crude oil and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare; to provide for the delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Interior; 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby determines that—

(1) shortages of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products caused by inadequate domestic production, environmental constraints, and the unavailability of imports sufficient to satisfy domestic demand, now exist or are imminent;

(2) such shortages have created or will create severe economic dislocations and hardships, including loss of jobs, closing of factories and businesses, reduction of crop plantings and harvesting, and curtailment of vital public services, including the transportation of food and other essential goods; and

(3) such hardships and dislocations jeopardize the normal flow of commerce and constitute a national energy crisis which is a threat to the public health, safety, and welfare and can be averted or minimized most efficiently and effectively through prompt action by the Executive branch of Government.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to grant to the President of the United States and direct him to exercise specific temporary authority to deal with shortages of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products or dislocations in their national distribution system. The authority granted under this Act shall be exercised for the purpose of minimizing the adverse impacts of such shortages or dislocations on the American people and the domestic economy.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "branded independent marketer" means a person who is engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products pursuant to—

(A) an agreement or contract with a refiner (or a person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such refiner) to use a trademark, trade name, service mark, or other identifying symbol or name owned by such refiner (or any such person), or

(B) an agreement or contract under which any such person engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products is granted authority to occupy premises owned, leased, or in any way controlled by a refiner (or person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such refiner),

but who is not affiliated with, controlled by, or under common control with any refiner (other than by means of a supply contract, or an agreement or contract described in subparagraph (A) or (B)), and who does not control such refiner.

(2) The term "nonbranded independent marketer" means a person who is engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products, but who (A) is not a refiner, (B) is not a person who controls, is controlled by, is under common control with, or is affiliated with a refiner (other than by means of a supply contract), and (C) is not a branded independent marketer.

(3) The term "independent refiner" means a refiner who (A) obtained, directly or indirectly, in the calendar quarter which ended immediately prior to the date of enactment of this Act, more than 70 per centum of his refinery input of domestic crude oil (or 70 per centum of his refinery imput of domestic and imported crude oil) from producers who do not control, are not controlled by, and are not under common control with, such refiner, and (B) marketed or distributed in such quarter and continues to market or distribute a substantial volume of gasoline refined by him through branded independent marketers or nonbranded independent marketers.

(4) The term "small refiner" means a refiner whose total refinery capacity (including the refinery capacity of any person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such refiner) does not exceed 175,000 barrels per day.

(5) The term "refined petroleum product" means gasoline, kerosene, distillates (including Number 2 fuel oil), LPG, refined lubricating oils, or diesel fuel.

(6) The term "LPG" means propane and butane, but not ethane.

(7) The term "United States" when used in the geographic sense means the States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

MANDATORY ALLOCATION

SEC. 4. (a) Not later than fifteen days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall promulgate a regulation providing for the mandatory allocation of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and each refined petroleum product, in amounts specified in (or determined in a manner prescribed by) and at prices specified in (or determined in a manner prescribed by) such regulation. Subject to subsection (f), such regulation shall take effect not later than fifteen days after its promulgation. Except as provided in subsection (e) such regulation shall apply to all crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products produced in or imported into the United States.

(b)(1) The regulation under subsection (a), to the maximum extent practicable, shall provide for—

(A) protection of public health, safety, and welfare (including maintenance of residential heating, such as individual homes, apartments, and similar occupied dwelling units), and the national defense;

(B) maintenance of all public services (including facilities and services provided by municipally, cooperatively, or investor owned utilities or by any State or local government or authority, and including transportation facilities and services which serve the public at large);

(C) maintenance of agricultural opera-

tions, including farming, ranching, dairy, and fishing activities, and services directly related thereto;

(D) preservation of an economically sound and competitive petroleum industry; including the priority needs to restore and foster competition in the producing, refining, distribution, marketing, and petrochemical sectors of such industry, and to preserve the competitive viability of independent refiners, small refiners, nonbranded independent marketers, and branded independent marketers;

(E) the allocation of suitable types, grades, and quality of crude oil to refineries in the United States to permit such refineries to operate at full capacity;

(F) equitable distribution of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products at equitable prices among all regions and areas of the United States and sectors of the petroleum industry, including independent refiners, small refiners, nonbranded independent marketers, branded independent marketers, and among all users;

(G) allocation of residual fuel oil and refined petroleum products in such amounts and in such manner as may be necessary for the maintenance of exploration for, and production or extraction of, fuels, and for required transportation related thereto;

(H) economic efficiency; and

(I) minimization of economic distortion, inflexibility, and unnecessary interference with market mechanisms.

(2) In specifying prices (or prescribing the manner for determining them), such regulation shall provide for—

(A) a dollar-for-dollar passthrough of net increases in the cost of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products to all marketers or distributors at the retail level; and

(B) the use of the same date in the computation of markup, margin, and posted price for all marketers or distributors of crude oil, residual fuel oil and refined petroleum products at all levels of marketing and distribution.

(3) The President in promulgating the regulation under subsection (a) shall give consideration to allocating crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products in a manner which results in making available crude oil, residual fuel oil, or refined petroleum products to any person whose use of fuels other than crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products has been curtailed by, or pursuant to a plan filed in compliance with, a rule or order of a Federal or State agency, or where such person's supply of such other fuels is unobtainable by reason of an abandonment of service permitted or ordered by a Federal or State agency.

(c)(1) To the extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of subsections (b) and (d), the mandatory allocation program established under the regulation under subsection (a) shall be so structured as to result in the allocation, during each period during which the regulation applies, of each refined petroleum product to each branded independent marketer, each nonbranded independent marketer, each small refiner and each independent refiner, and of crude oil to each small refiner and each independent refiner, in an amount not less than the amount sold or otherwise supplied to such marketer or refiner during the corresponding period of 1972, adjusted to provide—

(A) in the case of refined petroleum products, a pro rata reduction in the amount allocated to each person engaged in the marketing or distribution of a refined petroleum product if the aggregate amount of such product produced in and imported into the United States is less than the aggregate amount produced and imported in calendar year 1972; and

(B) in the case of crude oil, a pro rata reduction in the amount of crude oil allocated to each refiner if the aggregate amount produced in and imported into the United States is less than the aggregate amount produced and imported in calendar year 1972.

(2)(A) The President shall report to the Congress monthly, beginning not later than January 1, 1974, with respect to any change after calendar year 1972 in—

(i) the aggregate share of nonbranded independent marketers,

(ii) the aggregate share of branded independent marketers, and

(iii) the aggregate share of other persons engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products,

of the national market or the regional market in any refined petroleum product (as such regional markets shall be determined by the President).

(B) If allocation of any increase of the amount of any refined petroleum product produced in or imported into the United States in excess of the amount produced or imported in calendar year 1972 contributes to a significant increase in any market share described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (A), the President shall by order require an equitable adjustment in allocations of such product under the regulation under subsection (a).

(3) The President shall, by order, require such adjustments in the allocations of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products established under the regulation under subsection (a) as may reasonably be necessary (A) to accomplish the objectives of subsection (b), or (B) to prevent any person from taking any action which would be inconsistent with such objectives.

(4) The President may, by order, require such adjustments in the allocations of refined petroleum products and crude oil established under the regulation under subsection (a) as he determines may reasonably be necessary—

(A) in the case of refined petroleum products (i) to take into consideration market entry by branded independent marketers and nonbranded independent marketers during or subsequent to calendar year 1972, or (ii) to take into consideration expansion or reduction of marketing or distribution facilities of such marketers during or subsequent to calendar year 1972, and

(B) in the case of crude oil (i) to take into consideration market entry by independent refiners and small refiners during or subsequent to calendar year 1972, or (ii) to take into consideration expansion or reduction of refining facilities of such refiners during or subsequent to calendar year 1972.

Any adjustments made under this paragraph may be made only upon a finding that, to the maximum extent practicable, the objectives of subsections (b) and (d) of this section are attained.

(5) To the extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of subsections (b) and (d), the mandatory allocation program established under the regulation under subsection (a) shall not provide for allocation of LPG in a manner which denies LPG to any industrial user if no substitute for LPG is available for use by such industrial user.

(d) The regulation under subsection (a) shall require that crude oil, residual fuel oil, and all refined petroleum products which are produced or refined within the United States shall be totally allocated for use by ultimate users within the United States, to the extent practicable and necessary to accomplish the objectives of subsection (b).

(e)(1) The provisions of the regulation under subsection (a) shall specify (or prescribe a manner for determining) prices of crude oil at the producer level, but, upon a finding by the President that to require allocation at the producer level (on a national, regional, or case-by-case basis) is unnecessary to attain the objectives of subsection (b)(1)(E) or the other objectives of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, such regulation need not require allocation of crude oil at such level. Any finding made pursuant to this subsection shall be transmitted to the Congress in the form of a report setting forth the basis for the President's finding that allocation at such level is not necessary to attain the objectives referred to in the preceding sentence.

(2)(A) The regulation promulgated under subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to the first sale of crude oil produced in the United States from any lease whose average daily production of crude oil for the preceding calendar year does not exceed ten barrels per well.

(B) To qualify for the exemption under this paragraph, a lease must be operating at the maximum feasible rate of production and in accord with recognized conservation practices.

(C) Any agency designated by the President under section 5(b) for such purpose is authorized to conduct inspections to insure compliance with this paragraph and shall promulgate and cause to be published regulations implementing the provisions of this paragraph.

(f)(1) The provisions of the regulation under subsection (a) respecting allocation of gasoline need not take effect until thirty days after the promulgation of such regulation, except that the provisions of such regulation respecting price of gasoline shall take effect not later than fifteen days after its promulgation.

(2) If—

(A) an order or regulation under section 203(a)(3) of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 applies to crude oil, residual fuel oil, or a refined petroleum product and has taken effect on or before the fifteenth day after the date of enactment of this Act, and

(B) the President determines that delay in the effective date of provisions of the regulation under subsection (a) relating to such oil or product is in the public interest and is necessary to effectuate the transition from the program under such section 203(a)(3) to the mandatory allocation program required under this Act,

he may in the regulation promulgated under subsection (a) of this section delay, until not later than thirty days after the date of the promulgation of the regulation, the effective date of the provisions of such regulation insofar as they relate to such oil or product. At the same time the President promulgates such regulation, he shall report to Congress setting forth his reasons for the action under this paragraph.

(g)(1) The regulation promulgated and made effective under subsection (a) shall remain in effect until midnight February 28, 1975, except that (A) the President or his delegate may amend such regulation so long as such regulation, as amended, meets the requirements of this section, and (B) the President may exempt crude oil, residual fuel oil, or any refined petroleum product from such regulation in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection. The authority to promulgate and amend the regulation and to issue any order under this section, and to enforce under section 5 such regulations and any such order, expires at midnight February 28, 1975, but such expiration shall not affect any action or pending proceedings, civil or criminal, not finally determined on such date, nor any action or

proceeding based upon any act committed prior to midnight February 28, 1975.

(2) If at any time after the date of enactment of this Act the President finds that application of the regulation under subsection (a) to crude oil, residual fuel oil, or a refined petroleum product is not necessary to carry out this Act, that there is no shortage of such oil or product, and that exempting such oil or product from such regulation will not have an adverse impact on the supply of any other oil or refined petroleum products subject to this Act, he may prescribe an amendment to the regulation under subsection (a) exempting such oil or product from such regulation for a period of not more than ninety days. The President shall submit any such amendment and any such findings to the Congress. An amendment under this paragraph may not exempt more than one oil or one product. Such an amendment shall take effect on a date specified in the amendment, but in no case sooner than the close of the earliest period which begins after the submission of such amendment to the Congress and which includes at least five days during which the House was in session and at least five days during which the Senate was in session; except that such amendment shall not take effect if before the expiration of such period either House of Congress approves a resolution of that House stating in substance that such House disapproves such amendment.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), (A) sections 205 through 211 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act) shall apply to the regulation promulgated under section 4(a), to any order under this Act, and to any action taken by the President (or his delegate) under this Act, as if such regulation had been promulgated, such order had been issued, or such action had been taken under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; and (B) section 212 (other than 212(b)) and 213 of such Act shall apply to functions under this Act to the same extent such sections apply to functions under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

(2) The expiration of authority to issue and enforce orders and regulations under section 218 of such Act shall not affect any authority to amend and enforce the regulation or to issue and enforce any order under this Act, and shall not effect any authority under sections 212 and 213 insofar as such authority is made applicable to functions under this Act.

(b) The President may delegate all or any portion of the authority granted to him under this Act to such officers, departments, or agencies of the United States, or to any State (or officer thereof), as he deems appropriate.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS AND ACTIONS TAKEN THEREUNDER

SEC. 6. (a) All actions duly taken pursuant to clause (3) of the first sentence of section 203(a) of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 in effect immediately prior to the effective date of the regulation promulgated under section 4(a) of this Act, shall continue in effect until modified pursuant to this Act.

(b) The regulation under section 4 and any order issued thereunder shall preempt any provision of any program for the allocation of crude oil, residual fuel oil, or any refined petroleum product established by any State or local government if such provision is in conflict with such regulation or any such order.

(c)(1) Except as specifically provided in this subsection, no provisions of this Act shall be deemed to convey to any person subject to this Act immunity from civil or criminal liability, or to create defenses to actions, under the antitrust laws.

(2) As used in this subsection, the term "antitrust laws" includes—

(A) the Act entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890 (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.);

(B) the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.);

(C) the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.);

(D) sections 73 and 74 of the Act entitled "An Act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes", approved August 27, 1894 (15 U.S.C. 8 and 9); and

(E) the act of June 19, 1936, chapter 592 (15 U.S.C. 13, 13a, 13b, and 21a).

(3) The regulation promulgated under section 4(a) of this Act shall be forwarded on or before the date of its promulgation to the Attorney General and to the Federal Trade Commission, who shall, at least seven days prior to the effective date of such regulation, report to the President with respect to whether such regulation would tend to create or maintain anticompetitive practices or situations inconsistent with the antitrust laws, and propose any alternative which would avoid or overcome such effects while achieving the purpose of this Act.

(4) Whenever it is necessary, in order to comply with the provisions of this Act or the regulation or any orders under section 4 thereof, for owners, directors, offices, agents, employees, or representatives of two or more persons engaged in the business of producing, refining, marketing, or distributing crude oil, residual oil, or any refined petroleum product to meet, confer, or communicate in such a fashion and to such ends that might otherwise be construed to constitute a violation of the antitrust laws, such persons may do so only upon an order of the President (or of an officer or agency of the United States to whom the President has delegated authority under section 5(b) of this Act); which order shall specify and limit the subject matter and objectives of such meeting, conference, or communication. Moreover, such meeting, conference, or communication shall take place only in the presence of a representative of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and a verbatim transcript of such meeting, conference, or communication shall be taken and deposited, together with any agreement resulting therefrom, with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission, where it shall be made available for public inspection.

(5) There shall be available as a defense to any action brought under the antitrust laws, or for breach of contract in any Federal or State court arising out of delay or failure to provide, sell, or offer for sale or exchange crude oil, residual fuel oil, or any refined petroleum product, that such delay or failure was caused solely by compliance with the provisions of this Act or with the regulation or any order under section 4 of this Act.

(6) There shall be available as a defense to any action brought under the antitrust laws arising from any meeting, conference, or communication or agreement resulting therefrom, held or made solely for the purpose of complying with the provisions of this Act or the regulation or any order under section 4 thereof, that such meeting, conference, communication, or agreement was carried out or made in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (4) of this subsection.

MONITORING BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) During the forty-five day period beginning on the effective date on which the regulation under section 4 first takes effect; the Federal Trade Commission shall monitor the program established under such regulation; and, not later than sixty days after such effective date, shall report to the President and to the Congress respecting the effectiveness of this Act and actions taken pursuant thereto.

(b) For purposes of carrying out this section, the Federal Trade Commission's authority, under sections 6, 9, and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to gather and compile information and to require furnishing of information, shall extend to any individual or partnership, and to any common carrier subject to the Acts to regulate commerce (as such Acts are defined in section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act).

And the House agree to the same.

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

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the House to the title of the Senate bill, insert the following: "An Act to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare; to provide for the delegation of authority; and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
JAMES M. COLLINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
LEE METCALF,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
PAUL FANNIN,
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
M. W. COOK,
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 House to the bill (S. 1570) to authorize the President of the United States to allocate crude oil and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety, or welfare; to provide for the delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Interior; 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 amendments struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the Senate bill.

The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment to the text of the bill. Except for clarifying, clerical, and conforming changes, the differences are noted below:

The conference substitute generally fol-

lows the provisions of the House amendment. A detailed description and explanation of the provisions of the House amendment from which the provisions of the conference substitute are derived may be found in the report of the House committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce accompanying H.R. 9681 (House Report No. 93–531), which was substituted for the text of S. 1570 on the floor of the House.

Several general comments should be made concerning the overall pattern of this legislation agreed to by the conference committee. Initially, it should be said that the conferees are in unanimous agreement that due to various factors the self-regulatory laws of supply and demand are not currently operating in the petroleum market. It is imperative that the Federal Government now accept its responsibility to intervene in this marketplace to preserve competition and to assure an equitable distribution of critically short supplies. Toward this end, the conference substitute requires the President to promptly implement a mandatory allocation program which must be crafted so as to accomplish Congressionally defined objectives. These are set out principally in section 4(b) of the conference substitute. Very generally stated they establish guidelines for the priority uses of fuels covered by this Act and set forth standards of action concerning the competitive structure of the industry and general economic policy to be followed in the establishment of the fuel allocation program.

The listing of objectives in successive paragraphs (A) through (I) in section 4(b)(1) is not intended to establish any order of priority. There are collective goals, and the conferees have not attempted to discern an order of precedence or value one against another. It is fully recognized that, in some instances, it may be impossible to satisfy one objective without sacrificing the accomplishment of another. For example, the President could not totally allocate propane to agricultural and rural heating needs and at the same time give consideration to the identified objective of preserving and fostering competition in the petro-chemical industry. For this reason the direction to the President is qualified to permit the regulation to be constructed so as to accomplish the enumerated objective "to the maximum extent practicable". This qualification is intended to give the President administrative flexibility in marshalling short supplies and equitably assigning them to particular needs.

In meeting the objectives of section 4(b), the President may find it most convenient to rely on historical use and supply patterns. The conferees wish to emphasize, however, that the President *need not* base allocations on a historical period. The President is intended to have full flexibility in devising the most effective and efficient means of meeting the priority needs of the American people identified in section 4(b). There are, of course, many situations where priority users simply do not have a historical use pattern. For example, in this emergency period a high priority has been assigned to the maintenance of public services including those provided by government and utilities—whether privately, publically, municipally, or cooperatively owned. It is expected that the President will pay special attention to the need of continuing these services without disruption or interruption. Allocations to utilities, in particular, should be made to the extent necessary to preserve the reliability of our utility services in various parts of the country. It is understood that, in certain instances, these utilities have relied on their ability to obtain inexpensive natural gas. They have no historical pattern of using residual fuel oil or other covered fuels, but where natural gas is unavailable they must locate and make use of substitute fuels. The President's program must take into consideration this need and, where appropriate, provide for the necessary allocations. It is not the expectation of the conferees, however, that allocations of covered fuels would be made to utilities and others solely for the purpose of minimizing their costs of operation. The President would be expected to take into account on a case by case basis the availability to utilities of alternative fuels, such as coal.

In the face of the present shortage, large integrated oil companies understandably protect their own interests first. As shortages deepen—and all figures and analyses available seem to indicate that they will—it is unreasonable to expect businessmen to share their limited supplies with their competitors. Indeed, some have argued that it may be inconsistent with their obligations to shareholders to do so. Accordingly, this legislation requires the mandatory allocation program to be so structured as to prevent major oil companies from inequitably restructuring crude production for their own use or from favoring their directly owned outlets over independent marketers in the sale or distribution of refined petroleum products.

Allocations of crude are to be made to small and independent refiners and allocations of refined petroleum products are to be made to independent marketers (including small and independent refiners) in amounts *equal* to those which such refiners and marketers were able to obtain in calendar year 1972, if allocations in such amounts are practicable and consistent with the objectives of the Act. The independent marketer and small and independent refiner is not *guaranteed* supply at 1972 levels if to do so would be inconsistent with the Congressionally defined goals in sections 4 (b) and (d). Moreover, the President is given express authority to order departures from allocations based on 1972 historical patterns in cases where those departures are necessary to meet priority needs. For example, it would be expected that an independent marketer or small or independent refiner would be denied an allocation based upon calendar year 1972 in circumstances where the allocated fuel is not being put to a use which is consistent with the needs identified in section 4(b) or the requirements of section 4(d).

It should be noted that allocations are to be based on a corresponding period in calendar year 1972. The President is intended to have discretion to select within the calendar year the appropriate period or periods. Thus the corresponding period of 1972 could be the entire calendar year or the President could divide the year into quarters, months, or weeks. Moreover, it should be emphasized that the President is intended to have flexibility to depart from the calendar year 1972 altogether if it would be inconsistent with the Congressionally stated objectives to continue to rely on that base period. In such event the President would be expected to select some other appropriate historical period or some other mechanism or procedure for allocation which would be more suited to the accomplishment of the objectives of this Act.

The mandatory allocation program will operate to compel the allocation of product throughout the various levels of the petroleum market. It may be necessary, in selective cases, to compel the allocation of product to particular end-users, such as hospitals, units of government, or persons engaged in energy production and transportation; but it is not generally expected that the regulation promulgated by the President will be burdened with the complexities of assigning fuels to users unless such assignment is necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act. When required, however, it is intended that the President would have full authority under this Act to identify permissible uses of covered fuels and to restrict the amounts which may be made available to such uses.

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

The House amendment and the Senate bill were grounded on similar findings and purposes with one exception: the Senate bill contained findings not found in the House amendment related to shortages of natural gas liquids. Also contained in the Senate bill, but not in the House amendment, was the admonition that no allocation plan, regulation or order, nor mandatory price, price ceiling or restraint, was to be promulgated whose net effect would be a substantial reduction of the total supply of crude oil or refined petroleum products available in or to markets in the United States.

Conference Substitute: The Senate recedes. By way of initial emphasis it should be noted that the bill which the Conference Committee reports today is not designed to and should not be interpreted as increasing supplies of critically short petroleum products. The shortage problem is the result of policies which have been in effect over a number of years, and it awaits a more far reaching and long ranged solution. Instead, this bill focuses on the short term objectives of seeing to it that during times of shortage our priority needs are met and that whatever limited supplies we have are equitably distributed throughout the nation to meet regional needs and preserve competition in the marketplace. Although specific language to this end was not included in the bill, it is the clear and firm understanding on the part of the Managers of both Houses that the mandatory allocation program called for in this legislation shall not be designed or implemented in a manner which would have the net effect of occasioning a substantial reduction in the total supply of crude oil, residual fuel oil or refined petroleum products. It is expected that the President in applying the mandatory controls called for in this legislation will assiduously avoid that result.

DEFINITIONS

House: Section 3 of the House amendment defined the term "branded independent marketer" to mean a person who engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products pursuant to (A) an agreement or contract with a refiner (or a person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such refiner) to use a trademark, trade name, service mark, or other identifying symbol or name owned by such refiner (or any such person), or (B) an agreement or contract under which any such person engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products is granted authority to occupy premises owned, leased, or in any way controlled by a refiner (or person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such refiner), but who is not affiliated with, controlled by, or under common control with any refiner (other than by means of a supply contract, or an agreement or contract described in clause (A) or (B)) above, and who does not control such refiner.

The term "nonbranded independent marketer" was defined in the House amendment to mean a person who is engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products, but who is not a refiner or a person (A) who controls, is controlled by, is under common control with, or is affiliated with a refiner (other than by means of a

supply contract), or (B) who is not a branded independent marketer.

The term "independent refiner" was defined to mean a refiner who (A) obtained, directly or indirectly, in the calendar quarter which ended immediately prior to the date of enactment of the bill, more than 70 per centum of his crude oil refinery input from producers who do not control, and are not controlled by or under common control with, such refiner, and (B) marketed or distributed in such quarter and continues to market or distribute (i) a substantial volume of gasoline refined by him through nonbranded independent marketers, and (ii) a substantial volume of other refined petroleum products refined by him directly to the ultimate user.

The term "refined petroleum product" was defined to mean gasoline, kerosene, distillates (including Number 2 fuel oil), LPG, refined lubricating oils, or diesel fuel, and the term "LPG" was defined to mean propane and butane, but not ethane.

Senate: Sections 105(b) and 108(b) of the Senate bill contained defined terms. The terms defined in section 105(b) were meant for purposes of such sections, and the terms defined in section 108(b) of the Senate bill were for purposes of sections 108, 109, and 110 of the Senate bill.

The definitions in section 105(b) of the Senate bill dealt with sales to independent refiners and dealers. The term "base period" was defined as the period from October 1, 1971, to September 30, 1972, inclusive; the term "nonaffiliated" referred to a buyer (seller) who has no substantial financial interest in, is not subject to a substantial common financial interest in, and is not subject to a substantial common financial interest with, the seller (buyer) in question; the term "independent refiner" meant a refiner who produced in the United States less than one hundred thousand barrels per day of petroleum products during the base period; the term "independent dealer" meant a terminal operator, jobber, dealer, or distributor, at wholesale or retail, who obtains refined petroleum products either on term contract or in spot markets, and who purchased during the base period at least half of such products from nonaffiliated sellers.

Section 108 of the Senate bill contained definitions for purposes of sections 108 through 110 of the Senate bill. The term "base period" meant the period from October 1, 1971, to September 30, 1972. The term "market area" meant any State or any area so defined by the Secretary of the Interior.

The term "petroleum distributor" meant any person engaged in commerce in the sale, consignment, or distribution of petroleum products to wholesale or retail outlets whether or not it owns, leases, or in any way controls such outlets.

The term "petroleum refiner" meant any person engaged in the importation or refining of petroleum products.

The term "petroleum product" meant any liquid refined from petroleum and usable as a fuel.

The term "petroleum retailer" meant any person engaged in commerce in the sale of any petroleum product for purposes other than resale in any State, either under a franchise or independent of any franchise or who was so engaged at any time after the start of the base period.

The term "State" meant any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any organized territory or possession of the United States. This provision also defined "commerce", "franchise", "notice of intent" and "person".

Conference substitute: The conference substitute contains the provisions of the House amendment with the following changes:

(1) The definition of "independent refiner" is modified in three respects: First, the requirement that the refiner obtain 70 percent of his crude oil refinery input from producers not controlling, controlled by or under common control with the refiner is changed to a requirement that a refiner obtain either 70 percent of his refinery input of domestic crude oil, or 70 percent of his refinery input of domestic and imported crude oil, from producers who do not control, or are not controlled by and are not under common control with such refiner. Second, the requirement that he market or distribute a substantial volume of his gasoline through nonbranded independent marketers is changed to a requirement that a substantial volume be marketed through branded independent marketers or nonbranded independent marketers. Third, the requirement that a substantial volume of other refined petroleum products be marketed directly to the ultimate user is dropped.

(2) A definition of "small refiner" is added in the conference substitute. A small refiner is a refiner whose total refinery capacity (including the refinery capacity of any person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such refiner) does not exceed 175,000 barrels per day.

(3) The conference substittue contains a definition of the United States. The term, when used in the geographic sense, means the States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

In incorporating the term "independent refiner" from the House bill and in making some modifications thereto, the conference committee has sought to identify for certain purposes under this bill a refiner who is dependent upon others for the major portion of his crude demand and who has historically provided independent marketers (both nonbranded and branded) with gasoline supplies. The conferees are aware that refiners frequently exchange crude supply with one another for purposes of convenience and to minimize distribution costs. In instances where a refiner trades or exchanges crude supply which he had produced or which had been produced by an affiliated person of such refiner, the supply so obtained would be looked upon as if it were supply of the refiner's own production in determining his entitlement to "independent refiner" status. The Committee is aware that some independent refiners have historically been able to obtain foreign crude from persons who control are controlled by or are under common control with them. It would not be consistent with the objectives of this legislation to require allocations of crude to such refiners based upon their 1972 crude runs in amounts necessary to make up for a short fall in supply occurring because the refiner's parent or affiliate has cut off or reduced—without good reason—the refiner's supply of foreign crude. The President would be expected to take this into consideration in implementing the requirements of section 4(c).

Special mention should be made of the term "refined petroleum product" which is taken from the House amendment. This term is defined to mean kerosene, gasoline, distillates (including Number 2 fuel oil), LPG (as further defined to mean propane and butane), refined lubricating oils, or diesel fuel. The conference committee considers the term "kerosene" to also encompass jet fuel and the term "diesel fuel" to also refer to light commercial heating oil. It is understood that the term "distillates" when applied in a technical sense would encompass only Numbers 1, 2, and 4 fuel oils. It is the committee's intent, however, that this term also reach to include naphtha and benzene so as to require the allocation of these products as may be necessary to accomplish the objective of restoring and fostering competition in the petrochemical sector of industry. In this respect the conference committee wishes to emphasize that, in expressing congressional concern with fostering competition in the petrochemical industry, the committee intends to also identify petrochemical feedstock needs as important enduses for which allocation should be made.

In singling out small refiners for certain purposes under this bill, the conference committee intends to offer a mantle of protection to those refiners who by reason of their relatively small size may be disadvantaged in competing with larger refiners in bidding for and obtaining adequate crude supplies.

The inclusion of the definition of the term "United States" is designed to make clear that the allocation program called for under this legislation is to reach beyond the States and the District of Columbia to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the territories and possessions of the United States. The conference committee is aware that important refinery facilities are located in Guam and the Virgin Islands. It is expressly intended that allocations of covered fuels be made both to and from these refineries as may be required to carry out the purposes of this legislation.

MANDATORY ALLOCATION

A. The regulatory scheme

House: Section 4 of the House amendment set forth a mandatory allocation program which provided that not later than ten days after date of enactment, the President was to promulgate a regulation providing for the mandatory allocation of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and each refined petroleum product, in amounts and at prices specified in (or determined in a manner prescribed by) such regulation and that such regulation was to take effect not later than fifteen days after its promulgation. The regulation was required, to the extent practicable, to be consistent with certain objectives described below. Section 4(b)(3) of the House amendment included the direction to the President to give consideration to allocating residual fuel oil and refined petroleum products to any person whose use of fuels other than crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products has been curtailed by, or pursuant to a plan filed in compliance with, a rule or order of a Federal or State agency.

Section 4(c)(3) of the House amendment provided that, to the extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of certain other provisions in section 4 of the House amendment, the mandatory allocation program established under the regulation under subsection (a) was not to provide for allocation of LPG in a manner which denied LPG to industrial users if no substitute for LPG was available for use by such industrial users.

Section 4(d) of the House amendment provided that the regulation under section 4 would have to require that crude oil, residual fuel oil, and all refined petroleum products (other than refined lubricating oils) which are produced or refined within the United States should be totally allocated for use by ultimate users within the United States, to the extent practicable and necessary to accomplish certain objectives discussed later.

Section 4(e) of the House amendment also stated no regulation under this section was to provide for allocation of, or specify

(or prescribe a manner for determining) the price of, crude oil produced in a calendar month by any well, the average daily production of which did not exceed 10 barrels per day during the month preceding such calendar month.

Senate: Sections 104, 105, 108, 109, and 110 of the Senate bill contained the Senate bill's basic provisions with respect to the allocation of crude oil and refined petroleum products.

Sections 105 and 108 through 110 are discussed later in this statement.

Section 104 stated that within thirty days of the date of enactment of the bill, the President was, after due notice and public hearings, to cause to be prepared and published, priority schedules, plans, and regulations for the allocation or distribution of crude oil and any refined petroleum product which was or may be in short supply nationally or in any region of the United States in accordance with the objectives of the bill. The bill also stated that if the President found that on either a nationwide or regional basis a shortage had been reached, or may imminently reach, emergency proportions, he could order temporary allocations as necessary to accomplish the objectives of the section, pending promulgation of priority schedules, plans, and regulations as otherwise required by the bill.

The Senate bill further provided that in order to accomplish the objectives of section 102 of the bill, and subject to the provisions thereof, the President was directed to allocate or distribute or cause to be allocated and distributed, pursuant to the schedules, plans, and regulations required under the aforementioned provisions of the bill, any liquid fuel, whether crude or processed, and whether imported or domestically produced, then or prospectively in extraordinarily short supply nationally or in any region of the United States.

The Senate bill stated that the regulations required by the aforementioned provision was to include standards and procedures for determining or reviewing prices of fuels allocated by the President under the provisions of the bill to prevent (1) appropriation of private property without due compensation or (2) exorbitant price increases reflecting temporary shortage conditions.

Also, under the Senate bill, the President was directed to use his authority under the bill and under existing law to assure that petroleum and petroleum products were allocated in such a manner as to assure adequate production, processing, and distribution of food and fiber.

Conference substitute:

(1) General.—The conference substitute basically follows the House amendment to the Senate bill. It provides for the mandatory allocation of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and each refined petroleum product produced in or imported into the United States.

(2) Effective dates.—The regulation requiring such allocation in amounts and at prices specified in (or determined in a manner prescribed by) such regulation is to be promulgated not later than fifteen days after the date of enactment of the bill and to take effect not later than fifteen days after its promulgation. The conference substitute allows the President in accordance with section 4(f) to delay the effective date of the regulation promulgated under section 4(a). This subsection permits delay only of the provisions of the regulation with respect to the allocation of gasoline and with respect to any allocation of products which are allocated under section 203(a)(3) of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 prior to promulgation of the regulation under the bill. No delay is permitted under this subsection in the provisions relating to price. Under subsection (f) the provisions of the regulation under section 4(a) respecting allocation of gasoline need not take effect until thirty days after the promulgation of such regulation. In addition, if an order or regulation under section 203(a)(3) of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 applies to crude oil, residual fuel oil, or a refined petroleum product and has taken effect on or before fifteen days after the date of enactment of the bill and if the President determines that delay in the effective date of provisions of the regulation promulgated under section 4(a) of the conference substitute relating to such oil or product is in the public interest and is necessary to effectuate the transition from the program under such section 203(a)(3) to the mandatory allocation program required under this program, he may in the regulation promulgated under subsection (a) of this section delay until not later than thirty days after the date of the promulgation of the regulation, the effective date of the provisions of such regulation insofar as they relate to such oil or product. At the same time the President promulgates such regulation he shall report to Congress setting forth his reasons for the action under this paragraph.

(3) Exemption Authority.—Section 4(g)(2) of the conference substitute permits the President, if he finds (A) that application of the regulation under section 4(a) to crude oil, residual fuel oil, or a refined petroleum product is not necessary to carry out the Act, (B) there is no shortage of such oil or product, and (C) exempting such oil or product from such regulation will not have an adverse impact on the supply of any other oil or refined petroleum products subject to the Act, to amend the regulation to exempt such oil or product from such regulation for a period of not more than ninety days. The President must submit the amendment and findings to the Congress. An amendment may not exempt more than one oil or product (but separate amendments may be submitted for different oils or products; and at the expiration of the 90 days that an amendment applies to an oil or product, a new amendment applicable to such oil or product could take effect). An amendment would take effect on a date specified in the amendment, but not before the end of a period which includes at least five days during which the House was in session and at least five days during which the Senate was in session. Either House of Congress before the expiration of the period could by simple resolution disapprove such amendment.

(4) Industrial Use of LPG.—The conference substitute accepts the provisions of the House amendment which directs the President to take steps to assure that, to the extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of this Act, he does not allocate IPG in a manner which denies an industrial user access to a fuel for which there is no available alternative. Propane is a liquified petroleum gas in critically short supply. People in rural areas need it to heat their homes; farmers use it to dry their crops; the petrochemical industry uses it as a feedstock; and the glass industry uses it as the only acceptable or feasible substitute for natural gas. In the allocation of propane, the President is going to have to find an equitable balance among these priority uses. Paragraph (5) requires the President in this situation, to the extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of the Act, to make sure that in allocating propane to farmers and others he does not force petrochemical and glass plants across the country to close their doors. In administering this program, the President must be ever watchful to discover the unintended and undesired consequences of his acts. Clearly it is not in the public interest to compel the allocation of covered fuels (including propane and other refined petroleum products) in such a way as to result in large scale closings of industry, significant unemployment or serious economic stress in specific areas or regions of this nation. The President must be ever vigilant to avoid that result.

Several points should be made concerning the amendments made by the conference substitute to the House provisions relating to the timing requirements for the issuance and implementation of the mandatory allocation program. First, it was decided to give the President 15 days instead of 10 days to promulgate the regulation providing for the mandatory allocation of covered fuels. This was done simply with the understanding that—although the Administration has for several months been engaged in the task of devising a workable allocation mechanism—a 15-day period is probably minimally required to fashion a program with the necessary requirements and modifications of existing procedures to accomplish the objectives stated in this legislation.

Second, the Conference substitute continues the House requirement that the regulation once promulgated take effect 15 days thereafter. However, additional flexibility has been given to the President to delay this effective date in the case of the applicability of the allocation requirements to gasoline and to products already subject to mandatory controls under orders issued pursuant to the President's Economic Stabilization Act authority. The President is permitted to delay the gasoline allocation on the premise that his full administrative energies may be required to focus on other refined petroleum products in the first days of implementing the program. It is the Committee's understanding that an allocation program, if it is to work at all, must be comprehensive in scope and therefore must include the major refined components of a barrel of crude oil. Gasoline simply must be brought within the program as soon as practicable if we are to avoid the disastrous dislocations of resources and effort which have occurred in the past year as a result of selectively applying controls to the petroleum industry. For this reason the President is not permitted to defer the effective date of the gasoline allocation controls beyond 30 days after promulgation of the initial regulation.

The authority to defer the effective date for allocations of products already subject to mandatory controls under orders issued by the President pursuant to his Economic Stabilization Act authority is founded on the desire to take every step to permit an orderly transition from those programs to the allocation requirements of this legislation. For example, allocation programs have been established for propane and so-called "middle distillates." Modifications in these programs will be required to conform them to accomplish the Congressionally defined objectives stated in this legislation. It would not be a reasoned result for these programs to be summarily terminated while necessary revisions are made. Accordingly, this legislation provides for their continuance up until the effective date of the regulation called for in this legislation and permits the President to defer that effective date when necessary to provide for an orderly transition.

(5) Users denied access to other fuels.—The conference substitute contains the provisions from the House amendment which direct the President to give consideration to allocating residual fuel oil and refined petroleum products to any person whose use of fuels other than crude oil, residual fuel

oil, and refined petroleum products has been curtailed by, or pursuant to a plan filed in compliance with, a rule or order of a Federal or State agency, and the conference substitute states that this consideration also be given where such person's supply of such fuels is unobtainable by reason of an abandonment of service permitted or ordered by a Federal or State agency.

The inclusion of the House provisions on this matter represents a determination by the members of the conference that there must be reasoned coordination of Federal and state policies which control or influence the energy requirements of our citizens and industry. It is the expectation that in fashioning the allocation program and ordering subsequent adjustments to it, the President shall be watchful of the need to allocate supply to those users, such as electric utilities, who contribute to the accomplishment of the objectives of this legislation in those circumstances where such users have been denied access to alternative fuels by actions taken by other Federal or state governmental authority.

(6) Exports.—The conference substitute contains in section 4(d) the House provision relating to the total allocation of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and all refined petroleum products which are produced or refined with the United States. However, the exception relating to refined lubricating oil has been removed.

An allocation of covered fuels totally within the boundaries of the United States would act to prevent the export of such substances. In this regard the conference committee wishes to emphasize the conditions upon which such exclusion would be based. Total allocations within the United States would be required *only* where practicable *and* where necessary to accomplish the objectives of section 4(b). It is not intended to interrupt or prevent exports of fuels which are consistent with those objectives. In this regard the conference committee is especially mindful of the potential hardship which would result from an interference with or disruption of the important fuel interchanges with Canada and Mexico.

Particular complexity and concern is raised with respect to maintenance of international transportation. Other nations faced with similar fuel shortages are also adopting fuel allocation and conservation measures. Without reciprocity and comity among nations, these measures, if discriminatory or retaliatory, could jeopardize international air, ocean, and surface transport regardless of what steps are taken by the United States to allocate equitably among its own carriers. It is thus essential in making fuel allocations to coordinate, to the extent necessary, with foreign governments and, consistent with principles of reciprocity and comity and as may be consistent with the objectives of this Act, meet the fuel needs of foreign carriers at United States' points served by them.

(7) Allocation at producer level.—The conference substitute contains in section 4(e)(1) provisions which state that the provisions of the regulation under subsection (a) shall specify (or prescribe the manner for determining) price of crude oil at the producer level; but, if the President finds that to require allocation at the producer level (on a national, regional, or case-by-case basis) is unnecessary to attain the objectives of subsection (b)(1)(E) or the other objectives of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 4, such regulation need not require allocation of crude oil at such level. The conference substitute requires that any finding made pursuant to this subsection be transmitted to the Congress in the form of a report setting forth the basis of his finding that allocation at the producer level is not necessary to attain such objectives.

Several have argued that the compelled allocation of crude oil at the producer level would be administratively unworkable. Indeed, the Administration identified this problem as largely responsible for its opposition to the House bill. Others contend that producer-level allocations are absolutely essential if the objectives of the Act are to be accomplished. Unable to fully resolve the issue, the conference substitute seeks an accommodation of these opposing views. Under its terms, the President would be relieved of the necessity of applying allocation requirements to the producer level if he can make the finding that allocation at that level on a national, regional, or case-by-case basis is unnecessary to attain the objectives of the Act. Specifically noted is the objective contained in section 4(b)(1)(E) which calls for the allocation of crude in a manner which makes maximum utilization of our nation's total refinery capacity.

The conference committee wishes to emphasize that the President is to retain full authority to require allocation at the producer level on a national, regional, or case-by-case basis whenever he determines it is necessary to attain the objectives of the Act. It is expressly intended to give to the President flexibility to act selectively. Accordingly, he may apply controls to large but not small producers—thus avoiding administrative complexity. Also, it is expected that the authority to require allocations at the producer level on a case-by-case basis can be and would be exercised to prevent producers from withholding supplies from the market by capping wells or otherwise.

It is specifically intended that the allocation program operate at the refinery level to compel inter-refinery transfers and exchanges of crude oil. By this means, it is expected that allocations of crude would be made to assure the maximum utilization of the refinery capacity of the United States and, in particular, that low-sulfur crude will be allocated to those refineries which are limited in their ability to process crude oil of higher sulfur content or which are operating under environmental restrictions which prevent the processing of high-sulfur grade crude. While the President's authority does not expressly permit him to order refineries to adjust their product mix (i.e. crack the barrel at different fractions to produce more or less of a specific refined petroleum product), the President must, in allocating crude to different refineries, take into account the historical patterns of product mix so as to assure accomplishment of the Congressionally stated objectives. Moreover, in circumstances where additional supply of a particular product, such as home heating oil, must be obtained, it is expected that the President will withhold or divert the allocation of crude from any refinery which does not adjust his product mix to contribute to the development of such additional supply.

(8) Stripper wells.—The conference substitute contains a provision relating to stripper wells. This provision, found in section 4(e)(2) states that the regulation promulgated under subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to the first sale of crude oil produced in the United States from any lease whose average daily production of crude oil for the preceding calendar year does not exceed ten barrels per well. In order to qualify for the exemption, a lease must be operating at the maximum feasible rate of production and in accordance with recognized conservation practices. Any agency designated by the President under section 5(b) of the conference substitute for such purpose is authorized to conduct inspections to insure compliance with this paragraph and shall promulgate and cause to be published requirements implementing the provisions of this paragraph.

B. Objectives

House: Section 4(b)(1) of the House amendment set forth certain objectiveness which the regulation promulgated under that section was to the maximum extent practicable to provide for seven objectives. The House amendment's objectives included the maintenance of all public services (including facilities and services provided by municipally, cooperatively, or investor owned utilities or by any State or local government or authority); the maintenance of agricultural operations, including farming, ranching, dairy, and fishing activities, and services directly related thereto; the preservation of an economically sound and competitive petroleum industry, including the priority needs to restore and foster competition in the producing, refining, distribution, marketing, and petrochemical sectors of such industry, and to preserve the competitive viability of independent refiners, nonbranded independent marketers, and branded independent marketers; and the equitable distribution of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products at equitable prices among all regions and areas of the United States and sectors of the petroleum industry, including independent refiners, nonbranded independent marketers, branded independent marketers, and among all users.

Senate: Section 102 of the Senate bill provided for the President to take such actions as are necessary to insure the attainment of the specified objectives in implementing the authority granted under the Senate bill. These objectives included the maintenance of all public services; the maintenance of all essential agricultural operations, including farming, ranching, dairy and fishing activities and services directly related to the cultivation, production and preservation of food; the preservation of an economically sound and competitive petroleum industry, including the competitive viability of the independent producing, refining, marketing, distributing, and petrochemical sectors of that industry; and the equitable distribution of fuels at equitable prices among all regions and areas of the United States and all classes of consumers with the proviso that priority shall be given to supplying essential activities in the public interest and to independent marketers, jobbers, and refiners who supply those priorities. Whenever possible, preference shall be given to independent refiners and marketers (1) in the carrying out of such priorities, and (2) in other cases where all other conditions are equal and a choice must be made between allocation of supplies to an independent or to a major company.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute basically follows the House amendment to the Senate bill with the following changes:

(1) The objective providing for protection of the public health, safety, and welfare, and the national defense specifies that public health, safety, and welfare includes the maintenance of residential heating, such as individual homes, apartments, and similar occupied units.

(2) The objective providing for mainte-

nance of all public services specified that such maintenance of public services included facilities and services provided by municipally, cooperatively, or investor owned utilities or by any State or local government or authority. The conference substitute further specifies that this objective includes transportation facilities and services which serve the public at large.

(3) The conference agreement includes small refineries in the objective relating to the preservation of an economically sound and competitive petroleum industry.

(4) The conference substitute contains a new objective (E) relating to the allocation of suitable types, grades, and quality of crude oil to refineries in the United States to permit such refineries to operate at full capacity.

(5) The conference substitute includes small refiners in the equitable distribution of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products at equitable prices among all regions and areas of the United States and sectors of the petroleum industry.

(6) The conference substitute contains a new objective (G) relating to the allocation of residual fuel oil and refined petroleum products in such amounts and in such manner as may be necessary for the maintenance of exploration for, and production or extraction of, energy fuels, and for the required transportation related thereto.

Section 4(b)(1)(I) of the conference substitute requires special mention. This section emphasizes the objective of minimizing economic distortion, inflexibility and unnecessary interference in market mechanisms. The committee recognizes that mandatory allocation programs which compel the distribution and sale of fuels for particular uses at specified prices necessarily distort the economy and interfere with a free market mechanism. It is the intent of this legislation that that economic distortion and interference be minimized to the extent practicable. The President should assure himself that his actions interrupt existing supply mechanisms only when necessary to permit the accomplishment of the objectives stated in subsection (4). Moreover, while it is expressly recognized and intended that the allocation program would have the effect of abrogating contracts for the supply of fuels covered by the regulation, such abrogation should occur *only* to the extent necessary to accomplish the objectives of the Act. It is expected that the President's regulation will in most cases merely confirm existing supply relationships. For example, it is understood that in many circumstances small refiners own their own production or obtain it from affiliated sources. It is not expected that the President would disturb this relationship unless it were necessary to do so.

The conferees have included in section 4(b)(1)(B) specific mention of the need to allocate fuels to provide for the maintenance of transportation facilities and services which serve the public at large. The term "transportation services" is intended to identify those surface, rail or air facilities and services—whether public or privately owned—which serve the general public or which otherwise serve the objectives of this Act.

The petroleum fuel shortage threatens numerous areas of commerce. The jeopardy from shortage of these fuels impacts most directly on transportation. Without adequate petroleum fuel most United States' domestic and international transportation, with no option to convert to other fuels, potentially would be seriously disrupted. A significant reduction of transportation capability could adversely affect all other areas of commerce and the national economy. Thus, one of the primary objectives of the Act is to assure maintenance of transportation services.

C. Prices

House: The House amendment provided in section 4(b)(2) that in specifying prices (or prescribing the manner for determining them), the regulation under section 4 of the House amendment was to provide for a dollar-for-dollar passthrough of net increases in the cost of crude oil and refined petroleum products to all marketers or distributors at the retail level; and the use of the same date in the computation of markup, margin, and posted price for all marketers or distributors of crude oil and refined petroleum products at all levels of marketing and distribution.

Senate: Section 116 of the Senate bill provided that the Congress found and declared that, notwithstanding the imposition of mandatory controls by the Cost of Living Council on March 6, 1973, on the prices of crude oil and petroleum products, such prices had increased and were continuing to increase at an excessive rate and that in order to control inflation, promote a sound economy, and carry out the obejctives of the Senate bill as stated in section 102, the Congress urged the President immediately to take such further action as may be necessary to stabilize effectively the prices of crude oil and petroleum products.

Conference Substitute: The conference substitute contains the provisions of the House amendment with a change making the House provisions applicable to residual fuel oil.

The conference committee wishes to make several comments with respect to the pricing authority contained in this legislation. This has been included on the premise that it does no good to require the allocation of products if sellers are then permitted to demand unfair and unrealistic prices. It is not intended, however, that the pricing authority be exercised by establishing specific prices for products at each level in the distribution system. For example, the regulation could merely state an equitable method for determining price levels, such as permitting a specified percentage markup of base costs. The conference committee has decided to couple price controls with the mandatory allocation authority so as to focus in a single act decision-making authority and responsibility for dealing with the fuels shortage situation.

By requiring that both allocations and prices be covered in the regulation required to be promulgated and implemented under Section 4(a), Congress intends to force the Administration to rationalize and harmonize the objective of equitable allocation of fuels with the objectives of the Economic Stabilization Act. The committee wishes to emphasize that the pricing controls called for in this legislation may, in those circumstances where pricing controls established pursuant to other federal authority are consistent with the requirements and objectives of this Act, merely confirm those controls in the regulation to be promulgated under authority of section 4 of this Act. It is expressly contemplated, for example, that the price controls established by Phase IV under authority of the Economic Stabilization Act would continue in effect unless and until required to be modified by the price regulation required to carry out the purposes of this Act. As a matter of administrative convenience, the President may wish to continue to exercise federal pricing controls through the Cost of Living Council and may, pursuant to section 5(b), assign to that agency responsibility for administering the price controls called for in this Act.

The reference to equitable prices in the bill is specifically intended to emphasize that one of the objectives of the mandatory allocation program is to prevent price gouging or price discrimination which might otherwise occur on the basis of current shortages. On the other hand, it is contemplated that prices for allocated fuels will be set at levels or pursuant to methods which will permit adequate compensation to assure that private property is not implicitly confiscated by the government. Most importantly, the President must, in exercising this authority, strike an equitable balance between the sometimes conflicting needs of providing adequate inducement for the production of an adequate supply of product and of holding down spiraling consumer costs.

D. Allocation to independent refiners and marketers

House: Section 4(c)(1) of the House amendment provided that to extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of subsections (b) and (d) of section 4, the mandatory allocation program established under the regulation under subsection (a) of section 4 was to be so structured as to result in the allocation during each period during which the regulation applied of each refined petroleum product to each branded and each nonbranded independent marketer, and of crude oil to each independent refiner, in an amount equal to the amount sold or otherwise supplied to such marketer or refiner during the corresponding period of 1972, adjusted to provide a pro rata sharing among persons engaged in the marketing or distributing of a refined petroleum product of any amount of such product produced in excess of the amount produced in calendar year 1972, or a pro rata reduction in the amount allocated to such persons if lesser amounts are produced than those produced in calendar year 1972; and a pro rata sharing among refiners of any amount of crude oil produced in excess of the amount produced in calendar year 1962, or a pro rata reduction in the amount allocated to such refiners if lesser amounts are produced than those produced in calendar year 1972.

Section 4(c)(2) of the House amendment provided the President was authorized by order, to require such adjustments in the allocations of refined petroleum products and crude oil established under the regulation under subsection (a) of section 4 as may reasonably have been necessary in the case of refined petroleum products (i) to take into consideration market entry by branded independent marketers and nonbranded independent marketers subsequent to calendar year 1972, or (ii) to take into consideration subsequent expansion or reduction of marketing or distribution facilities of such marketers; and in the case of crude oil (i) to take into consideration market entry by independent refiners subsequent to calendar year 1972, or (ii) to take into consideration subsequent expansion or reduction of refining facilities of such refiners. Any adjustments made under section 4(c)(2) may have been made only upon a finding that, to the maximum extent practicable, protection of the objectives of subsections (b) and (d) of section 4 were attained.

Senate: Section 105 of the Senate bill stated that the President was directed to use his authority under the Senate bill and under existing law to assure that no petroleum refinery in the United States was involuntarily required to operate at less than its normal full capacity because of the unavailability to said refinery of suitable types or grades of crude oil.

Subsection (c) of section 105 provided that in order to achieve the objectives of the bill, (1) any producer or importer of crude petro-

leum and/or natural gas liquids who produced in the United States and/or imported more than two hundred thousand barrels per day of crude oil and natural gas liquids during the base period had to sell or exchange to nonaffiliated independent refiners or to any other reasonable and appropriate class of refiners established by regulation, in accordance with the objectives and priorities established under section 102(e) of the Senate bill, in the aggregate during each quarter during the effective term of the Senate bill a proportion of his domestic production and imports no less than the proportion he sold or exchanged to such refiners during the corresponding quarter of the base period. It also provided under such subsection that to the extent practicable, all such refiners previously supplied by such producer or importer were to continue to be supplied on an equitable basis taking into consideration past supply relationships and unused refinery capacity; and (2) all refiners or importers of petroleum products were to sell or exchange to nonaffiliated independent dealers or to any other reasonable and appropriate class of purchasers established by regulation, in accordance with the objectives and priorities established under section 102(e) of the Senate bill, in the aggregate in each quarter during the effective term of the Senate bill, a proportion of his refinery production and imports of said products no less than the proportion he sold or exchanged to such dealers during the correspondng quarter of the base period. It further provided that to the extent practicable, all such dealers previously supplied by such refiner were to continue to be supplied on an equitable basis taking into consideration past supply relationships.

Subsection (d) of section 105 stated that the allocation program established pursuant to section 105 may have been replaced or amended by, or incorporated into, the priority schedules, plans, and regulations promulgated under section 104 of the Senate bill.

Section 109 of the Senate bill stated that a petroleum refiner or a petroleum distributor was not to deliver or tender for delivery in any quarter to any petroleum distributor or petroleum retailer a smaller quantity of petroleum products than the quantity of such products delivered by him or his predecessor or predecessors during the corresponding quarter in the base period, unless he delivered to each petroleum distributor or petroleum retailer doing business in commerce the same percentage of the total amount as was delivered to all such distributors or retailers in the market area who were supplied by such refiner or distributor and that a petroleum refiner or a petroleum distributor was not to sell petroleum products to a nonfranchised petroleum distributor or petroleum retailer at a price, during any calendar month, which was greater than the price at which such petroleum products were sold to a similarly situated franchised petroleum distributor or petroleum retailer on the same level of commerce (wholesale or retail) in the market area except that a reasonable differential which equaled the value of the goodwill, trademark, and other protections and benefits which accrued to franchised distributors or retailers was not prohibited.

Enforcement of this provision is described below under the section relating to enforcement.

Section 110 of the Senate bill stated that a petroleum refiner or a petroleum distributor was not to cancel, fail to renew, or otherwise terminate a franchise unless he furnished prior notification pursuant to this paragraph to each petroleum distributor or petroleum retailer affected. Such notification was to be in writing and was to be accomplished by certified mail to such distributor or retailer; was to be furnished not less than ninety days prior to the date on which such franchise was to be canceled, not renewed, or otherwise terminated; and was to contain a statement of intention to cancel, not renew, or to terminate together with the reasons therefor, the date on which such action was to take effect, and a statement of the remedy or remedies available to such distributor or retailer under the Senate bill together with a summary of the provisions of this section.

Section 110 of the Senate bill further stated that a petroleum refiner or a petroleum distributor was not to cancel, fail to renew, or otherwise terminate a franchise unless the petroleum retailer or petroleum distributor whose franchise was terminated failed to comply substantially with essential and reasonable requirement of such franchise or failed to act in good faith in carrying out the terms of such franchise, or unless such refiner or distributor withdrew entirely from the sale of petroleum products in commerce for sale other than resale in the United States.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute incorporates the provisions of the House amendment with the following changes:

(1) Small refiners are given the same treatment as independent refiners.

(2) The provisions of subsection (c)(1) which provide for allocation of refined petroleum products to branded and nonbranded independent marketers based on amounts they received in 1972 are expanded to provide for allocation of such products to small refiners and independent refiners based on amounts they received in 1972.

(3) The provisions of sections 4(c)(1)(A) and (B) of the House amendment which required a pro rata increase in allocations of refined petroleum products and crude oil to marketers and refiners, respectively, to reflect increase in supply are deleted, and replaced in the conference substitute by a provision directing the President to report to the Congress monthly, beginning not later than January 1, 1974, with respect to any change after 1972 in the aggregate national or regional market shares of nonbranded independent marketers, branded independent marketers, and other persons engaged in the marketing or distributing of refined petroleum products. The provision further requires that if allocation of any increase of the amount of any refined petroleum product produced in or imported into the United States in excess of the amount produced or imported in 1972 contributes to a significant increase in any market share described above, the President must order an equitable adjustment in allocations of such product.

(4) The President is directed to order adjustments in the allocations of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products as may reasonably be necessary to accomplish the objectives of section 4(b) or to prevent any person from taking any action which would be inconsistent with those objectives.

(5) In adjusting allocations to provide pro-rata decreases, the President is directed to consider aggregate decreases in domestic production plus imports, rather than considering only domestic production.

A great deal of the discussion in conference focused on the workings of section 4(c). Under the terms of the House amendment, the mandatory allocation program was required to be so structured—to the extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of the Act—as to result in the allocation to branded independent marketers and non-branded independent marketers of amounts of refined petroleum product equal to what they were able to obtain in calender year 1972. Finding that many small refiners and independent refiners have historically also been bulk purchasers and marketers of refined petroleum products, the conference committee determined to in addition include such refiners within the formula so as to give to them an entitlement to refined petroleum products (to the extent practicable and consistent with the objectives of the Act) based upon 1972 allotments.

It is understood that a number of independent marketers, small refiners and independent refiners have been sold to or otherwise been acquired by others since 1972. It is the expectation of the conferees that where it is possible to trace the corporate or business history of an entity, the successor company shall be entitled to the base period allocation of its predecessor.

The committee has also made provision for the allocation of crude oil to small and independent refiners based upon their calendar year 1972 crude runs. Here, as in the case of refined petroleum products, it is expected that small and independent refiners who entered the market after calendar year 1972 and who acquired interests in refineries which had been in operation during that year would be entitled to claim an allocation based upon the 1972 crude runs of the predecessor refineries.

(1) Certain Contracts.—The conferees wish to comment specifically on the application of this section in circumstances where a successor company has acquired assets and made capital investments in reliance on a court decree issued in furtherance of a resolution of antitrust claims. As noted in an earlier portion of this report, it is intended that the allocation program minimize economic distortion and interference with market mechanisms. Also this legislation lists as a basic objective the need to promote and foster competition in the petroleum industry. It would be an anomalous result if the allocation program would be implemented in a manner which would frustrate or make impossible the accomplishment of a court-ordered decree whose objective was to create a viable competitive entity where there was none before. It is expected, therefore, that the President will take care to assure that the allocation program would not interrupt supply agreements, whose very terms had been ordered by a court to assure that an entity would be able to operate in a manner which offers meaningful competition. The Committee does not wish, however, to totally insulate such supply agreements. It is fully intended and expected that the President would have authority to abrogate such contracts if the President finds that he must do so in order to accomplish the objectives of this Act.

(2) Pro-rata Sharing of Shortfall.—In those circumstances where the aggregate amount of crude oil produced in or imported into the United States is less than the amounts produced or imported in calendar year 1972, the conference substitute requires a pro rata reduction in the amounts allocated among refiners. This provision is intended to assure an equitable sharing of the short-fall among small, independent, and other refiners including those which are owned and operated by major vertically integrated oil companies. A similar pro-rata sharing, as described above, is provided for shortfalls in refined petroleum products.

(3) Refinery expansion or new construction.—The conferees view the construction of new refineries, and the expansion of present refinery capacity, as critically important factors in maximizing the amount of petroleum products available to meet domestic demand. The conferees are concerned that refiners may be hesitant to make the

substantial investments, and other commitments required for the construction of new refineries and the expansion of existing facilities unless they are assured of adequate supplies of crude oil for their facilities. The provisions of section 4(c)(4)(B), are intended to provide the President with a means of affording that assurance.

Although the conferees have determined not to include the dealer protection provisions which were contained in the Senate bill, the committee wants to express its concern with the downsteam vertical integration of the major oil companies into the distribution and retail levels of the market. Major oil companies have begun to market secondary brands through wholly-owned distribution subsidiaries. The primary brands are to an increasing extent being marketed through so-called salaried or managed retail outlets. Branded independent marketers, already under short term lease and supply agreements, are finding that their agreements are not being renewed. Leases of one year's duration are being converted to thirty days. Representatives of branded dealers believe that this represents an attempt by the majors to force private entrepreneurs out of the retail market and to convert station operators to salaried employees. The committee believes that the agency administering this Act and the Congress should watch this development closely. Should it be shown to be progressing in a manner which cannot be dealt with under the allocation authority contained in this bill, it may be in order for the Congress to consider remedies such as proposed in the Senate bill or as may be appropriate in the formulation of tax, import and anti-trust policy.

ENFORCEMENT

House: Section 5(a) of the House amendment provided that the regulation under the House amendment would be enforced under sections 205 through 213 (other than 212(b)) of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 (as in effect on the date of enactment of the bill) except that the expiration of the Economic Stabilization Act would not affect any authority to amend and enforce the regulation or to issue and enforce any order under the House amendment.

Senate: The Senate bill authorized the head of the agency designated to implement the bill to require periodic reporting and to issue subpenas. The head of the agency (or his delegate) was authorized to request the Attorney General to bring an action in the appropriate district court of the United States to enjoin any act or practices constituting a violation of the bill (or order or regulation thereunder) and upon a proper showing a temporary restraining order or a preliminary or permanent injunction would be granted without bond. The court could also issue mandatory injunctions.

The Senate bill also contained special provisions providing a private remedy for the enforcement of the provision of section 109 which prohibit failing to sell petroleum products to petroleum distributors and retailers at prices and in quantities determined under that section. Section 109(b) authorized a petroleum retailer or a petroleum distributor to maintain a suit against certain refiners and distributors who engage in conduct prohibited by section 109 and whose products he purchases. The court was directed to grant such equitable relief to remedy the effects of the prohibited conduct, including declaratory judgment and mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief. The court was also authorized to grant interim equitable relief, and punitive damages; and award the plaintiff a reasonable attorney's fee. Notice of intent to file suit was required to be filed with each defendant and with certain public officials. Similar enforcement provisions were provided for section 110 of the Senate bill.

Conference substitute: The Senate recedes.

ADMINISTRATION

Both the Senate bill and House amendment authorized the President to delegate any part of his authority under the bill to any Federal officer or agency. In addition, the Senate bill required designation of an agency to promulgate regulations and supervise compliance. The Senate bill also required establishment of an office to receive complaints from State and local governments respecting fuel oil and gasoline supplies and prices.

Conference substitute: The conference substitute follows the provisions of the House amendment with an amendment permitting the President to delegate functions under the bill to States (or to officers thereof) as well as to Federal officers and agencies.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

Both the House and Senate versions of the bill provide generally that compliance with the bill and requirements imposed under the bill are a defense to the actions under the antitrust laws and for certain breaches of contract. The Senate bill, in addition, made such compliance a defense to State pricing or restraint-of-trade statutes comparable to the antitrust laws.

Conference substitute: The Senate recedes.

The conferees wish to make special mention of the limited antitrust defense created by the provisions of the conference substitute. Under its terms, certain meetings, conferences, or other communications which might otherwise be construed to violate the antitrust laws would be permitted provided that (i) the President issues an appropriate approving order, (ii) the meeting, conference, or communication takes place in the presence of a representative of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and (iii) a transcript is kept, and—together with a copy of any agreement resulting therefrom—placed in a public file. The conferees believe it is a reasoned interpretation of the application of these provisions to permit the Attorney General to exempt from these requirements classes or types of meetings, conferences, or communications, which are ministerial in nature and which occur subsequent to and in furtherance of agreements, decisions, and policies which are arrived at at meetings, conferences, or communications authorized by the President attended by a representative of the Department of Justice and appropriately transcribed. To be consistent with the requirements of this section, however, a written summary of any such meetings, conferences, or communications should be made, and, together with any agreement resulting therefrom deposited with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission, where it shall be made available for public inspection.

MONITORING BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

House: The House amendment directed the Federal Trade Commission to monitor the program established under the regulation under section 4 during the first 45 days the regulation is in effect and not later than 60 days after the regulation takes effect to report to the Congress and the President respecting the effectiveness of the provisions of the House amendment and of actions taken pursuant to the provisions of the House amendment. The scope of the Commission's investigative authority, for this purpose, is augmented to encompass individuals, partnerships, and certain common carriers.

Senate: The Senate bill directed that the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission monitor the actions taken pursuant to the Senate bill by the agency designated to administer the provisions thereof and by persons subject to the provisions thereof, and report to the President and to the Congress any provision of the bill, action taken pursuant thereto, or condition created thereby, which would have tended to create or maintain anticompetitive practices or situations inconsistent with the antitrust laws or had a lasting adverse impact upon competition or upon any of the objectives set forth in section 102 (d), (f), or (g) of the bill.

The Federal Trade Commission was to prepare and transmit to the Congress, not later than thirty days after the enactment of section 112, an interim report on the following, and not later than six months after such date a report on the relationship between the structure, behavior, and operational characteristics of the petroleum industry (including the vertical integration of production, transportation, refining, and marketing; and joint ventures among petroleum companies) and the causes of the present shortages of crude oil and refined petroleum products; and a report on petroleum industry practices and trends in the marketing of gasoline and other petroleum products including the use of credit cards, the promotion of second and third brand name products, the terms and conditions of franchise agreements and the protection they afford the franchisee, and the role of the independent retailer. The scope of the Commission's authority to implement the aforementioned provisions was augmented to include all corporations including common carriers subject to the Act.

Conference substitute: The Senate recedes.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

Senate: Section 106 of the Senate bill directed the President to submit to both Houses of Congress any schedules, plans, and regulations promulgated for implementing the provisions of the bill.

The Senate bill also directed the President to make to the Congress quarterly reports, and upon termination of authority under the bill a final report, including a summary and description of all actions taken under the authority of the bill, an analysis of their impact, and an evaluation of their effectiveness in implementing the objectives of section 102 of the bill.

House: The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The conference report contains no general requirement for periodic reports or for reports to Congress respecting regulations. See description of the mandatory allocation program contained in section 4 of the conference substitute for requirements for reports on specific matters.

HIGHWAY SPEED REDUCTIONS TO CONSERVE GASOLINE

Senate: Section 111 of the Senate bill stated that it was the sense of the Congress that, in order to conserve gasoline supplies which in some areas of the Nation were approaching critical shortages (1) speed limits for motor vehicles traveling on Federal-aid highways presently at or in excess of fifty-five miles per hour should be reduced immediately to fifty-five miles per hour, or ten miles per hour lower than the speed limit posted on the affected portion of such Federal-aid highway prior to the enactment of section 111, whichever is the greater; (2) Federal, State, and local governmental agencies should take appropriate actions to achieve and enforce such reductions in vehicle speed; and (3) Federal, State, and local governmental agencies should take such actions as may be necessary to increase public awareness of the need to conserve gasoline and the means for doing so, including the

connection between decreasing gasoline consumption and decreasing vehicle speed, excessive idling, unnecessary travel, and abrupt acceleration and deceleration.

House: The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The Senate recedes.

NATIONAL VOLUNTARY ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Senate: Section 113 of the Senate bill provided that in order to more effectively carry out the purpose of the Senate bill to solve a national energy crisis the President was to (1) develop a National Voluntary Energy Conservation Program calling for and suggesting means of terminating unnecessary use of energy for power or lighting, and (2) call upon State and local officials, public and private entities, and the public generally, by means of television, radio, newspaper, and other appropriate manner, to cooperate in promoting and carrying out such program.

House: The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The Senate recedes.

GOVERNMENT USE OF ECONOMY CARS AND LIMOUSINES; PROMOTION OF CARPOOLS

Senate: Section 114 of the Senate bill provided that, as an example to the rest of our Nation's automobile users, the President of the United States was requested to take such action as is necessary to require all agencies of Government, where practical, to use economy model automobiles, pickups, and trucks; that the President was to take action to require that no Federal official or employee below the level of cabinet officer be furnished a limousine because such automobiles are particularly expensive, gas consuming and pollution producing; and that the President was requested to take such action as was necessary to begin a national program of public information to inform the commuter of the benefits of carpools and economy cars and that the President was to report to Congress on legislative incentives to promote such a program.

House: The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The Senate recedes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE FUELS AND ENERGY CONSERVATION OFFICES

Senate: Section 115 of the Senate bill expressed the sense of the Congress that each Governor of each State was requested to establish a State Office of Fuels and Energy Conservation, such office immediately to develop and promulgate a program to encourage voluntary conservation of gasoline, diesel oil, heating oil, natural gas, propane, other fuels, and electrical energy.

House: The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

Conference substitute: The Senate recedes. However, the conference substitute, in section 5(b), authorizes the President to delegate functions under the bill to States or officers thereof.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,
CLARENCE J. BROWN,
JAMES M. COLLINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK CHURCH,
LEE METCALF,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
PAUL FANNIN,
CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
M. W. COOK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today and Tuesday, November 13, on account of official business of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEELMAN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:

Mr. FRENZEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOGAN, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STARK) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. REUSS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. COTTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HAMILTON, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. HUNGATE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CULVER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SIKES, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RODINO, and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $209.

Mr. BRAY, to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $574.75.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska, immediately following his remarks in reply to the chairman of the Rules Committee to insert minutes of the transcript of the Rules Committee hearing which pertains to the resolution Mr. MARTIN introduced on the Alaska pipeline bill.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEELMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
Mr. WINN.
Mr. QUIE.
Mr. ARCHER.
Mr. SARASIN.
Mr. STEELMAN.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. KETCHUM.
Mr. WIDNALL.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.
Mr. SHUSTER in two instances.
Mr. CARTER in three instances.
Mr. LOTT.
Mr. BELL.
Mr. RONCALLO of New York.
Mr. HOGAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STARK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. RANGEL in 10 instances.
Mr. MCFALL.
Mr. SEIBERLING in 10 instances.
Mr. BLATNIK in 10 instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
Mr. STOKES in six instances.
Mr. BADILLO.
Mr. KARTH.
Mr. JOHNSON of California.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. GIBBONS.
Mr. MACDONALD.
Mr. HUNGATE.
Mr. NEDZI in three instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON in five instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNGATE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YATRON.
Mr. MAHON.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2641. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the district court of the United States of certain civil actions brought by the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4771. An act to authorize the District of Columbia Council to regulate and stabilize rents in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 13, 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:

1541. A letter from the President of the

United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1974 for the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation (H. Doc. No. 93–186); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1542. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting two reports of violation of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes to the Committee on Appropriations.

1543. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrate, and under German Offset Agreement for the quarter ended September 30, 1973, pursuant to section 720 of Public Law 92–570; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1544. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Agency for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 79–592; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1545. A letter from the First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report covering the month of September 1973, on Export-Import Bank approved loans, guarantees and insurance in support of U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Poland, pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1546. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1547. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on increasing foreign visitor travel to the United States under programs of the U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce; 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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on Nov. 8, 1973, the following Report was filed on Nov. 10, 1973]

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 1570 (Rept. No. 93–628). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ULLMAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11333. A bill to provide a 7-percent increase in social security benefits beginning with March 1974 and an additional 4-percent increase beginning with June 1974, to provide increases in supplemental security income benefits, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 93–627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 11393. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to provide for the extension thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 11394. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to repeal the recently added provision for the establishment of Professional Standards Review Organizations to review services covered under the medicare and medicaid programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOTT, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 11395. 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. BROYHILL of Virignia:

H.R. 11396. A bill to extend daylight saving time to the entire calendar year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 11397. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the deduction for moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 11398. A bill to reestablish November 11 as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 11399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a special rule for determining insured status, for purposes of entitlement of disability insurance benefits, of individuals whose disability is attributable directly or indirectly to meningioma or other brain tumor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 11400. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 11401. A bill to provide for, and assure the independence of, a special prosecutor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 11402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain lands in the State of Colorado to the Department of Agriculture for consolidation, to facilitate better management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHUM:

H.R. 11403. A bill to amend the provision of title 28 of the United States Code which deals with Federal tort claims to allow recovery in certain cases for injuries caused by the negligence of contractors performing services for the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 11404. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 44, United States Code, to provide that certain proceedings of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 11405. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11406. A bill to amend chapter 59 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition of representatives of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 11407. A bill to provide for the conservation of energy by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer an income tax deduction for insulation improvement or repair expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 11408. A bill to direct the President to halt all exports of gasoline, distillate fuel oil, and propane gas until he determines that no shortage of such fuels exists in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT):

H.R. 11409. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide temporary authority to suspend certain stationary source fuel and emission limitations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SARASIN:

H.R. 11410. A bill to impose an embargo on the export of petrochemicals until price controls on petrochemicals are removed; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 11411. A bill to extend daylight saving time to the entire calendar year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 11412. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants and provide technical assistance to units of general local government to implement programs which are designed to increase the use of carpools by commuters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 377. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United Nations or other appropriate international organizations, should call for international conferences to consider the present world energy crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 691. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court decisions on abortion; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 692. Resolution impeaching Richard M. Nixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 11413. A bill for the relief of Do Van Du; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 11414. A bill for the relief of Norma Quinones Monge; 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 in 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 quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1973:

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. John J. Adams, Suite 1060, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ethyl Corp., 330 South Fourth Street, Richmond, Va.

A. John J. Adams, Suite 1060, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Vepco, Seventh and Franklin Streets, Richmond, Va.

A. Altman, Kurlander & Weiss, Attn: Alan S. Finger, 125 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.

A. American Rivers Conservation Council, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Scott P. Anger, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Superior Oil Co., P.O. Box 1521, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association, 222 Cedar Lane, Teaneck, N.J. 07666.

A. Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc., P.O. Box 8733, Friendship International Airport, Md. 21240.

A. Associated Employers, Inc., 8107 Broadway, Suite 202, San Antonio, Tex. 78209.

A. Donald L. Badders, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. TRW Credit Data, 2030 M Street, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Linda M. Billings, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Sierra Club, 1050 Mills Tower, 220 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.

A. Charles Binsted, National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, 2945 Banksville Road, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15216.

A. John W. Black, 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. Boasberg, Hewes, Klores & Kass, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fans Inc., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Helen Bremberg, 4515 South 31st Street, Apt. 202, Arlington, Va. 22206.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Bill Brier, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. J. Colvin Brown, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

A. Travis Taylor Brown, 2525 49th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carol Burris, 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Burson-Marsteller, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 607, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Council for Responsible Nutrition, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Jerald R. Butchert, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., No. 216, Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, P.O. Box 54153, Los Angeles, Calif. 90054.

A. John W. Byrnes, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Cabot Corporation and Subsidiaries, 125 High Street, Boston, Mass., 02110.

A. Sharyn G. Campbell, 1620 I Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National BankAmericard, Inc., 555 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94126.

A. W. Dean Cannon, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.
B. California Savings & Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Independent Gas Producers Committee, c/o GHK Co./Gasanadarko, 1400 Fidelity Plaza, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

A. Richard Caulfield, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Nancy H. Chasen, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Girard P. Clark, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Ronald D. Clements, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Railroad Passenger Corp., 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. N.Y. Cocoa Exchange, Inc., 127 John Street, New York, N.Y.; N.Y. Coffee & Sugar Exchange, Inc., 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.; Commodity Exchange, Inc., 81 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Coalition of Concerned Charities, c/o John G. Milliken, Suite 1102, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Coalition to End Grand Jury Abuse, 23 Cornelia Street, New York, N.Y. 10014.

A. Grover B. Cobb, 1200 Travis, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Houston Natural Gas Corp., P.O. Box 1188, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Jerry S. Cohen, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, 2945 Banksville Road, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15216.

A. Cohen & Uretz, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, c/o Mr. Jose A. Cabranes, 2210 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

A. Lynn R. Coleman; Vinson, Elkins, Searles, Connally & Smith, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William R. Corson, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Penthouse International, Ltd., 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Irving Trust Co., 1 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), Midland Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Orgalime (Organisme de Liaison des Industries Metalliques Europeennes), Brussels, Belgium.

A. Stephen I. Danzansky, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. P. M. Davison, Jr., 418 East Rosser Avenue, Box 938, Bismarck, N.D. 58501.
B. North Dakota Railway Lines.

A. Daniel P. Dawson, 200 East Randolph Drive, M.C. No. 3101, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 200 East Randolph Drive, M.C. No. 3101, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road, NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30326.

A. Ronald B. Dear, 1225 Martha Custis Drive, No. 1216, Alexandria, Va. 22302.
B. American Conservation Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Louis H. Diamond, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Steven P. Doehler, 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.

A. John D. Doherty, Jr., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Carol Ann Douglas, 3100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Apartment 204, Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. H. Stewart Dunn, Jr., 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Rochester Tax Council, 1100 Midtown Tower, Rochester, N.Y. 14604.

A. N. Boyd Ecker, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Brock Evans, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Sierra Club, 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.

A. R. Scott Faley, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fans Inc., 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Lloyd Fillion, 1318 Girard Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.

A. Tim C. Ford, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

A. Foss Launch and Tug Co., 660 West Ewing Street, Seattle, Wash. 98119.

A. Joe H. Foy, 1200 Travis, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Houston Natural Gas Corp., 1200 Travis, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Alice Frandsen, 10311 Folk Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Gay H. Friedmann, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 206, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Lone Star Gas Co., 301 South Harwood, Dallas, Tex. 75201.

A. Joseph L. Gibson, 1660 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.

A. Frederick A. Gilbert, 293 Middlesex Road, Darien, Conn. 06820.
B. FMC Corp., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Rochester Tax Council, 1100 Midtown Tower, Rochester, N.Y. 14604.

A. Walter W. Goeppinger, P.O. Box 358, Boone, Iowa. 50036.

A. Ann Elena Gordon, 2300 McAuliffe Drive, Rockville, Md. 20851.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Stanley M. Gortikov, 9200 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90069.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. David B. Graham, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

A. Neal Gregory, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Chellis O'Neal Gregory, Jr.
B. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Richard Greenspan, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. A. J. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Securities Industry Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Henkel & Lamon, 2500 Peachtree Center, Cain Tower, Atlanta, Ga., 30303.
B. American Society of Pension Actuaries.

A. Lillie E. Herndon 525 North Treuholm Road, Columbia, S.C. 29206.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

A. Philip R. Hochberg, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Hockey League, 2 Pennsylvania Plaza, Suite 2480, New York, N.Y. 10001.

A. Houston Natural Gas Corp., 1200 Travis, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Independent Gas Producers Committee, c/o GHK Co./Gasanadarko, 1400 Fidelity Plaza, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73102.

A. Joseph S. Ives, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

A. Richard J. Jones, 1110 Davidson Street, Champaign, Ill., 60631.
B. Independent Grocers' Alliance, 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. James J. Judge, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert E. Juliano, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 120 East Fourth Street, 13th Floor, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

A. Marvin Kamensky, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., 60603.

A. William J. Kennedy, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Judith M. Kim, 1030 15th Street NW., Suite 408, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.

A. Susan B. King.
B. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Koob, Robert L., d./b./a. Koob Associates, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 311, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. IMCO Services Division, Halliburton Co., 2400 West Loop South, Houston, Tex. 77027.

A. David R. Lambert, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Monte Lazarus, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.

A. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Union Investment GmbH, Neue Mainzer Strasse 33–35, 6 Frankfurt am Main 16, Federal Republic of Germany.

A. Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., Fort Wayne, Ind. 46801.

A. Joseph Lippman, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James Rowland Lowe, Jr., 1100 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaskan Arctic Gas Study Co., P.O. Box 979, Anchorage, Alaska 99510.

A. Russell E. MacCleery, 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.

A. Steven A. Martindale, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Horse Protection Association, 629 River Bend Road, Great Falls, Va.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C.
B. Quaker State Oil Refining Corp., Oil City, Pa. 16302.

A. Harry G. McComas, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Thomas M. Malone, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., P.O. Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. H. Warren Mann, 1200 Travis, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Houston Natural Gas Corp., P.O. Box 1188, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Dan V. Maroney, Jr., 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Guy R. Martin, State of Alaska Department of Law, 655 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Mayer, Brown & Platt, Suite 400, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Brunswick Corp., 69 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. 60602.

A. Ronald Michieli, Suite 1015, National Press Bldg., 14th and F Streets, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American National Cattlemen's Assn., 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.

A. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., Fort Wayne, Ind. 46801.

A. Joseph A. Millimet, 1838 Elm Street, Manchester, N.H. 03105.
B. Massachusetts Bankers Association.

A. Louis R. Moore, 500 Electric Building, Billings, Mont. 59101.
B. High Crest Oils, Inc., 2640 One Calgary Place, 330 Fifth Avenue SW., Calgary, Alberta T2P OL4 Canada.

A. Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association, 222 Cedar Lane, Teaneck, N.J. 07666.

A. Robert M. Mulligan, 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. Converse Murdoch, P.O. Box 949, Wilmington, Del. 19899.

A. Tom O. Murphy, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Coal Lessors, Inc., 1425 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. National Association of Railroad Passengers, 417 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.

A. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. E. John Neumann, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Lawrence L. O'Connor, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
B. Profit Sharing Council of America, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. James J. O'Neill, 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
B. The Committee of Publicly Owned Companies.

A. Franz M. Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.

A. David E. Osterhout, 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. William G. Painter, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Rivers Conservation Council, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Ellen Pattin, 6907 Lyle Street, Lanham, Md. 20801.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Susan Pennington, 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Parents Committee, 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Pennsylvania Independent Auto Dealers Association, 229 State Street, Harrisburg, Pa. 17101.

A. Howard Phillips, 4220 Linden Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. American Conservative Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

A. Grant C. Pinney, 610–A Kearsarge, China Lake, Calif. 93555.
B. China Lake Joint School District, Halsey Street, China Lake, Calif. 93555.

A. Profit Sharing Council of America, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Ski Areas Association, Inc., 99 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Clarence B. Randall, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Suite 321, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc., P.O. Box 8733, Friendship International Airport, Md. 21240.

A. John P. Roche, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Millard H. Ruud, Suite 370, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Irene Saunders.
B. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Thomas H. Saunders, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.

A. Phyllis Schultz, 12224 Valerie Lane, Laurel, Md. 20810.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius and Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Alpena Wholesale Grocer Co., P.O. Box 475, Alpena, Mich.; Bozzuto's Inc., P.O. Box 340, Cheshire, Conn.; Carpenter Cook Co., P.O. Box 37, Menominee, Mich.

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.
B. Ametalco, Inc., 530 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10036.

A. Barry M. Siegel, 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Committee of Publicly Owned Companies.

A. Margaret Siegel, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Silverstein, Sherman, and Damico, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association for Advanced Life Underwriting, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hugh H. Smith, Suite 606, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. J Kenneth Smith, Suite 820, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Sun Oil Co., 240 Radnor Chester Road, St. Davids, Pa. 19087.

A. Joseph L. Spilman, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Springs Mills, Inc., Fort Mill, S.C. 29715.

A. Fred Solowey, 412 Fifth Street NW., Room 708, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Coalition to End Grand Jury Abuse, 23 Cornelia Street, New York, N.Y. 10014.

A. Catherine Stirling, 7012 Beechwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G. Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Cynthia Day Stratton, 6300 Stratford Road, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Roger J. Stroh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Stroock & Stroock & Lavan, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United States Banknote Corp., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. R. Keith Stroup, 2105 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Agway, Inc., P.O. Box 1333, Syracuse, N.Y. 13201.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., 1295 State Street, Springfield, Mass. 01101.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Travelers Insurance Cos., One Tower Square, Hartford, Conn. 06115.

A. Philip Tierney, 711 Princess Street, Alexandria, Va. 22313.
B. Estate of Paul T. Stone, 515 King Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

A. Charles Richard Titus, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the United States, Inc., 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

A. J. Drake Turrentine, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.

A. St. Clair J. Tweedie, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28281.

A. Joseph D. Tydings, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. United States Banknote Corp., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Wald, Harkrader & Ross, 1320 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Springs Mills, Inc., Fort Mill, S.C. 29715.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Electric Co., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Judy Waxman, 19036 Canadian Court, Gaithersburg, Md.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Weisman, Celler, Spett, Modlin & Wertheimer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 910, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Football League Players Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Daniel Kehr Weitzenfeld, 6450 Jones Road, Falls Church, Va. 22043.
B. Naval Employees' Association, Naval Air Station Alameda, P.O. Box 139, Alameda, Calif. 94501.

A. William Welsh, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Whaley, MuCutchen, Blanton & Dent, 1414 Lady Street, Columbia, S.C.
B. Motion Picture Assoc. of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald F. White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Samuel M. Williams, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Council for Responsible Nutrition, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Marianas Political Status Commission, P.O. Box 825, Saipan, Mariana Islands 96950.

A. Barry Wolf, 631 North Carolina Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Leslie Wolfe, 5807 Bradley Boulevard, Bethesda, Md. 20014.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Sidney M. Wolfe, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Health Research Group, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Airbus Industrie, 160 Avenue de Versailles, Paris, 16e, France.

A. Dennis M. Yamamoto, 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. Leslie A. McKnight Yates, 1215 Lawrence Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20017.
B. Washington Office On Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Donald P. Zeifang, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Ziontz, Pirtle, Morisset & Ernstoff, 3101 Seattle First National Bank Building, Seattle, Wash. 98154.
B. Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation, P.O. Box 150, Nespelem, Wash. 99155.

A. Ziontz, Pirtle, Morisset & Ernstoff, 3101 Seattle First National Bank Building, Seattle, Wash. 98154.
B. Lummi Tribe of Indians, P.O. Box 309, Marietta, Wash. 98268.

A. Ziontz, Pirtle, Morisset & Ernstoff, 3101 Seattle First National Bank Building, Seattle, Wash. 98154.
B. Makah Indian Tribe, P.O. Box 115, Neah Bay, Wash. 97357.

A. Ziontz, Pirtle, Morisset & Ernstoff, 3101 Seattle First National Bank Building, Seattle, Wash. 98154.
B. Northern Cheyenne Tribe, P.O. Box 128, Lame Deer, Mont. 59043.

A. Ziontz, Pirtle, Morisset & Ernstoff, 3101 Seattle First National Bank Building, Seattle, Wash. 98154.
B. Suquamish Indian Tribe, P.O. Box 556, Suquamish, Wash. 98382.

A. Thomas K. Zaucha, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

QUARTERLY REPORT*

*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

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) $8,500.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,263.90. E. (9) $8,263.90.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $2,079.75.

A. Air-Conditioning & Refrigeration Institute, 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $624.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, P.O. Box 5800, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Randolph 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.

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) $5,676.44.

A. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Room 2, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,610.13.

A. Nicholas E. Allen, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $38.85.

A. Altman, Kurlander & Weiss, c/o Alan S. Finger, 125 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $11,025. E. (9) $1,255.08.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Ave., NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Ave. NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. American Academy of Family Physicians, 1740 West 92nd Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64114.
D. (6) $6,141.87. E. (9) $6,141.87.

A. American Association of Meat Processors, 224 East High Street, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022.
D. (6) $203.93. E. (9) $37.85.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606.
D. (6) $1,736.83. E. (9) $1,736.83.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $2,105.47. E. (9) $2,105.47.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $6,331.68. E. (9) $6,331.68.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
D. (6) $41,913. E. (9) $41,913.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $59,764.24.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $110,295.13. E. (9) $2,192.68.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $2,915.55. E. (9) $3,473.20.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 South Roslyn Street, P.O. Box 1266, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
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) $3,550.08. E. (9) $4,309.41.

A. American Land Title Association, Suite 303, 1828 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $2,346.83.

A. American Life Insurance Assoc., Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $868.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
E. (9) $29,509.54.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
E. (9) $3,435.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.
E. (9) $2,878.40.

A. American Optometric Association, c/o Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $7,552.57. E. (9) $7,552.57.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
E. (9) $766.64.

A. American Parents Committee Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $17,780.44. E. (9) $6,988.79.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,812. E. (9) $43,964.

A. American Physical Therapy Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $7,917.84. E. (9) $7,917.84.

A. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
E. (9) $4,197.28.

A. American Postal Workers Union AFL–CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,226,160.46. E. (9) $106,853.99.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. American Rivers Conservation Council, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $309.45. E. (9) $322.76.

A. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 620, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $3,552.10. E. (9) $4,691.12.

A. American Surveys, Embassy Square (Suite 901), 2000 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., 1 World Trade Center—Suite 1109, New York, N.Y. 10048.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $63.77.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $39.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28281.
D. (6) $19,049.05. E. (9) $19,049.05.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $54,583.49.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $86,286. E. (9) $2,786.10.

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. 20006.
D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $360.

A. J. Lem Anderson, 400 First Street, NW., Room 809, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Eastex Inc., 229 North Bowie Street, Jasper, Texas 75951.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $315.75.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,281. E. (9) $39.08.

A. Scott P. Anger, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Superior Oil Co., P.O. Box 1521, Houston, Tex. 77001.

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.
D. (6) $7,600. E. (9) $914.78.

A. George W. Apperson, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., #403, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Div. 689, 100 Indiana Ave. NW., #403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Clarence A. Arata, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $15,000.

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) $150. E. (9) $1.70.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.

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) $5,417. E. (9) $369.

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) $1,250. E. (9) $44.04.

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) $500. E. (9) $21.02.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bottled Water Association, 1411 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90015.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $22.50.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fairchild Camera & Instrument Corp., 464 Ellis Street, Mountain View, Calif. 94040.
D. (6) $6,450. E. (9) $175.

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. 20795.
E. (9) $276.46.

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) $1,374.84.

A. Associated Employers, Inc., 8107 Broadway, Suite 202, San Antonio, Tex., 78209.
D. (6) $9,356.54. E. (9) $5,831.76.

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 and Innovation, Suite 301, Crystal Mall 1, 1911 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
D. (6) $2,636. E. (9) $2,195.18.

A. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,031.58. E. (9) $8,031.58.

A. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $129.61.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $340.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $1,000.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $47.50.

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) $40. E. (9) $5.

A. Donald L. Badders, 2030 M Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. TRW Credit Data, 2030 M Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $800.10.

A. John C. Bagwell, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Assoc., Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. George F. Bailey, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala. 36104.

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) $6,175. E. (9) $738.

A. Grace C. Braisinger, 2870 Arizona Terrace NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $791.60.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) $118.99. E. (9) $5.40.

A. Donald F. Bale, 995 L'Enfant Plaza North, SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. The Boeing Co., P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Wash. 98124.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $185.

A. Al J. Ballard, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, 1660 L Street NW., 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) $5,500. E. (9) $417.

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) $5,894.84.

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) $4,563.

A. James C. Barr, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Federal Credit Unions, 1156 15th Street NW., Suite 315, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $117.50.

A. Robert W. Barrie, 777 14th St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

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) $1,500. E. (9) $158.10.

A. Weldon Barton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,730.98. E. (9) $90.49.

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) $4,040.99.

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) $255.25.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1125 15th Street NW., No. 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $4,492.92. E. (9) $369.61.

A. John H. Beidler, 1125 15th Street NW. No. 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $6,631.74. E. (9) $313.

A. Page Belcher, Suite 870, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $217.

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. 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.
E. (9) $19.50.

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) $1,500. E. (9) $202.

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. Charles Binsted, 2945 Banksville Road, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15216.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.

A. Lydia Bitter, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. U.S. Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $350.

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. E. (9) $30.20.

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) $157.50.

A. Jerald Blizin, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York N.Y.

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.

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) $270.

A. Theodore H. Bornstein, 2028 37th Street, Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $150.

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. 28281.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $160.96.

A. Charles G. Botsford, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 609, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Albert D. Bourland, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 814, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,062.71.

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, 415 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 415 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) $7,661.79. E. (9) $734.03.

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) $2,692.31. E. (9) $331.61.

A. George E. Bradley, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. 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) $900.

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. Helen Bremberg, 4515 S. 31st Street, Apt. 202, Arlington, Va. 22206.
B. Women's Lobby Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $117.96.

A. Bill Brier, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,282.04. E. (9) $29.18.

A. Edward J. Brenner, Suite 301, Crystal Mall 1, 1911 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. Association for the Advancement of Invention and Innovation, Suite 301, Crystal Mall 1, 1911 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 TV 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) $600. E. (9) $166.64.

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. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $18.20.

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) $750. E. (9) $142.18.

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.

A. J. Colvin Brown, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $100.

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 & Chase, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Housing Producers, Suite 308, 10920 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman, Schomer & Chase, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Franchise Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C. 20036.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman, Schomer & Chase, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Massachusetts Bankers Association, Inc., 125 High Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.
E. (9) $65.72.

A. Brownstein, Ziedman, Schomer & Chase, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobile Home Manufacturers Association, 14650 Lee Road, Chantilly, Va. 22021.

A. Brownstein, Zeidman, Schomer & Chase, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., MGIC Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 53201.

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) $1,319.

A. Marguerite E. Bryan, 400 First Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. District No. 1, Pacific Coast District, Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $68.98.

A. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. St. Paul Title Insurance Corp., 1650 W. Big Beaver Road, Troy, Mich. 48084.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $45.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

A. 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) $279.29.

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) $129.97.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa. 18901.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.
E. (9) $644.95.

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) $192.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Phelps Dodge Corp., 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $351.30.

A. Robert D. Buehler, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 929, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio 44318.
D. (6) $220.

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) $538.13. E. (9) $110.99.

A. Carol Burris, 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Women's Lobby Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $286.

A. Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace and New National Priorities, 901 North Howard Street, Baltimore, Md. 21201.
D. (6) $706.95. E. (9) $956.30.

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) $8.14.

A. John W. Byrnes, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Cabot Corporation and Subsidiaries, 125 High Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.
D. (6) $1,660. E. (9) $12.77.

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) $5,788.44. E. (9) $479.28.

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) $1,446.69. E. (9) $8.

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) $107.31.

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) $269.50.

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. W. Dean Cannon, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, P.O. Box R, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.
B. California Savings and Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, P.O. Box R, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $555.28.

A. Marvin Caplan.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,097.25. E. (9) $96.16.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Kirlin, Campbell & Keating, Room 505, The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London EC3A 8ET, England.
D. (6) $7,034.62. E. (9) $452.28.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, Suite 370, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Norval E. Carey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $375.

A. Philip Carlip, 675 Fourth Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11232.
B. Seafarers International Union.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $1,615.83.

A. Elizabeth Carpenter, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $507.22. E. (9) $25.

A. L. C. Carpenter, 201 South 7th Street, Columbia, Mo.
B. Midcontinent Farmers Association.
D. (6) $5,299.32. E. (9) $993.61.

A. John R. Carson, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. David C. Carter, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. U.S. Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

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. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. South African Sugar Association, P.O. Box 507, Durban, South Africa.
D. (6) $25,000. E. (9) $5,693.58.

A. James Cassese, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
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) $30. E. (9) $122.86.

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.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $87.10.

A. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $43,812.88. E. (9) $21,345.85.

A. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., 400 World Center Building, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $1,108.08.

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) $1,004.71.

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. J. M. Chambers & Co., Inc., 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Satra Corp., 475 Park Avenue South, N.Y., N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Donald E. Channel, 1705 DeSales NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $25.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Retired Officers Association, 1625 Eye 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) $2,838.73.

A. Nancy H. Chasen, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $50.

A. Leslie Cheek III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. 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. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $41,274.45.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $34.69.

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) $270. E. (9) $30.75.

A. Richard W. Clark, 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) $488.03.

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. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, P.O. Box 6, Pittsburg, Kans. 66762.

A. Joan Claybrook, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
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) $769.92.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Interbank Card Association, Suite 3600, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $19.

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.

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) $1,600. E. (9) $12.

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) $75.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky. 40201.
E. (9) $75.

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) $75.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lorillard, Division of Loews Theatres, Inc., 200 East Forty-Second Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $75.

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) $75.

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) $75.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Ronald D. Clements, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $75.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $76.50.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Conecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Basketball Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Railroad Passenger Corp., 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. N.Y. Cocoa Exchange, Inc., 127 John Street, New York, N.Y., N.Y. Coffee & Sugar Exchange, Inc., 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y., Commodity Exchange, Inc., 81 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5.50.

A. Larry D. Cline, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $30.60.

A. COALition Against Strip Mining, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $1,138.26.

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. D. (9) $400.

A. John M. Coffey, Suite 870, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Page Belcher, Suite 870, 1730 Pennsylvannia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Jeffery Cohelan.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $933.33.

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) $245.73.

A. Jerry Cohen, 470 Totten Pond Road, Waltham, Mass. 02154.
B. Ruetgerswerke Aktiengesellschaft, Frankfurt am Main, West Germany.

A. Jerry S. Cohen, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, 2945 Banksville Road, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15216.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Timothy A. Colcord, 1620 I Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National BankAmericard Inc., Post Office Box 26673, San Francisco, Calif., 94126
D. (6) $7,291.66. E. (9) $7,996.72.

A. R. Michael Cole, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $78.50.

A. Robert E. Cole, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association of the U.S., 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., One Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $117.67.

A. Robert T. Cole, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. H. H. Robertson Co., Two Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,416.67. E. (9) $205.99.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent U.S. Tanker Owners Committee, 1612 K St., NW., Suite 510, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,599.21.

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) $1,200.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill and Edwards, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cylinder Manufacturers Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $50.

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. 20006.
B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 50 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $125.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $825.

A. Committee for Modern, Efficient Transportation, Suite 808, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $10,527.39.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $7,152.70.

A. Committee of Copyright Owners, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $27,362.41. E. (9) $23,254.63.

A. Committee on Strikes in Transportation, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036
D. (6) $89.32. E. (9) $89.32.

A. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,787,716.22. E. (9) $232,296.92.

A. Computer Industry Association, Inc., 16255 Ventura Boulevard, Encino, Calif. 91316.
D. (6) $153,733. E. (9) $7,392.

A. Harold B. Confer, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,493.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Academy of Actuaries, 208 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $137.60.

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 Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1,465.50. E. (9) $1,465.50.

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) $200. E. (9) $61.

A. Connecticut Bankers Association, 100 Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Conn. 06103.
D. (6) $1,313.58. E. (9) $1,313.58.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $250.

A. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

A. Consulting Engineers Council/U.S., 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $6,450. E. (9) $6,450.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 E. Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
B. American Dental Association, 211 E. 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. 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) $2,000. E. (9) $800.

A. Cook & Franke, 660 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.
B. Marshall & Isley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Eileen D. Cooke, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $598.80.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 S. Lee Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $483.16.

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) $10.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1025 W. Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, Canada.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $22.68.

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) $197.

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) $100. E. (9) $8.80.

A. Robert M. Coultas, 1612 K Street NW, Suite 508, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Institute for Rapid Transit,[1] 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) $11,559.30. E. (9) $4,540.03.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $710.52. E. (9) $710.52.

[1] An association of public agencies engaged in providing or planning urban mass transportation services and organizations which provide goods and services to such agencies.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Roger C. Courtney, 1730 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, % Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $295.68. E. (9) $312.30.

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. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 10006.
B. MGIC Investment Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 43201.

A. Covington & Burling, 888 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Eugene S. Cowen, 9024 Willow Valley Drive, Potomac, Md. 20854.
B. American Broadcasting Co., 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $21. E. (9) $21.

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.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $2.

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 1960, Shawnee Mission, Kans. 66222.
D. (6) $3,783. E. (9) $122.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Company (Ohio) Midland Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
E. (9) $4.

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) $2,483.09.

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.

A. H. C. Crotty, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 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) $25.30.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1 Farragut Square, South Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Canned and Cooked Meat Importers' Association, c/o Deltec International, Ltd.,

2801 Ponce De Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla. 33134.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $281.24.

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) $1,655.

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) $3,500.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th St. 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) $3,287.95.

A. William Daines, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $21[illegible].

A. Thomas A. Daly, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) $34.90. E. (9) $5.

A. Stephen I. Danzansky, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

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.
E. (9) $4,741.55.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $1,719. E. (9) $39.10.

A. Philip J. Daugherty.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $3,012.75. E. (9) $69.10.

A. John B. Davenport, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $80.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
B. American Meat Institute, 50 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $117.24.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Bankers Life & Casualty Co., 4444 Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60630.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $5.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. The Myron Stratton Home, P.O. Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $225.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
E. (9) $896.26.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 First National Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60670.
B. United Insurance Company of America, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $355. E. (9) $5.

A. Claire Davis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. R. Hilton Davis, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. 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. P. M. Davison, Jr., 418 East Rosser Avenue, Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak. 58501.
B. North Dakota Railway Lines.
E. (9) $475.52.

A. Daniel P. Dawson, 200 East Randolph Drive, M.C. No. 3101, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. Standard Oil Co., (Indiana), 200 East Randolph Drive, M.C. No. 3101, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $665. E. (9) $426.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30326.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $389.89.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $791.12.

A. Charles W. Day, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $245.

A. Ronald B. Dear, 1225 Martha Custis Drive, #1216, Alexandria, Va. 22302.
B. American Conservative Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $576.93.

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) $47.80.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Clairol, Inc., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $210.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Kansas City Southern Industries, Inc., 114 West 11th Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.
D. (6) $140.

A. DeHart & Broide, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $200.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. 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) $800.

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) $660.

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 & Publishers, 1 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., 1 Liberty Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10006.

A. Claude J. Desautels, Suite 811, 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, 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. C. H. DeVaney, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,281. E. (9) $55.84.

A. R. Daniel Devlin, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

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) $1,584. E. (9) $850.90.

A. Louis H. Diamond, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,300.

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) $6,029.76. E. (9) $94.49.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky. 41076.
D. (6) $47,125.58. E. (9) $47,125.58.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $3,140.

A. William H. Dodds, 1125 15th Street NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $6,538.24. E. (9) $732.54.

A. James F. Doherty.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,208.30. E. (9) $3,784.65.

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) $85.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 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) $348.75. E. (9) $160.02.

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) $1,691. E. (9) $1,741.

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) $324.25.

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) $31.75.

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) $407. E. (9) $162.60.

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) $3,038.55. E. (9) $270.

A. Richard Morgan Downey, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
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 6th Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

A. Harry J. Doyle, 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) $677.74. E. (9) $606.10.

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. David S. Dreyer, 4111 Backmeyer Road, Richmond, Ind. 47374.
B. Indiana Conservation Council, 2128 East 46th Street, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.
D. (6) $740.39. E. (9) $3.06.

A. Wilbur B. Dronen, 100 NE. Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
B. Caterpillar Tractor Co., 100 NE. Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D.(6) $670. E. (9) $669.80.

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) $333.20. E. (9) $440.41.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $120.

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) $4,329. E. (9) $2,306.79.

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. M. L. DuMars, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $60.

A. 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) $320. E. (9) $139.25.

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) $2,850. E. (9) $42.

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.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $2,418.

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) $340.

A. J. Frederick Durr, Rural Road No. 2, Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, Rural Road No. 2; Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
E. (9) $31.50.

A. Roy W. Easley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc.
D. (6) $69.

A. East-West Trade Council, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $426.66.

A. N. Boyd Ecker, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $250.

A. Daniel J. Edelman, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Safety Belt Council, Inc., New Rochelle, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $236.61.

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. J. Rodney Edwards, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York N.Y. 10016.

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) $350.25. E. (9) $23.03.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., 1600 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John Doyle Elliot, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.

A. Ruth Bowdey Elliot, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.
D. (6) $3,197. E. (9) $3,538.72.

A. Frank Ellis Associates, Inc., Suite 400, 1730 N. Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $195.10.

A. Roy Elson, 1771 N St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Emergency Commitee for the American Offshore Service Industry, 2000 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
E. (9) $459.50.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $32,772.50. E. (9) $36,135.69.

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) $5.48.

A. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
E. (9) $719.50.

A. Lowell J. Endahl, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $200.

A. Gertrude Engel, 2450 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. York Barbell Co., York, Pa.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $220.53.

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) $276.

A. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $11,499.11. E. (9) $16,593.80.

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) $24.75.

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) $24.50.

A. R. Scott Faley, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,300.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $91,737.50. E. (9) $33,139.68.

A. Edward J. Farrell, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.

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) $2,100. E. (9) $970.

A. Penelope S. Farthing, 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) $175.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $4,500.

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.
D. (6) $550.

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) $8,793.42. E. (9) $193.40.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, 321 Bloor Street East, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $77.

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) $5,360.85.

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) $7.50. E. (9) $4.

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) $7,013.90. E. (9) $8,362.50.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $7,250.

A. David M. Fleming, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $23.04.

A. Carl J. Fleps, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Greyhound Corp., Greyhound Tower, Phoenix, Ariz. 85077.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $34.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, P.O. Box 89, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.

A. Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, c/o C. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33887.
E. (9) $700.

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) $497.29.

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) $2,300. 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. 20006.
D. (6) $10.

A. David H. Foster.
B. National Cable TV 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) $121.86.

A. Alice Frandsen, 10311 Folk Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $47.45.

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) $218.75. E. (9) $12.46.

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) $5,200.

A. James O. Freeman, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $6.

A. Benjamin W. Fridge, 1900 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,727.56.

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) $52.21.

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. 20005.
D. (6) $100.

A. Gay H. Friedmann, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Lone Star Gas Co., 301 South Harwood, Dallas, Tex. 75201.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $100.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $34,342. E. (9) $11,467.

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) $382.50. E. (9) $1,508.15.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $350.

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) $150.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Council of Independent Laboratories, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Council of Professional Services Firms in Free Enterprise, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

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) $240.40. E. (9) $39.60.

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) $1,656.24.

A. Galland, Kharasch, Calkins & Brown, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Foss Launch and Tug Co., 660 West Ewing Street, Seattle, Wash. 98119.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $25.

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. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $3,368.33.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.
D. (6) $6,375.

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) $1,875. E. (9) $1,055.12.

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) $1,938.49.

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) $450. E. (9) $270.

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.
E. (9) $1.25.

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) $356.91.

A. Dave Givens, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37201.
B. Tennessee Railroad Association, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37201.
E. (9) $213.02.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.58.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $166.67. E. (9) $10.31.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 614, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J. 07470.
D. (6) $143. E. (9) $20.50.

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.

A. Ann Elena Gordon, 2300 McAuliffe Drive, Rockville, Md. 20851.
B. Women's Lobby Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $2.90.

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) $130.

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) $12,831.56. E. (9) $5,555.62.

A. David B. Graham, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $120.

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) $396.52. E. (9) $39.94.

A. Graphic Arts International Union, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Warren Graves, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $245.

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) $12,132.51. E. (9) $178.27.

A. Robert K. Gray, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $2,175. E. (9) $373.

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) $197.50. E. (9) $125.49.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho 83702.
B. Union Pacific Railroad, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
E. (9) $847.66.

A. Wayne Green, Peterborough, N.H. 03458.
B. Institute of Amateur Radio, Inc., Peterborough, N.H. 03458.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash. 98104.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash. 98104.
E. (9) $458.14.

A. Chellis O'Neal Gregory, Jr.
B. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $923.25.

A. William G. Greif, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Bristol-Myers Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $500.

A. Fred J. Greiner, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Evaporated Milk Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Milk Industry Foundation, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,926.28. E. (9) $8,926.28.

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) $662.49.

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. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. 60602.

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) $1,906.28.

A. Keith Halliday, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 1776 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Business Roundtable, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $250.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 1776 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Hardaway Co., 11th Street and Third Avenue, Columbus, Ga. 39102.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 1776 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 1500 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 1776 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

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) $50.84.

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) $1,174.99. E. (9) $49.52.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $629.71.

A. Thomas E. Harman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., room 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., room 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

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) $320. E. (9) $127.25.

A. John H. Harper, 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) $209.25. E. (9) $50.75.

A. Otto R. Harrison, Room 1909, 800 Bell Avenue, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., P.O. Box 2180. Houston, Tex.

A. William C. Hart, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 20 Montchanin Road, Wilmington, Del. 19807.
D. (6) $3,359.70. E. (9) $5,414.55.

A. Rita M. Hartz, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,683.20.

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 St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $831.77.

A. Sidney G. Hawkes, 800 17th St. NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Mead Corp., 118 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio 45482.
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) $23.25. E. (9) $144.92.

A. Bruce R. Hawley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $3.55.

A. Robert T. Hayden, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 5 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $3,754.16. E. (9) $1,196.33.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,281. E. (9) $62.35.

A. Patrick J. Head, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.
D. (6) $558. E. (9) $708.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,987.23. E. (9) $11,987.23.

A. Health Research Group, 2000 P Street NW., Suite 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $179.71. E. (9) $179.71.

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) $62.25.

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) $4,375.

A. Spencer H. Heine, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.
D. (6) $84.83. E. (9) $234.83.

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) $513.12.

A. Barbara Heller, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $212.50.

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) $600.

A. Leslie P. Hemry, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $473.82.

A. Lillie E. Herndon, P.O. Box 6213, Columbus, S.C. 29260.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $18,276.97. E. (9) $791.60.

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) $406.38.

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) $1,158.42.

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) $900.

A. Donald E. Hirsch, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,687. E. (9) $49.43.

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) $360.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1801 K Street NW., 9th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $195.

A. Glen D. Hofer, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
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 P. Holley, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Henry W. Holling, 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
B. Caterpillar Tractor Co., 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria Ill. 61602.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $590.

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) $8,571.

A. John W. Holton, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $28.

A. Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.

A. C. T. Hoversten, 209 West 53d Street, Western Springs, Ill. 60558.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, 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) $1,655.53. E. (9) $1,655.53.

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 Co., 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) $9,375. E. (9) $21.90.

A. The Human Life Amendment, The Bellevue Hotel, 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $928.50. E. (9) $1,169.33.

A. David J. Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $143.13.

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) $431.64.

A. David Ignatius, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Public Citizen, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $120.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

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. E. (9) $1.22.

A. Independent U.S. Tanker Owners Committee, 1612 K Street NW., Suite 510, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $9,300.78. E. (9) $10,076.25.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,137.16. E. (9) $8,137.16.

A. Timothy H. Ingram, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Council for a Livable World.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $13,402.75. E. (9) $540.

A. International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $4,411.06.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $15,802.40.

A. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich. 48124.
D. (6) $115,600. E. (9) $115,600.

A. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $3,213.45.

A. Investment Counsel Association of America, Inc., 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $1,086.25.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn. 55101.
D. (6) $7,073.36. E. (9) $10,003.71.

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. 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) $163.65.

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. Japanese American Citizens League, 22 Peace Plaza, Suite 203, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
E. (9) $200.

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) $595.

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.
E. (9) $336.

A. Anita Johnson, 2000 P Street NW., No. 708, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Health Research Group, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Jess Johnson, Jr., Suite 300, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., One Shell Plaza, P.O. Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $500.

A. Rady A. Johnson, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 200 East Randolph Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $910.31. E. (9) $4.25.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $5,453.50. E. (9) $108.84.

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) $4,195.27.

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) $367.02.

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) $55. E. (9) $30.

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) $16.

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) $12,336.

A. Richard J. Jones, 1110 Davidson Street, Champaign, Ill., 60631.
B. Independent Grocers Alliance, 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill., 60606.
D. (6) $175.

A. Ronald K. Jones, 8209 Carrleigh Parkway, Springfield, Va. 22152.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, P.O. Box 201, Chantilly, Va. 22021.
D. (6) $4,875. E. (9) $181.50.

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) $75.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert E. Juliano, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 120 East Fourth Street, 13th Floor, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $2,199.90.

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) $8.95.

A. Marvin Kamensky, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
E. (9) $1,100.

A. Roger P. Kaplan, 1341 G Street, NW., Suite 512, Washington, D.C.
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) $5.48.

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.
D. (6) $170.

A. William J. Keating, 725 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Howard B. Keck, 555 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
B. Superior Oil Co., 555 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. Superior Oil Co., 555 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
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. 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) $1,460.10.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. George Kelm, One First National Plaza, Suite 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. The Myron Stratton Home, P.O. Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.

A. R. G. Kendall, Jr., Montgomery, Ala. 36104.
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) $362.20.

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) $41.80.

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) $250. E. (9) $50.

A. Mrs. Walter G. Kimmel, 1715 25th Street, Rock Island, Ill. 61201.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $256.02.

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) $33.

A. Susan B. King.
B. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $5,760.

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) $498.

A. Kirkland, Ellis & Rowe, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 2 North Ninth Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 2 North Ninth Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
D. (6) $737.80. E. (9) $544.69.

A. James D. Kittelton, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.
D. (6) $6,875.01. E. (9) $64.55.

A. Ralph W. Kittle, Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $500.

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. Paul R. Knapp, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Lumbermens Mutual Casualty Co., Long Grove, Ill. 60049.
D. (6) $875.

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. Bradley R. Koch, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $153.

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) $47.10.

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) $4,616.41. E. (9) $1,164.10.

A. June Kysilko Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $100.

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. 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) $1,140. E. (9) $29.39.

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 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,092. E. (9) $1,246.08.

A. Norman G. Kurland, 2027 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $2,462.74.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL–CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13,909.36.

A. Labor Bureau of the Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,273. E. (9) $8,381.

A. Nick L. Laird, Suite 300, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Shell Oil Co., One Shell Plaza, P.O. Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $500.

A. A. M. Lampley, 40 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $250.

A. Karl S. Landstrom, 510 North Edison Street, Arlington, Va. 22203.
B. Sportsman's Paradise Homeowners Association, 10612 Dalerose Avenue, Inglewood, Calif. 90304.
E. (9) $188.49.

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) $496.41.

A. Clifford C. LaPlante, 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. The Boeing Co., P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Wash. 98124.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $175.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Automobile Association, D.C. Division, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Lawyers Committee to End the War. 1 Wall Street, 25th floor, New York, N.Y., 10005.
E. (9) $2,229.33.

A. Monte Lazarus, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $203.87.

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. 20005.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Robert W. Lee, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 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) $172. E. (9) $1,204.40.

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., P.O. Box 3727, Spokane, Wash. 99220.
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) $649.70.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55440.
D. (6) $6,040. E. (9) $503.53.

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) $690.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroad Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Harry LeVine, Jr., 777 14th Street NW. Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. J. Stanly Lewis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $3,215.21.

A. Robert G. Lewis.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,615.38. E. (9) $132.30.

A. Ronald L. Leymeister, 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) $204.39.

A. Herbert Liebenson, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,200.

A. Russell B. Light, 955 L'Enfant Plaza North SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. The Boeing Co., P.O. Box 3707, Seattle, Wash., 98124.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $123.40.

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.
D. (6) $960.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, 1331 Southwest Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.
D. (6) $3,234. E. (9) $1,680.34.

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) $2,784.83. E. (9) $2,156.27.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 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) $23.54.

A. John E. Linster, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
B. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.
D. (6) $500.

A. Joseph Lippman, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $50.

A. Charles B. Lipsen.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,442.34. E. (9) $487.

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 Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $316.05. E. (9) $167.24.

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) $200.

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) $400. E. (9) $455.

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) $450.

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 20th 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) $500. 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) $3,500. E. (9) $10.

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.
D. (6) $336.

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. 20036.
E. (9) $13.35.

A. James H. Lynch, Jr., 1325 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5,835.90. E. (9) $122.84.

A. Mark H. Lynch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $200.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.
B. California Railroad Association, 11th and L Building, Sacramento, Calif. 95814.

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) $1,554.25.

A. James E. Mack, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Confectioners Association, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60603.
D. (6) $11,250. E. (9) $903.63.

A. Kenneth MacKenzie, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., P.O. Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.
D. (6) $54. E. (9) $204.

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) $1,875. E. (9) $20.

A. Andre Maisonpierre, 666 11th Street, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $495.

A. Ben J. Man, 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) $1,638. E. (9) $331.67.

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) 450. E. (9) $15.70.

A. Management Communications, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Potters Industries, Inc., Industrial Road, P.O. Box 14, Carlstadt, N.J. 07072.
D. (6) $450.

A. Management Communications, Inc., 1505 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Recycled Paperboard Division of the American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $21.90.

A. Carter Manasco, 8932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
B. National Coal Association, 1130 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,217.50. E. (9) $104.40.

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) $71.49. E. (9) $219.44.

A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. John V. Maraney, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C., 20003.

A. Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, District No. 1, Pacific Coast District, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
E. (9) $5,174.58.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

A. Ralph J. Marlatt, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $1,170.00.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 200 C Street SE., No. 401, Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $4,638. E. (9) $665.84.

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.

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) 286.68. E. (9) $162.55.

A. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Wilwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Guy R. Martin, State of Alaska, Department of Law, 655 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $7,875. E. (9) $7,878.36.

A. Richard E. 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) $994.98. E. (9) $1,114.10.

A. Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society, Inc., Timonium State Fair Grounds, Timonium, Md. 21993.
E. (9) $5.48.

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 M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Nisei Lobby, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, P.O. Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
D. (6) $500.

A. 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 & Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5.499.91. E. (9) $940.

A. P. H. Mathews, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE, Washington, DC. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $502.66. E. (9) $546.70.

A. John J. L. Matson, 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) $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) $562.50. E. (9) $127.50.

A. Robert A. Matthews, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 801 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) $320.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

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.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $177.70.

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) $850.

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. 20036.
B. American Land Title Association, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $20.

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 Co., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. William C. McCamant, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $300.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Horse Protection Association, 629 River Bend Road, Great Falls, Va.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $10.50.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $50.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $10.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Government Employees Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $3,019.38.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., P.O. Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga. 30301.
E. (9) $70.25.

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) $141.85.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Magnavox Co., 1700 Magnavox Way, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Mobil Oil Corporation, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) $105.02.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Montgomery Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., North Perry and Jefferson Streets, Montgomery, Ala. 36103.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. 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) $8.

A. E. L. McCulloch, Room 819, 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) $506.80. E. (9) $95.05.

A. Francis O. McDermott, 1750 K Street NW., Suite 1110, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
E. (9) $896.26.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont. 59701.
E. (9) $37.66.

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. 20036.

A. J. Raymond McGlaughlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.
D. (6) $7,080.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $102.30.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Retired & Veteran Railway Employees, Inc., Post Office Box 6069, Kansas City, Kans. 66106.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $500.

A. Clifford G. McIntire, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $24.85.

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.
B. First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Phoenix, Tucson Federal Savings & Loan Association.

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) $247.41.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, Suite 609, 1400 North Uhle Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. Marine Corps League, National Headquarters, Suite 317, 933 North Kenmore Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
E. (9) $10.50.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, Suite 609, 1400 North Uhle Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
B. Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States, Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex. 78298.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $2,411.92.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $150.

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) $575. E. (9) $295.40.

A. C. W. McMillan, Suite 1015, National Press Building, 14th and F Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.
D. (6) $1,500.

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.
B. American Dredging Co., 12 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107; Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60601; Dunbar & Sullivan Dredging Co., 22720 Michigan Avenue, Dearborn, Mich. 48124.
D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $1,553.27.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., Suite 1100, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montgomery Ward, Inc., 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $50.

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) $488.55.

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) $430. E. (9) $598.06.

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.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $1,958.61.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,527. E. (9) $327.19.

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. 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. Ronald Michieli, Suite 1015, National Press Building, 14th and F Streets, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American National Cattlemen's Assn., 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103.
D. (6) $20.13. E. (9) $732.59.

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) $10.91.

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, Nebr. 68179.
D. (6) $6,550.02. E. (9) $1,222.10.

A. Joe D. Miller, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
D. (6) $875.

A. Luman G. Miller, 620 S.W. Fifth Avenue Building, Suite 912, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 620 S.W. Fifth Avenue Building, Suite 912, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
E. (9) $245.04.

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. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Thomas F. Mitchell, 1735 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., 900 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
E. (9) $250.

A. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, P.O. Box 201, 14650 Lee Road, Chantilly, Va. 22021.
D. (6) $1,681.50. E. (9) $1,681.50.

A. John S. Monagan, Whitman & Ransom, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Connecticut Bankers Association, 100 Constitution Plaza, Hartford, Conn. 06103.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $63.58.

A. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $2,421.83.

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) $71.89. E. (9) $81.02.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $6,986.

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) $1,144.75.

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. Cleary, 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, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 206, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Lone Star Gas Co., 301 South Harwood, Dallas, Tex. 75201.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $580.

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. (9) $1,238.79.

A. Jack Moskowitz, 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) $139.42.

A. Lynn E. Mote, 1132 15th Street NW., Suite 503, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Central Gulf Steamship Corp., New Orleans, La.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Secondary Materials Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers and Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Sugar Distributors of Venezuela, Edif de la Luz Electrica de Venezuela, Av. Urdaneta, Seventh Floor, Caracas, Venezuela.

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) $269.64.

A. John J. Murphy, 416 Shoreham Building, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Customs Service Association.
D. (6) $1,154.88. E. (9) $1,154.88.

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. 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. Tom O. Murphy, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., 516 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $173.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., 1460 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $137.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 1103, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Industrial Parks, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $120. E. (9) $192.13.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $185.

A. Thomas H. Mutchler.
B. International Paper Co., 1620 I Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $23.65.

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.

A. John J. Nangle, 1626 I Street NW., Suite 812, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 2600 River Road, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $500.

A. Bonnie Jane Naradzay, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Congress Watch, 133 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $87.50.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Suite 711, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,475. E. (9) $6,430.60.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. National Association for Humane Legislation, Inc., 675 Pinellas Point Drive South, St. Petersburg, Fla. 33705.
D. (6) $119. E. (9) $314.24.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010.
D. (6) $1,259.81. E. (9) $7,917.46.

A. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, c/o J. Frederick Durr, Rural Route No. 2, Sheridan, Ind. 46069.
D. (6) $227.05. E. (9) $227.05.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
E. (9) $26,932.42.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $2,886,904.84. E. (9) $30,392.58.

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) $7,966.32. E. (9) $7,966.32.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,588.13. E. (9) $3,588.13.

A. National Association of Realtors, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) $17,509.07.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va., 22030.
D. (6) $6,768.97. E. (9) $7,009.69.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. National Building Granite Quarries Association, Inc., 202 South Second Street, Cold Spring, Minn.
E. (9) $9,042.68.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $764,877.61. E. (9) $3,774.68.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $448,590.19. E. (9) $3,258.72.

A. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $2,046.65.

A. National Committee for Effective No-Fault, 2535 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $800.

A. National Consumer Center for Legal Services, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,72[illegible]. E(9) $5,200.

A. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $36,275.84. E. (9) $36,275.84.

A. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $153.25. E. (9) $30.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $31,646. E. (9) $32,258.

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.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $87.50.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Cenco, Inc., 2600 S. Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $92.27.

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) $51.02.

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) $9,000. E. (9) $300.14.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 39326.
E. (9) $12,080.69.

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) $328,390.44. E. (9) $18,100.16.

A. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain and Feed Association.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $121,600.19. E. (9) $11,670.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $455.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $9,811.52. E. (9) $504.41.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $16,894.80. E. (9) $16,894.80.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Bldg., Omaha, Nebr. 68107.
D. (6) $4,707.96. E. (9) $4,707.96.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $3,394.91.

A. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $2,772.30. E. (9) $600.

A. National Patent Council, 1225 19th Street NW., Suite 409, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,575.50. E. (9) $800.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,347. E. (9) $1,458.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,556.50.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
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) $14,004.82.

A. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $15,675.50. E. (9) $4,406.75.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 2100 M Street NW., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20037.
E. (9) $880.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $14,866. E. (9) $6,533.53.

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.

A. Allen Neece, Jr., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $300.

A. Frances E. Neely, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,792.

A. Stanley Nehmer, Suite 800, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, DC. 20036
B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $500.

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. Robert W. Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $160.

A. Ivan A. Nestingen, Suite 700, 1010 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $228.95.

A. Robert B. Neville, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,362. E. (9) $90.82.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $547.80.

A. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) $13,500. E. (9) $20,370.

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.

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) $3,366.69.

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) $850. E. (9) $473.30.

A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa. 18332.
B. Northern Helex Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) $2,432.45. E. (9) $538.70.

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) $8,273.79. E. (9) $833.58.

A. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
E. (9) $562.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1225 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $150.98.

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) $1,256.41.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20015.
B. American Podiatry Association, 20 Chevy Chase Circle, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

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) $844.42.

A. O'Connor, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Transit Association, 465 L'Enfant Plaza West SW., Suite 2900, Washington, D.C. 20024.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $179.

A. O'Connor, 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) $133.40.

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) $190.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, 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, No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Philippine Sugar Institute, Box 978, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $250.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) $4,529.98. E. (9) $1,483.24.

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 Banks Association of Massachusetts, 50 Congress Street, Boston, Mass. 02109.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
E. (9) $356.91.

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. Michael S. Olson, P.O. Box 2776, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.
B. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, P.O. Box 2776, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.

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) $45.25.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $168.16.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 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) $4,673.49. E. (9) $786.26.

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. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa. 19035.
B. Campbell Soup Co., Campbell Place, Camden, N.J. 08101.

A. Norman Paige, 538 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Distilled Spirits Council of the United States, Inc., 538 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. William G. Painter, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Rivers Conservation Council, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $266.66.

A. Edward J. Panarello, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $6,483.23. E. (9) $602.20.

A. Frederick Panzer, 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. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $190.23.

A. Kenton Pattie, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) $1,418.18.

A. Ellen Pattin, 6907 Lyle Street, Lanham, Md. 20801.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $17.10.

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) $1,142.50. E. (9) $47.12.

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) $650.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Boating Industry Association, 401 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $33.57.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Central American Sugar Council, 1200 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $41.35.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Chippewa-Cree Tribe, Rocky Boy Route, Box Elder, Mont. 59521.
D. (6) $1,670. E. (9) $294.61.

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) $3,400. E. (9) $48.77.

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) $240. E. (9) $944.15.

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) $590.

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) $150.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Nestle Co., 100 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, N.Y., 10605.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. New Process Co., 220 Hickory Street, Warren, Pa. 16365.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Patton, Boggs & Blow, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63188.
D. (6) $2,100.

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 N.W., 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. Warner Brothers Inc., 4000 Warner Boulevard, Burbank, Calif. 91505.
D. (6) $8,941.90. E. (9) $778.56.

A. Jack Pearce, Suite 808, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee on Modern, Efficient Transportation, Suite 808, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,400. E. (9) $2,127.39.

A. John J. Pecoraro, 1750 New York Avenue, 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) $6,268.

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 and Vegetable Association, P.O. Box 20155, Orlando, Fla. 32814; Florida Citrus Mutual, P.O. Box 89, Lakeland, Fla. 33802; Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, c/o C. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33877.
D. (6) $1,448.68. E. (9) $10.

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. Roger J. Phaneuf, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $125.50.

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) $53.50.

A. Howard Phillips, 4220 Linden Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. American Conservative Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Daphne Philos, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) $1,525. E. (9) $1,750.78.

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) $90.64.

A. Pierson, Ball & Dowd, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.
D. (6) $1,000.

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. Political Action Committee 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 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $2.42.

A. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $4,680.

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) $3,000. E. (9) $29.45.

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) $1,055. E. (9) $31.25.

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. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) $549.78. E. (9) $70.77.

A. William C. Prather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Driver, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $137.65.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $312.60.

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.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $2,868.73.

A. Prod, Inc., Suite 511, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $44.

A. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $50.

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. Joseph E. Quin, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $720.

A. William A. Quinlan, Route 8, Box 238, Annapolis, Md. 21401.
D. (6) $1,516. E. (9) $424.48.

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) $344.56.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) $2,204.72.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $393.12.

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) $51.70. E. (9) $14.92.

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) $143.75. E. (9) $160.17.

A. G. J. Rauschenbach.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $650.

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) $20. E. (9) $30.

A. Dwight C. Reed, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) $100.96. E. (9) $2.

A. David J. Reedy, 6S430 Huntington Circle East, Naperville, Ill. 60540.
B. National Advertising Co., 6850 South Harlem Avenue, Bedford Park, Argo, Ill. 60501.
D. (6) $1,600

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. John A. Reilly, 59 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10038.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, Emma Giambald, George Hallingby.
E. (9) $25.

A. W. W. Renfroe, 69 Fountain Place, Wilkinson, Street, Capital Plaza, Frankfort, Ky. 40601.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, 69 Fountain Place, Wilkinson Street, Capital Plaza, Frankfort, Ky. 40601.
E. (9) $382.61.

A. The Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,973.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Suite 529, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) $4,982.68. E. (9) $8,043.12.

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) $175. E. (9) $82.

A. Austin T. Rhoads.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1130 17th Street NW., No. 420, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Continental Oil Co., High Ridge Park, Stamford, Conn. 06904.

A. Maxwell E. Rich, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $625.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.
B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.

A. 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. 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. 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) $145.07.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $294.57.

A. John P. Roche, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $210.

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 Cos., 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. Rogers & Wells, 1666 K Street NW., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Deltona Corp., 3250 Southwest Third Avenue, Miami, Fla. 33129.
D. (6) $1,102.50.

A. Rouss & 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.
D. (6) $2,900. E. (9) $939.81.

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) $6,978.46. E. (9) $814.46.

A. Wally Rustad, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. 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) $400. E. (9) $1,336.83.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., No. 514, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $986.46.

A. E. M. 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) $45.55.

A. Sachs, Greenebaum & Tayler, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson Street, Muncie, Ind.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Carl K. Sadler, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Federation of Government Employees, 1325 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $7,046.20. E. (9) $7,521.16.

A. Irene Saunders.
B. Center for Public Financing of Elections, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $155.81.

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) $300.

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) $1,249.98. E. (9) $346.90.

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 and 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) $5.48.

A. Stephen I. Schlossberg, 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) $7,573.74. E. (9) $726.75.

A. Donald H. Schwab, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.
D. (6) $1,821.88. E. (9) $26.10.

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.
D. (6) $844. E. (9) $18.

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 802, 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 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $37.14.

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) $306. E. (9) $13.85.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 302, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) $125. 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) $152.07.

A. J. Richard Sewell, 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. 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) $435. E. (9) $120.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Albright Title & Trust Co., American Title Insurance Co., Chelsea Title & Guaranty Co.
D. (6) $2,248.90. E. (9) $785.51.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard Allington, Estate of Robert P. Anninger, Henry Arnhold.
E. (9) $47.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $106.50.

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.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $193.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Independent Grocers Alliance, National Institutional Food Distributors Associates, Inc., Topco Associates, Inc.
D. (6) $7,813.52. E. (9) $2,263.99.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
E. (9) $114.25.

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.; Fur Conservation Council of America, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $114.50.

A. James R. Sharp, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ametalco, Inc., 530 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, Barr Building, 910 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Doubleday & 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) $6,195.25. E. (9) $4,864.78.

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.

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) $1,210.

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) $1,356.30.

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. Gilbert Simonetti, Jr., 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of CPA's, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

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) $235.26.

A. Talmage E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $101.40.

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) $1,246.27.

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. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,062.50. E. (9) $4.

A. Smathers, Merrigan & Herlong, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Horse Council, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $1,006.50.

A. Smathers, Merrigan & Herlong, 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. (9) $90.80.

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) $202.67.

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 E. Smith, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $264.25.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Edward Gottlieb and Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison 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.
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) $374. E. (9) $302.

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) $2,465. E. (9) $1,170.40.

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. 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) $94.95.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,941.

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) $400.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, P.O. Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C. 20007.
D. (6) $3,849.87. E. (9) $2,963.01.

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.
E. (9) $604.67.

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.

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.
D. (6) $624.

A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Standard Oil Co., 200 East Randolph Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $733.04. E. (9) $3.28.

A. Frank J. Specht, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William C. Spence, Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Columbia Gulf Transmission Co., Box 683, Houston, Tex. 77001.
D. (6) $290. E. (9) $70.89.

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. Sportsman's Paradise Homeowners Association, 10612 Dalerose Avenue, Inglewood, Calif. 90304.
E. (9) $246.75.

A. Squibb Corp., 40 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019.
E. (9) $72.

A. John M. Stackhouse, The 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) $2,892.50. E. (9) $82.84.

A. The Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $844.42.

A. Melvin L. Stark, Sr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Blake Building, 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.
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) $100. E. (9) $4.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wynne A. Stevens, Jr., 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
D. (6) $870.

A. Travis B. Stewart, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Hoffman-La Roche Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J. 07110.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $100.

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. Catherine Stirling, 7012 Beechwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $700.

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) $399.25.

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. Cynthia Day Stratton, 6300 Stratford Road, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $27.50.

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) $1,730.

A. Roger J. Stroh, 777 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $193.74. E. (9) $16.50.

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) $20.10.

A. R. Keith Stroup, 2105 N Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $450.

A. Norman Strunk, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $681.26.

A. Richard L. Studley, 1400 20th Street NW., P.O. Box 19128, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., P.O. Box 19128, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Walter B. Stults, 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $600.

A. Sullivan, Beauregard, Meyers & Clarkson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $613.05.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1666 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Credit Co., P.O. Box 4081, Atlanta, Ga. 30302.
E. (9) $80.

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) $13,894.63. E. (9) $2,508.69.

A. Irving W. Swanson, 1155 15th Street NW., 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) $400. E. (9) $318.50.

A. Ronald E. Sweet, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Federation of Professional and 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) $131.58.

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. 2036.

A. Charles C. Talley, 100 Agnes Court, Charlottesville, Va. 22901.
B. National Congress of Parents & 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. 20038.
D. (6) $225.

A. Tax Reform Research Group, 733 15th Street NW., Suite 426, Washington, D.C. 20005
D. (6) $515.15. E. (9) $515.15.

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, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hart Metals, Inc., Tamaqua, Pa. 18252.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. J. Woodrow 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 Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William D. Thompson, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Blvd., Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,621.57.

A. Cyrus C. Tichenor III, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. A. H. Robins Co., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va. 23220.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $1,280.89.

A. Paul J. Tierney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. Philip Tierney, 711 Princess Street, Alexandria, Va. 22313.
B. Estate of Paul T. Stone, 515 King Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

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 & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $1,666.

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) $200.25.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, No. 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $513.94. E. (9) $219.06.

A. Christine Topping, Suite 614, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Bipartisan Committee on Absentee Voting, Inc., Suite 614, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $229.70.

A. John P. Tracey.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 De Sales 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.
E. (9) $577.43.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) $2,688. E. (9) $40.91.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $78.50.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $792. E. (9) $175.

A. St. Clair J. Tweedie, 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) $358.10. E. (9) $25.80.
E. (9) $1,000.

A. Joseph D. Tydings, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $8,300. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Joseph D. Tydings, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $163.20. E. (9) $91.75.

A. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) $14,387.05.

A. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,218.25. E. (9) $2,218.25.

A. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $8,647.11.

A. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $294.77.

A. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $50,503.35.

A. Universal Development Consultants, Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America.
D. (6) $625.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1720 I Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
E. (9) $274.74.

A. Lois Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va. 22302.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $108. 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) $565.75. E. (9) $431.69.

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) $63. E. (9) $14.75.

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) $95.

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.
D. (6) $650.

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) $28.30.

A. Walter D. Vinyard, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. Bruce E. Vogelsinger, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Consulting Engineers Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $50.

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) $15.70.

A. Paul A. Wagner, 1125 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $4,338.24. E. (9) 1,345.68.

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) $379.75.

A. John S. Walker, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Glidden-Durkee Division of SCM Corp., 5601 Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md. 21224.
D. (6) $100.

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.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $80.22.

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.
E. (9) $80.22.

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) $1,238.10. E. (9) $80.22.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Electric Co., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,238.10. E. (9) $80.22.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. General Motors Corp., General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
E. (9) $80.22.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Georgia-Pacific Corp., 900 Southwest Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. 97204.
E. (9) $80.22.

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.
D. (6) $500.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Steel Corp., 2800 Grant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $80.22.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Procter & 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.
D. (6) $300.

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.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $80.22.

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.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $80.22.

A. Charls E. Walker Associates, Inc., 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash. 98401.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $80.22.

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 & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $5,068.44. E. (9) $915.37.

A. Charles S. Walsh.
B. National Cable TV 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 & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) $5,063.52. E. (9) $516.65.

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) $5,247. E. (9) $580.

A. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,320.42.

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, 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) $41.10.

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) $12,999.70. E. (9) $1,603.75.

A. Fred Wegner, 1750 K Street NW., Suite 1190, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retired Persons Services, Inc., 1750 K Street NW., Suite 1190, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $10.50.

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. Weisman, Celler, Spett, Modlin & Wertheimer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 910, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Lawrence N. Brandt & Co., 4201 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. Bernard J. Welch, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $108.12.

A. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul S. Weller, Jr., 1129 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,949.99. E. (9) $57.64.

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) $7,500. E. (9) 260.25.

A. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, P.O. Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
E. (9) $500.

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. 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. Robert Y. Wheeler, Box 185, Tilden, Tex., 78072.
B. Ernest G. Herman, 9538 Brighton Way, Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210.

A. Wheeler, Van Sickle, Day & Anderson, 25 West Main Street, Madison, Wis. 53703.
B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Donald F. White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $70.

A. John C. White, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. White, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio 45840.
E. (9) $708.43.

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 Whitlock 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) $150.

A. Alan J. Whitney, 1341 G Street NW., Suite 512, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Government Employees, Inc., 285 Dorchester Avenue, Boston, Mass. 02127.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $400.

A. Robert E. Wick, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $55.10.

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) $3,979.12.

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) $250.

A. David Wilken, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2030 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $120.

A. Francis G. Williams.
B. American Frozen Foods 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. Robert E. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Line, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $434.84.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Auto-Train Corp., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
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.
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) $20.

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) $200.

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) $200.

A. Williams & King, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Nutritional Foods Association, 7727 South Painter Avenue, Whittier, Calif. 90602.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $502.16.

A. Williams & King, 1620 I Street NW., Washingon, D.C. 20006.
B. Noranda Mines Ltd., P.O. Box 45, Commerce Court West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $278.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 2130 LeRoy Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Seventh-day Adventist Hospital Association, 6840 Eastern Avenue NW., Washingon, D.C. 20012.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $166.85.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Basketball Association 1700 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $247.43. E. (9) $138.66.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 1666 K Street NW., Washingon, D.C. 20006.
B. Council for Responsible Nutrition, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $10.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Oil Investment Institute, 2500 Dunstan, Houston, Tex. 77005.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La. 71106.
B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77005.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $50.

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) $2,018.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.
B. Colo. RR Assn., 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $825.

A. Barry Wolf, 631 North Carolina Avenue SE, Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $20.

A. Peter L. Wolff, Suite 370, 1 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, 1 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) $8,308.80. E. (9) $563.08.

A. Kenneth D. 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) $1,250.

A. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1213 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.
D. (6) $9,543.54. E. (9) $6,935.95.

A. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $6,056. E. (9) $5,260.

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $150.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Signal Companies, Inc., 9665 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif. 90212.

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) $6,000. E. (9) $311.

A. George M. Worden, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $45.
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) $2,250. E. (9) 52.58.

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. Airbus Industrie, 160 Avenue de Versailles, Paris, 16, France.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $11.35.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., 1675 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.
D. (6) $150.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. California Canners & Growers, 3100 Ferry Building, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.
D. (6) $450.

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 Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Embassy of the Government of the Republic of Korea, 2320 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. City of Palm Springs, 3200 Tahquitz-McCallum Way, Palm Springs, Calif. 92262.
D. (6) $250.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Petersen Publishing Co., 8490 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 90069.

A. Leslie A. Yates, 1215 Lawrence Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20017.
B. Washington Office on Africa, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
D. (6) $681.

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) $691.44. E. (9) $935.62.

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) $57.99.

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1973 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter.

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

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, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Association of Realtors, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,850. E. (9) $79.45.

A. Action for Legal Rights, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,828.30. E. (9) $11,299.66.

A. Actors Equity Association, 165 West 46th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Air-Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, 1815 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $624.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,442.19. E. (9) 8,442.19.

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) $1,200.

A. American Conservative Union, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $21,742.53. E. (9) $8,090.99.

A American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $5,873.82. E. (9) $5,873.82.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
E. (9) $1,950.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.
D. (6) $57,552.10. (9) $57,552.10.

A. American Rivers Conservation Council, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $470.10. E. (9) $359.23.

A. American Society of Consulting Planners, 1750 Old Meadow Road, McLean, Va. 22101.
E. (9) $1,249.98.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28281.
D. (6) $19,768.16. E. (9) $19,768.16.

A. J. Lem Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Room 809, Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Eastex Inc., 229 North Bowie Street, Jasper, Tex. 75951.

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) $200. E. (9) $68.75.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Franklin Life Insurance Co., Franklin Life Square, Springfield, Ill. 62705.
E. (9) $2.50.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Maremont Corp., 168 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) $1,020. E. (9) $14.85.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Powell Lumber Co., Lake Charles, La.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $25.69.

A. Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc., P.O. Box 8733, Friendship International Airport, Md. 21240.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,250.

A. Gary D. Avery, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10015.
D. (6) $294. E. (9) $113.44.

A. Charles W. Bailey, 1990 M Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1990 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Emil F. Baker, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Peter M. Balitsaris, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,396.11. E. (9) $143.55.

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.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $36.

A. Al J. Ballard, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. William B. Barton, 632 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc., P.O. Box 8733, Friendship International Airport, Md. 21240.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $5.

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. Winston Everett Bell, P.O. Box 1718, Las Vegas, Nev. 89101.

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) $3,000.

A. H. Michael Bennett, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Action for Legal Rights, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Linda M. Billings, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Sierra Club, 1050 Mills Tower, 220 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $246.

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. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co., 12th Street at Hill, Los Angeles, Calif. 90054.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Paul Revere Corp., Worcester, Mass. 01608.
D. (6) $100.

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.
E. (9) $160.

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.
E. (9) $160.

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. Helen Bremberg, 4515 South 31st Street Apt. 202, Arlington, Va. 22206.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $46.40.

A. Cyril F. Brickfield, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Association of Retired Persons/Naticnal Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $1,613.05.

A. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20.56.

A. Teresa A. Brooks, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 209, Bailey's Crossroads, Va. 22041.
B. American Osteopathic Hospital Association, 930 Busse Highway, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $250.

A. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill.
D. (6) $21,741.10. E.(9) $21,741.10.

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) $1,495.36. E.(9) $167.85.

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) 105.98.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The Hearst Corp., 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. David A. Bunn, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Parcel Post Association, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $700.

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) 134.24.

A. George J. Burger, 250 W. 57th Street, New York City, N.Y.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York City, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 30 Clinton Place, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, New Rochelle, N.Y. 10801.
D. (6) $4,249.98. E. (9) $366.30.

A. J. J. Burke, Jr., 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont. 59701.

A. Carol Burris, 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E.(9) $100.

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.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Paul M. Butler, Jr., 53 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
B. Schlumberger Ltd., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $15,000.

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.
D. (6) $1,500.

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) $6,646.80.

A. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 706 Raleigh Building, P.O. Box 2776, Raleigh, N.C.

A. Blue Carstenson, Carstenson & Associates, Room 509, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $7.00

A. Donald E. Chanell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $30.

A. Chapman, Duff and Lenzini, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Fouke Co., Route 1, Box 168, White Horse Road, Greenville, S.C. 29611.

A. Leslie Cheek III, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515 Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515 Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. 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) $2.76.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $6,305. E. (9) $6,575.85.

A. Citizens for Control of Federal Spending, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $102,350. E. (9) $30,335.04.

A. Coalition of Concerned Charities, c/o John G. Milliken, Suite 1102, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,834.56. E. (9) $9,266.22.

A. Coalition to Tax Pollution, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $3,876.19.

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) $7,124.99. E. (9) $785.47.

A. The Coca-Cola Bottlers' Association, 166 16th Street NW., Atlanta, Ga. 30318.
D. (6) $14,350. E. (9) $608.73.

A. Jeffery Cohelan, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., No. 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $900.

A. Cohen and Uretz, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. McDonnell Douglas Finance Corp., 3855 Lakewood Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif. 90801.
D. (6) $3,824.83. E. (9) $139.18.

A. C. S. Coleman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $120.

A. Colson & Shapiro, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for the Martin Report, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $1250.20.

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. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (6) $22,331.85. E. (9) $23,583.56.

A. Committee for Modern, Efficient Transportation, Suite 808, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,500. E. (9) $10,325.09.

A. The Committee of Publicly Owned Companies, 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
D. (6) $202,375. E. (9) $80,221.

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. Council of AFL–CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,250.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Adhesive & Sealant Council, 1410 Higgins Road, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Industrial Diamond Association of America, 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19103.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, 156 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Kohler Co., Kohler, Wis. 53044.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Linen Supply Association of America, 975 Arthur Godfrey Road, Miami Beach, Fla. 33140.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Casualty & Surety Agents, 5225 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Printing Ink Manufacturers, 101 Executive Building, Elmsford, N.Y. 10523.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Glass Dealers Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Optical Manufacturers Association, 30 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. John A. Couture, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 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) $297.47.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $4,500.59. E. (9) $967.07.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $9,000. E. (9) $398.49.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey, 1100 Raymond Boulevard, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $57.08.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Office Machine Dealers Association, 1510 Jarvis Avenue, Elkgrove Village, Ill. 60007.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Stephen I. Danzansky, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $133.92.

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) $320. E. (9) $239.70.

A. John B. Davenport, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Assoc., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. Claire C. Davis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. P. M. Davison, Jr., 418 East Rosser Avenue, Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak. 58501.
B. North Dakota Railway Lines.
E. (9) $1,455.92.

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. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. 84101.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,186.56.

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.

A. Dealer Bank Association, P.O. Box 479, Wall Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $850. E. (9) $256.

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.
E. (9) $140.

A. Steven P. Doehler, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Realtors, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,187.50.

A. James F. Doherty, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., No. 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., No. 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $9,956.33.

A. Carol Ann Douglas, 3100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Apt. 204, Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $62.

A. M. L. DuMars, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electronic Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $60.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $90.75. E. (9) $28.40.

A. Hope Eastman, 410 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $36,067.10. E. (9) $36,067.10.

A. Frank Ellis Associates, Inc., Suite 400, 1730 North Lynn Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) $195.10.

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) $1,383.26.

A. Lowell J. Endahl, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $185.

A. Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Edward J. Farrell, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. George Bronz, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. James I. Fender.
B. Caterpillar Tractor Co., 100 Northeast Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

A. Fensterwald & Ohlhausen, 910 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $2,383.60.

A. Frank C. Fini, 2020 Brooks Drive, Apt. 618, Suitland, Md. 20028.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, 6101 28th Avenue SE., Marlow Heights, Md. 20031.

A. David M. Fleming, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

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.
E. (9) $140.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, P.O. Box 20155, Orlando, Fla. 32814.
D. (6) $301.32. E. (9) $301.32.

A. Forest Farmers Association, 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.
D. (6) $241.69. E. (9) $241.69.

A. Fortas & Koven, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
B. Committee of Publicly Owned Cos., 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
D. (6) $22,500.

A. Alice Frandsen, 10311 Folk Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $74.73.

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) $1,096.56. E. (9) $162.40.

A. Charles L. Frazier, 485 L'Enfant Plaza SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
B. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa 50841.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $2,307.78.

A. Friends of the Earth, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $7,600. E. (9) $3,800.

A. Frosh, Lane and Edson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Housing Consultants, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100.

A. Frosh, Lane and 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. 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., 1255 K 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, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $500.

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) $975.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $260,825. E. (9) $116.

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) $2,404.96. E. (9) $313.49.

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) $2,929.26.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $6.87.

A. Glassie, Pewett, Beebe & Shanks, 1819 H. Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $166.67. E. (9) $32.81.

A. Jack Golodner, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
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. Robert K. Gray, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,418.80. E. (9) $320.

A. Harold H. Griffin, 9250 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Realtors, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $124.81.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., No. 800, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $14,981.33. E. (9) $14,981.33.

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) $24.40.

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) $859.84.

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) $30.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Avenue, P.O. Box R, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.
B. California Savings & Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, P.O. Box R, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Andrew E. Hare, 1990 M Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right To Work Committee, 1990 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $820. E. (9) $203.25.

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. Thomas E. Harman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Room 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,381.52. E. (9) $21,381.52.

A. Richard A. Henneges, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Realtors®, 155 E. Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $55.88.

A. Leslie P. Hemry, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $58.50. E. (9) $2.

A. Lillie E. Herndon, 525 North Trenholm Road, Columbia, S.C. 29206.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $28,277.19. E. (9) $470.39.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association.
E. (9) $1,821.34.

A. Thomas P. Holley, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Douglass C. Horstman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Northern Textile Ass'n, 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) $355.68.

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) $527.46.

A. Gregory A. Humphrey, 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) $391.

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. E. (9) $12.50.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.
E. (9) $50.

A. Independent U.S. Tanker Owners Committee, 1612 K Street NW., Suite 510, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $2,500.

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. Japanese American Citizens League, 22 Peace Plaza, Suite 203, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
E. (9) $200.

A. Janice C. Johnson, 1611 North Kent Street, Suite 803–A, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 1611 North Kent Street, Suite 803–A, 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, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. James J. Judge, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Building Manufacturers, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300.

A. George J. Kelley, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $400.

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) $881.

A. R. I. Kilroy, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $100.

A. Peter M. Kirby, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $569.35.

A. John D. Knodell, Jr., 200 112th Avenue NE., Bellevue, Wash. 98004.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co.

A. John S. Knox, Jr., 1666 16th Street NW., Atlanta, Ga. 30318.
B. The Coca-Cola Bottlers' Association, 166 16th Street NW., Atlanta, Ga. 30318.
D. (6) $75.

A. Bradley & Koch, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $140.

A. June Kysilko Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $128.12.

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) $404.33.

A. Leonard Lee Lane, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Coalition to Tax Pollution.
D. (6) $2,209.74.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1990 M Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1990 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $70. E. (9) $12.

A. Monte Lazarus, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $302.19.

A. Charles W. Lee, 148 Duddington Place SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Full Funding of Education Programs, 148 Duddington Place SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $30.

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. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 2401 Crow Canyon Road, San Ramon, Calif.

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.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $36.

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.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroad Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. J. M. B. Lewis, Jr., 308 Shenandoah Building, P.O. Box 2887, Roanoke, Va. 24001.
B. National Council of Coal Lessors, 317 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005. Iron Ore Lessors Assoc., 1500 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,886.80. E. (9) $21,657.65.

A. J. Patrick Logue, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.
D. (6) $4,331.39.

A. Ronald E. Madsen, 962 Wayne Avenue, Room 802, Silver Spring, Md. 20910.
B. Park Mobile, Inc., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.
E. (9) $20.

A. Ben J. Man, 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) $1,638. E. (9) $192.38.

A. Dallace E. Marable.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $680. E. (9) $665.

A. John V. Maraney, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers' Association, 324 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, District No. 1, Pacific Coast District, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
E. (9) $5,180.93.

A. William J. Marschalk, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $187.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 200 C Street SE., No. 401, Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $4,638. E. (9) $809.81.

A. Guy R. Martin, State of Alaska Department of Law, 655 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $5,611.50. E. (9) $1,980.91.

A. Craig Mathews, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.
D. (6) $200.

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) $2.08.

A. Frank W. Mayo, 1809 23d Street, Manhattan Beach, Calif.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union.
D. (6) $2,035. E. (9) $227.50.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Horse Protection Association, 629 River Bend Road, Great Falls, Va.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee for Humane Legislation, Inc., 11 West 60th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,200. E. (9) $37.02.

A. Robert C. McCandless, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, 1101 17th Street NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $28.50.

A. John L. McConnell, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. New York Stock Exchange, Inc., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $225.

A. Barbara D. McGarry, 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Myles F. McGrail, 1825 K Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich. 48640.

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. E. (9) $224.30.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $4,161.02.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $1,607.70.

A. Jack R. Miller, 5417 Kirkwood Drive, Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. American International Reinsurance Co., Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $5,000.

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) $264. E. (9) $8.

A. Joseph A. Millimet, 1838 Elm Street, Manchester, N.H. 03105.
B. Massachusetts Bankers Association.
D. (6) $1,030. E. (9) $177.51.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 422 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $4,000.

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) $383.85.

A. Charles Morgan, Jr., 410 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $36,067.10. E. (9) $36,067.10.

A. Motorists United for Ecology, Inc., 3477 New Ridge Drive, Palos Verdes, Calif. 90274.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $32.91.

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. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $185.

A. George E. Myers, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $832.77. E. (9) $174.67.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.
B. Forest Farmers Association, 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.
D. (6) $70. E. (9) $171.67.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) $14,134.96. E. (9) $14,278.05.

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) $36,948.83. E. (9) $36,481.52.

A. National Association of School Bus Contract Operators, 4616 Lawn Court, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) $625.

A. National Building Granite Quarries Association, Inc., 202 South Second Street, Cold Spring, Minn.
E. (9) $91.75.

A. National Citizens Committee for Revenue Sharing, 707 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill., 60611.
D. (6) $28,277.19. E. (9) $470.39.

A. National Council of Technical Service Industries, 888 17th Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $579.31.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920–922 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,449.23. E. (9) 11,449.23.

A.. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $26,525.67. E. (9) $30,080.38.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $1,191.35. E. (9) $2,599.60.

A. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $3,381.82. (9) $600.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $825.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1990 M Street NW., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $3,928.45. E. (9) $3,928.45.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
E. (9) $4,027.36.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $5,042. E. (9) $4,229.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101.
D. (6) $24,129. E. (9) $7,063.26.

A. Navajo Tribe, c/o Controller, Window Rock, Ariz. 86515.

A. E. J. Neal, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $160.

A. Robert W. Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $160.

A. 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) $421.95.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $100.

A. R. Norton, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $160.

A. Raymond D. O'Connell, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
B. National Cable Television Association, Inc., 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,940.95.

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) $187.69.

A. James J. O'Neill, 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
B. The Committee of Publicly Owned Cos., 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
D. (6) $4,146. E. (9) $3,564.

A. Franz M. Oppenheimer, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $4.50.

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. 20006.
D. (6) $264. E. (9) $10.

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.
E. (9) $160.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa. 19035.
B. Campbell Soup Co., Campbell Place, Camden, N.J. 08101.

A. William G. Painter, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Rivers Conservation Council, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $266.60.

A. Lawrence Parachini, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Suite 403, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Communities in Action Together, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $7,741.58.

A. Lew M. Paramore, P.O. Box 1160, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.
B. Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, P.O. Box 1160, 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) $1,050.

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.
E. (9) $140.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $382.40.

A. Kenton Pattie, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $1,190.77.

A. Ellen Pattin, 6907 Lyle Street, Lanham, Md. 20801.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $30.75.

A. E. L. Patton, 200 112th Avenue NE., Bellevue, Wash. 98004.
B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co.

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) $75.

A. Jack Pearce, Suite 808, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Committee on Modern, Efficient Transportation, Suite 808, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $7,857.22. E. (9) $2,467.87.

A. Pepper, Hamilton &. Scheetz, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coalition of Concerned Charities, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washingthon, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $9,266.22. E. (9) $1,101.84.

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) $1,692.84.

A. Roger J. Phaneuf, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $149.

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.
E. (9) $120.

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. S. Z. Placksin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $160.

A. Judy Pope, 620 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Coalition to Tax Pollution.
D. (6) $795.50.

A. Joseph E. Quin, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $720.

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. 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. Stimson Lumber Co., and Miller Redwood Co., 315 Pacific Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $125.

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) $264. E. (9) $7.

A. Clarence B. Randall, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc., P.O. Box 8733, Friendship International Airport, Md. 21240.
E. (9) $250.

A. G. J. Rauschenbach.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,260.

A. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., One East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) $155,011.77. E. (9) $9,642.62.

A. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $15,049.90.

A. John T. Reggitts, Jr., R.D. No. 2, Boonton Avenue, Boonton, N.J. 07005.

A. Reserves Officers Association of United States, 1 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,117.19. E. (9) $353.15.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1130 17th Street NW., No. 430, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Continental Oil Co., High Ridge Park, Stamford, Conn. 06904.

A. 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. W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 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. 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) $28.18.

A. Kenneth Roberson, 2 Dubonnet Road, Valley Stream, N.Y. 11581.
B. Meat Importers Council of America, Inc., 708 3d Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $32. E. (9) $10.

A. William S. Roberts, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $50.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $185.

A. Rogers & Wells, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Iron & Steel Institute, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) $541.13.

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) $84.78.

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) $1,125.

A. Wally Rustad, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) $150.

A. 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) $2,488.69.

A. Kenneth I. Schaner, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Leva, Hawes, Symington, Martin & Oppenheimer.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $36.

A. Arlie Schardt, 410 First Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) $36,067.10. E. (9) $36,067.10.

A. A. Cleve Schneeberger, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill. 60076.

A. Milton W. Schober, 1775 K Street NW., Suite 220, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Massachusetts Consumer Bankers Group.

A. Phyllis Schultz, 12224 Valerie Lane, Laurel, Md. 20810.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $34.65.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $38.41.

A. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich. 48207.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz.
E. (9) $420.30.

A. W. O. Senter, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $6.

A. Leo Seybold, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $1,479. E. (9) $482.75.

A. Norman R. Sherlock, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $865. E. (9) $558.57.

A. A. Z. Shows, Suite 904, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Watergate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $4,134. E. (9) $3,777.47.

A. Barry M. Siegel, 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
B. The Committee of Publicly Owned Cos., 22 Thames Street, New York, N.Y. 10006.
D. (6) $2,292. E. (9) $408.

A. Gilbert Simonetti, Jr., 1620 I Street NW., ninth floor, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of CPA's 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY. 10019.

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) $2,991.33.

A. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va. 22207.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $2,184.60. E. (9) $1,003.15.

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.
D. (6) $624.

A. Frank J. Specht, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. J. Gilbert Stallings, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $50.

A. Catherine Stirling, 7012 Beechwood Drive, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $41.25.

A. Roger J. Stroh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $193.74. E. (9) $21.41.

A. R. Keith Stroup, 2105 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, 1237 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) $450.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1666 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retail Credit Co., P.O. Box 4081, Atlanta, Ga. 30302.
E. (9) $35.

A. Gerald Toppen, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $140.

A. J. P. Trainor, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $1,441.63.

A. W. M. Trevarrow, 601 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Road, Detroit, Mich. 48232.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $137.50.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94108.
E. (9) $128.89.

A. Joseph D. Tydings, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 1900 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) $261.36.

A. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) $2,200.17. E. (9) $2,200.17.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 916 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
E. (9) $1,066.65.

A. Walter D. Vinyard, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $250.

A. 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) $775.90. E. (9) $40.20.

A. James A. Warren, 5500 Friendship Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.
B. REA Express, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $75.

A. George A. Watson, Suite 800, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Ferroalloys Association, Suite 800, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $1,562.61.

A. Judy Waxman, 19036 Canadian Court, Gaithersburg, Md.
B. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
E. (9) $30.

A. Fred Wegner, 1750 K Street NW., Suite 1190, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Retired Persons Services, Inc., 1750 K Street NW., Suite 1190, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $10.50.

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. Bernard J. Welch, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) $124.16.

A. Whaley, McCutchen, Blanton & Dent, 1414 Lady Street, Columbia, S.C. 29211.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $5,000.

A. Robert Y. Wheeler, Box 185, Tilden, Tex. 78072.
B. Ernest G. Herman, 9538 Brighton Way, Beverly Hills, Calif.

A. Thomas E. Wheeler, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $24.

A. Robert E. Wick, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $94.20.

A. Harry D. Williams, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 204–205, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Ashland Oil, Inc., P.O. Box 391, Ashland, Ky. 41101.
D. (6) $250.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, P.O. Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $725.90.

A. Williams & King, 1620 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
B. National Nutritional Foods Association, 7624 South Painter Avenue; Whittier, Calif. 90602.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $329.

A. Frederick L. Williford, 10010 Green Forest Drive, Adelphia, Md.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) $2,688.61.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th St., NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Dealer Bank Association, P.O. Box 479, Wall Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10005.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. J. C. Penny Co, Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY. 10019.
D. (6) $578.50. E. (9) $30.25.

A. Earl Wilson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline, and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) $140.

A. Women's Lobby, Inc., 1345 G Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) $2,897. (9) $2,062.85.

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) $547.88.

A. Jack Yelverton, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Zimmer, 1775 K Street NW., Suite 220, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Massachusetts Consumer Bankers Group.
E. (9) $468.17.

A. John L. Zorack, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) $1,415. E. (9) $372.52.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONNECTICUT REALTOR OF THE YEAR

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, this week the largest professional organization in the Nation, the National Association of Realtors, is holding its annual convention in the Nation's Capital. I am happy to note that among those in attendance are a number of realtors from Connecticut and my own Fifth District.

I would particularly like to call to my colleagues' attention the participation of Mr. Emil J. Morey of Danbury, Conn., a constituent of mine who has the distinction of being "Connecticut Realtor of the Year," the highest statewide honor conferred by this organization.

Mr. Morey was nominated for this honor by the Danbury Board of Realtors, which had already chosen him as their realtor of the year. The requirements for this award are established by the National Association of Realtors and include realtor spirit, civic activity, business accomplishments, local board activity, and support of State and national association activity.

In presentation of the State award to Mr. Morey, the judging committee pointed out his many accomplishments

and service to his community. Among these were his successful leadership of the fight to defeat increased State conveyance taxes and his support for efforts to upgrade the qualifications for real estate salesmen and brokers licensed in Connecticut.

Mr. Morey is a past president of the Danbury Board of Realtors, a director of the multiple listing service, a member of the professional standards committee, chairman of the realtors legislative committee, and regional vice president of the Connecticut Association of Realtors.

He is truly a credit to his profession and richly deserves these honors, which I commend to your attention.

NATION'S DOCTORS MOVE TO POLICE MEDICAL CARE

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Federal Government has embarked upon an experimental program providing review of physicians' work by their local peers, I wish to call the Members' attention to an article from the New York Times of October 28, titled "Nation's Doctors Move To Police Medical Care."

Peer group review is a new program established by the Congress and is designed to provide a realistic method of controlling health care costs, as well as providing quality care for our citizens.

The people of San Joaquin County, whom I am privileged to represent, have benefited since 1954 from the local peer group organization of physicians which is based in Stockton, Calif.

Founded and still headed by Dr. Donald C. Harrington, the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care has successfully evolved as a cornerstone in making the peer group review concept work for the benefit of our medical practitioners and the patients they serve.

Following is the article from the Times which I am sure will provide additional information and perspective on this important concept which is being put into practice throughout our Nation.

The article follows:

NATION'S DOCTORS MOVE TO POLICE MEDICAL CARE

(By Nancy Hicks)

STOCKTON, CALIF.—American doctors are quickly developing a new nationwide system to police the quality and cost of the medical care they dispense.

Pushed by demands from Congress and the public for more economical use of the billions of tax dollars spent on health services, doctors throughout the country will eventually be engaging in the type of performance analysis that was started here in the northern California county of San Joaquin almost 20 years ago.

In medicine, such analysis of a doctor's work by other doctors is called peer review. Although the idea has been catching on of its own accord and is already actively practiced in dozens of locations, a new Federal law that goes into effect next Jan. 1 has put doctors on notice that they must systematically regulate themselves or face Federal regulations within two years.

"It doesn't quite have the ring of certainty now accorded death and taxes—not yet. But peer review as now mandated by Federal law is fast becoming inevitable," writes Dr. Leonard Rubin, coordinator of medical education for the Oakland-based Kaiser-Permanente Plan, which covers 1.5 million people.

The Kaiser plan has its own form of peer review, as do the Foundation for Health Care Evaluation in Minnesota, the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care here, and a network of federally funded experiments—widely differing organizations whose common experience is often called on to show that the peer review concept is workable.

Yet at the center of each of these diverse systems is the belief that more control must be placed on the physician, whether he is a solo practitioner, a member of a private group, or on the staff of a clinic or hospital. And this is another irritant to American doctors, many of whom are already unhappy about increasing "bureaucratic restrictions" imposed on them by publicly sponsored health porgrams such as Medicaid and Medicare.

Nonetheless, peer review is supported by the American Medical Association, the National Medical Association, which represents the nation's black physicians, and by many medical societies. And the new Federal legislation has made the idea something that doctors will have to deal with whether they want to or not.

The statute, a last-minute change in the massive package of Social Security amendments passed a year ago, requires that all medical cases paid for by Medicaid or Medicare—the Federal programs for the indigent and elderly, respectively—be reviewed for "appropriateness". The review is to be performed by self designated local doctor groups that will be called Professional Standards Review Organizations, or P.S.R.O.'s.

The legislation, sponsored by Senator Wallace F. Bennett, Republican of Utah, is supposed to see that the money spent for Medicaid and Medicare—programs that accounted for $16.4-billion or about 20 per cent of the total $83.4-billion of national health expenditures for the fiscal year 1972—buys medical care of the highest quality and the lowest cost.

And while the statute is limited specifically to Medicaid and Medicare, it is seen by doctors and politicians alike as the possible framework for any future medical review system enacted as part of a national health insurance program.

PURPOSES OFTEN CONFLICT

The purposes of peer review are often conflicting.

One goal of the law is for doctors who control such things as laboratory tests, hospital admissions and length of hospital stay to become just as mindful of cost as a housewife in the supermarket.

This concept of conserving basic medical resources, very much a part of medical care in developing countries such as China, is hard for American medicine to accept, given the country's high degree of medical technology.

Some practicing physicians find it absurd, for instance, to spend more than $50,000 on one kidney transplant case and then skimp on giving a blood test routinely to another patient. Yet it has been shown that unnecessary routine medical procedures push up the cost of medical care.

"Vitamin B-12 and estrogen shots alone pay the doctor's rent and put his kids through college," said Dr. George J. Williams, one of the pioneers in the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care.

Dr. Williams, a general practitioner in Lodi, about 10 miles from Stockton, said that the foundation's scrutiny of the need for such injections had reduced them significantly. Such injections make up only about 2 per cent of physicians' income in San Joaquin rather than the 30 per cent common in some places, Dr. Williams said.

The second goal—quality care—is more subtle, less easily defined, more difficult to achieve.

While American medical education prides itself on its heavy scientific base, the actual practice of medicine consists of about one-third science and two-thirds "art", according to Dr. John A. Cooper, president of the Washington-based Association of American Medical Colleges. And the science is ever-changing.

"SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM"

Physicians are, after all, human. They make mistakes. They have differences of opinion. Their performances does not always reflect their knowledge.

The peer review system of the Kaiser-Permanente Plan of Northern California, for instance, found "significant problems" in one of every eight clinic charts it looked over and in 95 per cent of the hospital records it reviewed, according to Dr. Rubin of the Kaiser Plan.

And last year, after the United Store Workers Union in New York City, which administers its own health insurance plan, had begun requiring that members have a second doctor review each recommendation for surgery, 19 per cent fewer operations were performed than were initially recommended.

Whether this reduction of services represents quality care is still a matter of debate in the medical field. More controversial is whether cost and quality control can be reconciled in one review system.

"Many physicians doubt whether P.S.R.O.'s can obtain the two stated goals, for in many ways they are incompatible," Dr. Claude E. Welch, a nationally prominent Boston surgeon, wrote in an article in The New England Journal of Medicine.

Still, some experts feel that quality care with strong peer review will, in fact, increase health care costs.

In any case, such professional organizations as the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals and the American Hospital Association are not counting on the review organizations to insure quality medical care. Both organizations have developed a so-called "medical audit" system for hospitals to measure their care in such terms as the rate of postoperative complications—infections, for instance—rather than the number of days a patient stays in the institution.

From the consumer's standpoint peer review may upgrade the quality of health care, but it will not provide evidence to support malpractice suits. "Malpractice suits will still be the external quality control for individual patients," said Charles M. Jacobs, a lawyer who is assistant director of the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals.

From a philosophical point of view, some experts feel that peer reviewing will take the country one step closer to Government regulation of health services, and they wonder if direct regulation is the best route for American medicine to take.

"The Government, step by step, is being dragged into the regulation of health care and is doing so with no set policy, and P.S.R.O. is just the latest step," said Dr. Walter McClure, an astophysicist who is also a health care specialist at Interstudy, the Minneapolis "think tank" that originated the Health Maintenance Organization scheme at

the center of President Nixon's 1971 health message.

"The Government," he went on, "is drifting with just one goal in mind—cost control. But you just can't go about controlling costs. It's like trying to cure a symptom without having a diagnosis."

And politically, peer review is highly controversial.

Dr. William I. Bauer, who resigned as the first head of the P.S.R.O. office in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, charged that the Administration had not come forth with the promised $34-million to enact the new legislation. He has been replaced by Dr. Henry E. Simmons, formerly of the Food and Drug Administration.

OPPOSITION DEVELOPS

Some state medical societies—those in Texas and Louisiana for instance—are actively opposing the legislation, and one association of private practitioners, the Chicago-based Society of Physicians and Surgeons, has filed suit against it on the ground that it is unconstitutional.

Individual doctors, too, have protested. One Beverly Hills physician expressed his sentiments in a terse letter to Senator Bennett. "I oppose peer review, I have no peer," the doctor wrote.

Yet because of consumerism, which has brought about a general distrust of professionals, as well as the cost factors in health care, peer review is now appropriate, according to most professional medical organizations.

"Within the physician community, some still argue about whether the physician shall be accountable for his performance," said Dr. Richard E. YaDeau, a surgeon who is chairman of the board of the Minneapolis-based Foundation for Health Care Evaluation.

"As we physicians continue to debate this, the rest of the world has long since assumed that physicians are accountable—an assumption virtually unanimous throughout the nonphysician community," he continued. "Actually, the issue is no longer accountability, but: by what standards shall physicians be measured and who will be their architect?"

QUESTION OF "HOW" REMAINS

The question of who will do the reviewing has been settled; the doctors will do it. But the question of how it will be done remains unanswered.

Most existing peer review systems are in individual hospitals—in the form of utilization review committees that check admissions to make certain they are medically justified or tissue committees that examine human tissue removed during surgery to see whether the operations were justified.

It is because these hospital-based systems have not worked in the past, politicians and physicians agree, that a new national system is being assembled. But ask whether a new national system superimposed on the existing one will do a more responsive job. Theoretically, the national system could take over the hospital-based ones and monitor them, but the mechanism for doing this has not been worked out.

"We're moving into a totally uncharted area," Dr. Charles Edwards, Under Secretary for Health of H.E.W., conceded in an interview. "Neither the Congress nor I know where we're going or what we can achieve. We'd like to upgrade the level of health care in the country. But the question is, how do you do that?"

By Jan. 1, the country will be divided up geographically into P.S.R.O. areas in which at least 300 physicans practice.

Once this is done, local groups of doctors—not the medical socities—will petition the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to become the local reviewing agency, the P.S.R.O. This group of doctors will set standards for care for its geographic location and will check to make certain that variations from that norm are medically justified.

Physicians who are found to be chronic offenders against the locally set norms will be subject to several sanctions: They can be denied payments of claims; they can be declared ineligible to participate in the Medicaid and Medicare prorgams; they can be fined up to $5,000; they can have their questionable professional behavior made public. Fees will not be regulated, however.

If the system does not work to the Government's satisfaction by 1976, doctors will lose control of the program.

The peer review law is based on several models, some financed by the Federal Government. The oldest and best known, however, is the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care based here in Stockton.

The foundation was set up in 1954 by Dr. Donald C. Harrington, an obstetrician-gynecologist who is still its head.

As Dr. Harrington recalls, "I was going along happily practicing medicine when my brother who was president of the boilermakers union, called to tell me that the union was negotiating with the prepaid Kaiser-Permanente Plan for care."

Kaiser employes its own physicians, and their patients pay one monthly fee for all their health needs.

Dr. Harrington's brother said that his union members were satisfied with the care they were getting from Stockton doctors, but that this new Kaiser plan was economically more attractive.

SEPARATE GROUP SET UP

To combat this competition, Dr. Harrington set up an association of local physicians separate from the medical society.

For the dues they paid, they agreed to work for a set fee for most procedures, and in some cases would also offer prepaid services to groups of subscribers.

They named their organization the San Joaquin Foundation for Medical Care. The term foundation was chosen because Kaiser was sponsored by a foundation and, Dr. Harrington said, he wanted the concepts to be parallel in peoples' minds.

Today, there are 76 medical care foundations across the country. About half of them review claims. The other half also provide medical services.

For the San Joaquin Foundation, peer review came as an afterthought.

"We set up a comprehensive program with a reasonable fee schedule for doctors. But without review, it was like writing a blank check," Dr. Harrington said.

The foundation then realized that it could not do peer review unless outpatient insurance coverage was good enough to keep doctors from hospitalizing patients to treat them. Hospital care is expensive—running to almost $200 a day in some metropolitan New York hospitals—but it is covered by health insurance. Most health insurance policies do not cover the same procedures performed in a clinic or doctor's office at a fraction of the hospital cost.

The foundation, therefore, now sets a minimum standard of insurance that can be sold in San Joaquin and the four other counties under its jurisdiction: Alameda, Amador, Calavaras and Tuolumne.

It has virtually total control of health services in the area. Ninety-seven per cent of the 330 practicing physicians in the area are members, Dr. Harrington said. Membership means the doctors are willing to accept as payment in full fee schedules, set by the foundation, averaging about $8 for each 10 minutes spent with a patient. Reviewers scrutinize the number of visits, based on diagnosis, time spent with the patient, lab work and injections. About 8 per cent of all claims reach the review committee.

In addition to providing care on a prepaid basis for 47,000 MediCal (California's Medicaid program) and 37,000 Medicare patients, the foundation reviews claims for the 130,000 subscribers to other insurance programs. This means that two-thirds of the population in the area is covered in some way by the foundation, according to Boyd Thompson, executive director of this foundation and of the American Association of Foundations for Medical Care.

"We have total control of health services for the area because we control the flow of dollars," Dr. Harrington said. "We write the checks, not the insurance companies."

The foundation can and does impose strict sanctions for physicians of questionable performance. It can reduce the physician's fee, and he is not allowed to bill the patient for the extra amount.

In a few cases, doctors thought to be doing unnecessary surgery were required to have their diagnoses confirmed by other physicians before the operation could be performed. The 11 hospitals in the area know that when the foundation imposes their rules, and the hospital does not comply, the institution is not paid for the time the patient stays in the hospital.

Once or twice, the foundation has required the supervision of a doctor during surgery, Dr. Harrington said.

A COMMON PRINCIPLE

The principle behind peer review here is the same as in any group pressure situation—the same one, for instance, that has almost every 13-year-old wearing equally faded jeans with a regulation cuff.

"There are maybe a handful of marginal doctors and being a reviewer has made work very hard at not being considered one of them," explained Dr. Bryant B. Williams, a pediatrician who is one of 30 physician review and one of Stockton's four black doctors.

In his case, he said, peer review has not decreased his income but increased it—by making MediCal payments competitive with those paid in the community at large. As a result of this factor, about 90 per cent of the doctors in the area will take patients from MediCal and Medicare—a much higher than normal percentage.

The model in San Joaquin works, Dr. Harrington said, because the community is small enough for doctors to know one another. It would not be transferable to Boston, Baltimore or New York, he admits.

Larger scaled, less controlling models exist in other places, such as the foundation in Minnesota in which Dr. YaDeau is involved.

Unlike the San Joaquin foundation, the Foundation for Health Care Evaluation does not dispense medical care. It reviews the most expensive insurance claims—the top 15 per cent—for local companies, an activity that began in Hennepin County in 1968 and is now performed statewide.

REVIEWS ADMISSIONS

It reviews hospital admissions for 17 of the 35 hospitals in the seven-county area. And in the Bethesda Hospital in St. Paul, of which Dr. YaDeau is medical director, the foundation is studying the records of every patient treated in the hospital in the first quarter of the year.

About 90 per cent of the 2,000 doctors in the seven-county area belong to the foundation.

"They pay $10, and for that $10 they have their fees cut if they're too high," Dr. YaDeau said.

The activities of the foundation have been felt in the area. For instance, 58 per cent of those expensive claims reviewed by the foundation in 1972 were reduced, Dr. YaDeau said. For the first nine months of 1973 the fee reduction rate was 66 per cent.

A study of hospital bed utilization has resulted in a reduction in the average length of hospital stay from 8.7 days to 6.9 days at Bethesda Hospital. When the program was started, the average length of stay had dropped to 6.1 days, then came back up.

"This was the original fright of doctors who felt they had to send patients home because a norm had been set. Then the doctor realized that he did not have to send the patients home. All he had to do was say why the patient had to stay longer," Dr. YaDeau said.

Altogether, utilization review at Bethesda Hospital in St. Paul has reduced the cost of care for each hospitalized patient. And, the hospital no longer has a waiting list for elective surgery and it has closed down about 80 of its 300 hospital beds, turning that space into doctors' offices.

But the paradox in this—one that makes peer review unrelatable to many doctors and hospital administrators—is that the hospital is beginning to lose money by economizing.

In 1971, the hospital took in $9-million in income and realized an operating surplus of $450,000, or 5 per cent. In 1972, the first full year of utilization review, the gross income was a little higher, but the operating surplus was only $4,000, four-tenths per cent—one hospital employe's salary. This year, the hospital may run a deficit.

The way this paradox is resolved will determine whether peer review proves the strength or the bane of future health care reform.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, SEPTEMBER 1972

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the September 1973 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, SEPTEMBER 1973

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in September was 2,782,244 as compared with 2,810,468 in the preceding month of August—a net decrease of 28,244. Total pay for August 1973, the latest month for which actual expenditures are available, was $2,961,752,000. These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in September, as compared with the preceding month of August and with August a year ago, follows:

	Full-time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary, part-time, etc.	Change	Total employment [1]	Change
Current change:						
August 1973	2,396,610		370,359		2,766,969	
September 1973	2,403,480	+6,870	335,779	−34,580	2,739,259	−27,710
12 month change:						
September 1972	2,471,364		296,493		2,767,857	
September 1973	2,403,480	−67,884	335,779	+39,286	2,739,259	−28,598

Some highlights with respect to Executive Branch employment for the month of September are:

Total employment of Executive agencies shows a decrease of 27,710 during the month of September to a total of 2,739,259. Major decreases were in Defense with 11,843, Interior with 4,071, Agriculture with 3,936, Postal Service with 2,278 and General Services Administration with 1,005.

The 27,710 decrease in total Executive agency employment reflects a usual decline in *regular seasonal* employment and *temporary summer* employment in federal opportunity programs for the disadvantaged.

In September there were 32,469 youths employed in federal opportunity programs for the *disadvantaged*. This is a decrease of 19,683 from last month. Employment under this program reached its peak in the month of July when 63,331 youths were reported in temporary and part-time positions.

The *full-time* employment level of 2,403,480 reported for the month of September shows an increase of 6,870 as compared with the previous month of August and it is 67,884 under the total reported a year ago.

Of the 6,870 increase in full-time permanent employment during September *major increases* were reported by Postal Service with 3,048, Treasury with 1,511, Defense with 1,113 and Veterans Administration with 1,016.

During the *first quarter of fiscal year 1974* there was a net increase of 8,480 employees in full-time permanent positions. This represents an increase of 11,182 among the civilian agencies and a decrease of 2,702 in Defense agencies.

A comparison of total employment among the civilian and military agencies follows:

	September	August	Change
Civilian agencies	1,711,819	1,727,686	−15,867
Military agencies	1,027,440	1,039,283	−11,843
Total, civilian employment	2,729,259	2,766,969	−27,710

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in September totaled 34,123, a decrease of 638 as compared with the preceding month of August, while employment in the Judicial Branch totaled 8,862, an increase of 124 since August.

UNIFORMED MILITARY PERSONNEL

In the Department of Defense uniformed military personnel totaled 2,231,938 for the month of September and civilian employment totaled 1,027,440.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during September 1973, showing comparisons with June 1972, June 1973, and the budget estimates for June 1974:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1972	June 1973	September 1973	Estimated June 30 1974 [2]
Agriculture	82,511	81,715	79,182	78,800
Commerce	28,412	28,300	27,776	28,400
Defense:				
Civil functions	30,585	29,971	28,234	30,800
Military functions	1,009,548	957,310	945,688	[3] 956,000
Health, Education, and Welfare	105,764	114,307	117,415	[4] 101,800
Housing and Urban Development	15,200	15,820	15,487	13,900
Interior	56,892	56,771	56,199	56,900
Justice	45,446	45,496	46,762	47,100
Labor	12,339	12,468	12,254	12,400
State	22,699	22,578	22,445	23,400
Agency for International Development	11,719	10,108	9,759	9,900
Transportation	67,232	67,885	67,351	69,400
Treasury	95,728	98,087	98,932	104,000
Atomic Energy Commission	6,836	7,145	7,241	7,400
Civil Service Commission	5,260	5,911	5,976	6,000
Environmental Protection Agency	7,835	8,270	8,270	9,200
General Services Administration	36,002	35,721	35,340	37,800
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	27,428	25,955	25,814	25,000
Panama Canal	13,777	13,680	13,690	14,000
Selective Service System	5,791	4,607	3,577	3,900
Small Business Administration	3,916	4,050	3,990	4,100
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,001	13,995	13,709	14,000
U.S. Information Agency	9,255	9,048	8,929	9,100
Veterans Administration	163,179	170,616	170,575	170,000
All other agencies	33,499	34,610	33,839	35,800
Contingencies				5,000
Subtotal	1,910,854	1,874,424	1,858,434	1,874,100
U.S. Postal Service	594,834	547,283	545,046	564,500
Total [5]	2,505,688	2,421,707	2,403,480	[3 4] 2,428,600

[1] Included in the total employment shown on table 1, beginning on p. 3.

[2] Source: As projected in 1974 budget document. It should be noted that the President has ordered reductions in the projected 1974 level, but information is not yet available.

[3] Excludes increase of 31,000 for civilianization program.

[4] Excludes increase of approximately 15,000 in adult welfare categories to be transferred to the Federal Government under Public Law 92-603.

[5] September figure excludes 1,175 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 1,257 in August.

THE COST OF LIVING COUNCIL

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Cost of Living Council recently proved once again that they know nothing about agriculture. You would think that with the chick slaughter and the beef supply interruption, among other things, the Cost of Living Council would go out of its way to avoid previous blunders. Yet just last week the CLC pulled another dandy by persuading the White House to permit the importation of millions of pounds of subsidized butter.

I realize I am beginning to sound like a broken record, but American dairymen can favorably compete with their European counterparts in a free trade situation. The butter deal, however, is far from free trade; rather, it represents a condition where the United States is at least temporarily abolishing our quotas while Europe continues to engage in the unfair practice of export subsidies.

The Cost of Living Council argued that the price of domestic butter was high, so an increased supply of "cheap" butter would bring down prices. Of course, they chose to ignore the fact that butter had just dropped about 12 cents per pound. I have consistently warned, however, that such thinking is shortsighted. It does not consider the fact that these imports are not cheap, but subsidized, and that this subsidy will not continue once American producers are driven from the market.

I believe the data surrounding the butter deal confirm my argument. Currently, the target—support—price for manufactured milk in the EEC is $6.79 hundredweight; Government butter purchases keep the price at no less than 96.3 cents per pound. American producers would drool at the thought of these prices, yet the very difference is an outstanding indicator of the greater efficiency of our dairymen and the need for subsidies if the Europeans are going to compete with them.

I find it significant that the Europeans have already demonstrated their intention of lowering the export subsidy as soon as there no longer is a domestic industry to compete with. In late August or early September, vague rumors began to float around Washington that large butter imports were in the making. I could not substantiate these rumors for almost a month, but the Europeans did not need confirmation. Already considering somewhat reducing export subsidies on butter, the EEC dropped its subsidy, effective September 7, to the United States, Puerto Rico, Canada, and Mexico by nearly 22 cents per pound, from 60.19 cents per pound to 38.30 cents per pound. Subsidies for butter exports to other countries dropped less than 6 cents per pound, from 60.19 cents to 54.72 cents, effective October 13.

This action raises several questions. Why did the EEC lower subsidies for North America 3½ times more than for the rest of the world when the old ones had been equal? Why were the new subsidy rates effective on two different dates? Was it coincidental these new rates for North America became effective September 7, after the rumors about butter imports began?

It appears all too clear that the Europeans understood they would virtually have a guaranteed sale. That meant such large subsidies would not be needed. But the subsidy retained—38.3 cents per pound—had to be just enough to undersell the American producer. The result would be lowering the price minimally to the American consumer, but it also would have the effect of accelerating the already shocking decrease in domestic milk production. Once the current emergency situation is relieved, the butter price rise due to milk shortages and the whole process will begin again until such time as we have nothing but expensive imports.

I do not blame the Europeans; they are smart businessmen. What I want to know is where all that Yankee ingenuity has gone or, more probably, have we minor leaguers at the Cost of Living Council playing in the majors? If the latter is the case, it might be good to farm them out for a little seasoning.

PATROLMAN COOPER SAVES CHILD'S LIFE

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to call the attention of my colleagues to an inspiring and meritorious action taken by one of my constituents, Patrolman Phillip L. Cooper, of Grover City, Calif.

On August 13, 1973, Patrolman Cooper, trained in Red Cross first aid, was dispatched to the scene of a near drowning of a 16-month-old child. On arrival he found the victim with no viable life signs. Immediately Patrolman Cooper, assisted by the child's mother, began to administer artificial respiration and other supportive measures, which he continued until the child's breathing was restored. The victim was taken by ambulance to a hospital and later recovered completely. Without doubt, Patrolman Cooper's use of his first aid skills and knowledge saved the life of the child.

In recognition of this lifesaving action, Patrolman Cooper has been awarded the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This is the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves or sustains a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, or water safety course. The certificate bears the original signatures of the President of the United States, honorary chairman, and Frank Stanton, Chairman of the American National Red Cross.

Surely Patrolman Cooper is deserving of such an award, as well as the thanks and praise of his fellow citizens. The saving of a child's life is among the noble deeds that a man can perform, and I am sure that the Members of the House join me in expressing our admiration for Patrolman Cooper's action.

TRY IT ON

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the 22d amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that no person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice—thus limiting the term to 8 years.

Most of us agree that this is a good amendment, but I raise the question, why put this limit only on the term of the President? Perhaps it would be a good idea also to limit the terms of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Margery Burns, a weekly newspaper columnist in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, wrote a very interesting article on this matter which I would like to share with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD:

TRY IT ON

If you're feeling groggy because of all the disturbing things that go on and have gone on in our government, you should start thinking about what we can do to lighten those dark stretches.

What can be done? What should be tried? Along with the other ideas you're thinking about, here's one you should consider too.

What do you think about limiting the number of terms for all elected officials? The most important official in the world, the President, can only serve 8 years. Perhaps all the other offices should be limited to 8 years too.

Now, before you yell that it wouldn't work; that it wouldn't be efficient; that it would dump a lot of good people; that nobody would run for office; and besides, Congress and the Legislators would never dream of voting themselves out of office—before you shout it's a crazy idea, why don't you look at it a little bit. Maybe you're right and it wouldn't work, but don't step on it without talking it over.

Of course, we have only one example of limited terms—the Presidency. So far, its been better for the country than having one President keep the job for many, many years and turn in into a monarchy or dictatorship.

The argument that a limited term would hurt efficiency in getting things done is silly when you think about the inefficient things that are showered on us the way it is now. If you believe that it takes long years to learn the ropes, then you aren't voting for the smartest people. And it's imperative that we have intelligent and honest people running our government. And then, maybe a little honest inefficiency would be better than a lot of efficient, dishonest governing.

It's true that it would put some good people out of office, but it would dump some very incompetent people too. Fortunately, there are many good people to choose from.

Then, of course, the built-up pressures from different groups on elected officials would be cut off at an early date. The folks who use money and gifts to sway officials would have a tougher time trying to pin down new officials every few years. The constant turn-over would break that build-up of power over officials. There would be so many new officials all the time that it could cancel out a lot of graft and kick-backs.

The constant search for new and good candidates would keep the political parties from getting too complacent and sitting back with a 20 or 30 year term official who isn't too sharp. Of course, this would be a lot of work and worry. But why shouldn't the parties work to find good and honest candidates?

Now, maybe you're coming up fast with many arguments against this idea, but when you've finished that exercise, then think up some for it too.

What we need are some good safe-guards for giving us the best government there is. Of course, the whole thing comes down to you—you're the one who must take an interest in your government.

ARCHIBALD COX DISBARMENT

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, when Archibald Cox was dismissed as special prosecutor for the Justice Department, he was widely lauded as a man of conviction, one who put principle above politics, one whose integrity was more important than compromising his estimate of justice, indeed, Chesterfield Smith, president of the American Bar Association, glowingly praised Cox at that time, stating:

He emphasized to the people of this Nation that—he is a lawyer who honors and cherishes the tradition of the legal profession and—(he) properly and without hesitation puts ethics and professional honor above public office.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident now that these plaudits were totally without foundation.

Cox, by his confessed disclosure of confidential information to polititcal cronies, has betrayed the Congress and the American people, and seriously offended the integrity of the legal profession. I am appalled that such a blatant violation of both criminal statute and professional ethics can go virtually unnoticed in the legal profession.

This situation is so serious that I have personally written to the president of the American Bar Association and the president of the Massachusetts Bar Association asking for an immediate and thorough investigation of the Archibald Cox incident, leading to possible disbarment, censorship or any other action deemed appropriate by those professional associations.

Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent on these associations to take appropriate action in order to uphold the integrity of the legal profession, which may well be held in abeyance pending final disposition of this grave matter.

Mr. Speaker, I insert my letter to Chesterfield Smith in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., November 7, 1973.

Mr. CHESTERFIELD SMITH, ESQ.,
President, American Bar Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Mr. Archibald Cox, Special Prosecutor for the Justice Department, has, by his self-confessed actions relating to an executive communication, seriously broken faith and trust with the Congress and the American people, and, in my opinion, grievously jeopardized his standing in the American Bar Association.

By disclosing certain information regarding a federal investigation revealed to him by former Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst, Cox clearly violated 28 U.S. Code 509, § 50.2 of Part 50 of Chapter 1 of Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Additionally, this conduct was inconsistent with the spirit of the Code of Professional Responsibility, governing all officers of the court.

I am appalled at this blatant misuse and abuse of office. The reputation of all officers of the court may well be held in abeyance pending proper disposition of this matter.

Therefore, I believe it is incumbent on you, as President of the American Bar Association, to begin an immediate and thorough investigation into the potential criminal and certainly unethical activities of Archibald Cox, leading to possible disbarment, censorship or other action deemed appropriate by your organization.

In your statement following the dismissal of Cox as Special Prosecutor, you applauded him, stating he ". . . emphasized to the people of this nation that . . . (he is a) lawyer who honors and cherishes the tradition of the legal profession and . . . (he) properly and without hesitation puts ethics and professional honor above public office." It is clear now that this statement was without foundation. I hope that now, in light of the confession of Cox casting a long shadow on your plaudits, you will denunciate him with the same vigor and forcefulness with which you acclaimed him.

I wish to emphasize that my actions are completely segregated from any other ongoing investigations or Congressional or legal proceedings. I am merely attempting, as a concerned American and as a representative of nearly a half-million people, to insure that the same standards and rules apply across the board—to the investigators as well as the investigated.

If the integrity of our system of judicial process is to be upheld, no man can place himself above the law—not the President, not any duly appointed officer of the Court, not the average citizen, and not Archibald Cox.

I consider this to be a matter of utmost importance and urgency. Your cooperation is essential.

Sincerely,

E. G. SHUSTER,
Member of Congress.

CANADA ADMONISHED FOR TREATMENT OF UNITED STATES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the news developments pertinent to the energy crisis, that have been emphasized recently, has resulted in a cutoff from the Middle East oil supply and now an increase in tax on the Canadian flow. This has caused a political division in Canadian and U.S. relations.

In my judgment, the matter has suffered sufficient media coverage as noted in the Chicago Tribune in a very timely column by Eliot Janeway. The article discusses the Canadian decision which seems to take advantage of the situation of the United States.

CANADA ADMONISHED FOR TREATMENT OF UNITED STATES

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, Nov. 11.—Canada has done it to America again. The second tax increase in two months on the flow of Canadian crude oil to the northern tier American cities dependent on it is the form her latest unilateral declaration of economic war has taken.

I yield to no citizen of the United States in the warmth of my friendship for Canada, in the range and breadth of my Canadian friendships, and in the practicality of my concern for this closest and most natural and reciprocally rewarding of American partnerships. Three times in these last two troubled months, I have written columns warning of the consequences looming for both countries if America's present distress and Canada's continuing weakness are allowed to strain this genuinely special relationship beyond the point of negotiating accommodation.

Admittedly, the temptation for Canada to tweak Uncle Sam's whiskers is great. They are tattered. Canada's increasingly strident nationalists are confident of scoring points politically every time they make big uncle squeal and like it; altho I am not less sure than they that demagogic anti-U.S. swaggering will not pay off as claimed after Canadians of practical bent discover that they are hurting themselves every time they hurt their good, if wounded, neighbor to the south.

Admittedly, too, America's incompetent handling of her own affairs has invited the treatment Canada has given her. Oil is the only one of three parallel horror stories. With Washington fresh out of negotiating ploys to prevent the Arab and Venezuelan hosts of the American international oil companies from putting the squeeze on, Canada is not leading the parade but following it.

Newsprint is another horror story for which America has herself to blame. More precisely, she is overdue to blame the economic pundits who theorized about the advantages dollar devaluation would assure her.

In my column of Sept. 10, I warned that the prospect of earning cheaper U.S. dollars would give Canada's newsprint producers an irresistible incentive to divert increasing quotas of their premium product overseas. At $200 a ton, allowing 4 per cent for the cost of insurance against further weakness for the Nixon dollar, the Canadian newsprint managements are bound to reckon each ton shipped across the border as earning them $8 less than every ton shipped to stronger currency countries.

Washington's failure to play America's formidable auto bargaining chips is the third horror story. Washington has been giving Canada a free ride into a sizeable portion of America's mass market since 1965. Canada needs it more than ever; and this year finds America less able to afford playing "good time Charlie" than in a long time. Taking it away with unilateral harshness would be no wiser for America than Canada's provocative tactics are for her. But there's no substitute for bargaining between partners as their mutual protection against excesses—and we have no bargaining.

This second oil tax crackdown of Canada has hit America on two exposed nerves at once. The first is located domestically and centered in her slackened consumer economy. The other is located in the no-man's-land separating America from her one-time dependents who have long since gone into business for themselves as her successful competitors and harsh creditors.

The oil and gas dollar is petty change for American consumers alongside the food, rent, and tax dollar. But soaking them for big new fuel costs will rile them up more than the beef squeeze did.

All the foreign powers in the world scrutinizing America, as well as all the weaklings, are bound to be impressed by the one-way trip thru the meat grinder that Ottawa is giving Washington. Kicking Dick Nixon around is a paying business internationally, and every politician in every foreign capital is following Trudeau into it.

GRAND OLD LADY OF POLITICS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, an old friend of mine has decided to retire and thereby has brought to an end one of the most effective, colorful volunteer political careers I have ever known.

Alice Border, who will reach 79 years this month, has been known as "Mrs. Democrat" in the eastern Shasta County area for at least a decade and a half. It was in 1958 that she organized the Burney Democratic Women's Club and as she stepped down as its president this year, club members decided to regroup under another name, because it would not be the same without Alice Border.

One of the remarkable efforts sponsored annually by the club was a quilt sale, which has been a tradition in Burney. It was through the making of quilts and their sale that the club raised its funds for its most effective efforts.

Alice and her husband, Ted, who himself is an active, dedicated representative of the Democratic Party, together demonstrate the importance of participation by all our citizens in our Government regardless of party. Their work on behalf of their party, their State, and the Nation will stand for years to come as an example which should and must be followed not only by the people of Burney but of all our State of California and our Nation if we are to continue a free democratic society.

An announcement of the retirement of this "Grand Old Lady of Politics" was published recently in the Inter Mountain News of Burney, Calif., and I insert in the RECORD the article entitled "Grand Old Lady of Politics Is Retiring":

ALICE BORDER AT 79—GRAND OLD LADY OF POLITICS IS RETIRING

BURNEY.—The lady known as "Mrs. Democrat" in the Burney area is resigning. Mrs. Alice Border, who will turn 79 in November, has announced her retirement as president of the Burney Democratic Women's Club, effective November 1.

Mrs. Border was responsible for the organization of the club in 1958 and has been active ever since. She organized the club with the help of Kathryn Browand and Edna Barrington and Emma Timone.

The first president of the club was Jeanette Messinger. A year later Mrs. Border was appointed secretary-treasurer and she has held a top office in the club every year since then. She served as president for ten years and has been president for the past six years.

CLUB WILL BECOME INACTIVE

With the retirement of their president, the other members of the club decided not to continue an active club. However, in order to keep their identity and bank account, they will elect officers for 1974 on November 5. The club will also assist in the 1974 election in a small way.

Mrs. Border's political activity includes a TV appearance in Redding on behalf of John F. Kennedy when he was running for president in 1960, and on radio in Redding in 1964 on behalf of Pauline Davis.

She has served as Eastern Shasta County chairman for Don Rose when he was running for Secretary of State, Pauline Davis when she was running for the Assembly, Virgil O'Sullivan, State Senator, and Jess Unruh for Governor.

Mrs. Border has been on Bizz Johnson's Shasta County campaign committee, and on Senator John Tunney's campaign committee since each was first elected.

In addition, she has served the past nine years as Eastern Shasta registration chairman.

But perhaps her first love is music. Mrs. Border is the composer of several songs for the club and other music. She says, "Maybe now that I am retired, I'll have more time to play the piano and write music."

With all the activities of Mrs. Border, Mr. Ted Border is not left out of the picture at all. In fact, she said, "He has been the good right arm of the club since 1960 and has received a plaque as an honorary member of the club."

Ted Border, also known as "Mr. Democrat," retired from the then Scott Lumber Mill in 1956 and started his own business, Ted's Upholstery. He hopes to retire from this sometime next spring and open a rock shop. He has been a member of the Democratic Central Committee since 1962 but does not plan to run for the office next year.

QUILT SALE WILL BE THE LAST

The annual quilt sale that is almost a tradition with the Borders will be held this year on October 26 and 27, "But this will be the last," said Mrs. Border. "It has just gotten to be too much." Most of the quilt work is done by Mrs. Border herself.

"I'm not retiring from life, remember," Mrs. Border said. "I plan to spend more time enjoying the beautiful area we live in. I've traveled a lot, but there's no place like this area."

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the President's latest energy message which he delivered to the American people on television last week. I find myself in complete accord with the President when he spoke of the present energy crisis as a very serious one confronting all the people of this country. But that is about the only point in his message on which we agree.

For unlike this administration, the Congress has foreseen this grave situation and has been working diligently in an attempt to develop constructive and effective solutions to the complex problems relating to our Nation's energy needs.

There is also little doubt that the energy crisis has been heightened by the Arab States, who, in the practice of "oil diplomacy," have chosen to cut back oil exports to the United States. However, it is wrong to imply, as the President seemed to suggest, that the recent outbreak of hostility in the Middle East is alone responsible for creating our energy problems. These problems have been with us as a nation for a long, long time. They have been exacerbated by such artificial policies as the oil import quota system and others which have served the special interests rather than the public interest.

I agree fully with the President when he speaks of the need for bipartisan cooperation in overcoming the grave energy problems which now face us. I am reminded of the commitment made by the late President Kennedy to land a man on the Moon within the decade of the 1960's. When President Kennedy first made this commitment in 1961 there were few who believed that this lofty goal could be achieved. It was only through the spirit of cooperation between the President and the Congress, and between scientists and private industry, that we were able to make what first seemed no better than a dream become an almost commonplace reality. Meeting the energy needs of the people of this Nation will require a similar sense of purpose and dedication on the part of both the President and the Congress. Even more important it requires leadership on the part of the President to produce a willingness to cooperate on the part of Congress. It is precisely for this reason that I was sorry that the President, at the very moment when leadership and cooperation are so necessary, chose to lay the blame for the energy crisis at the door of the Congress. In so doing he was seriously misleading the American people.

It is important to examine the President's previous energy messages to the Congress. His message of 2 years ago was an enunciation of high goals and purposes but without specific recommendations. As the energy squeeze grew worse, Congress was led to believe that the President planned a comprehensive legislative program for which he would seek congressional approval. When his second message was finally sent to Congress, in April of this year, it proposed legislation which, at best, could only have a long-range effect. There is no evidence that any of the seven pieces of

legislation which he recommended in April would have better enabled the country to survive the shortages and the suffering which are undoubtedly in store for this winter. In addition, most of the legislation he proposed was extremely controversial and was the kind of legislation which Congress needed to examine carefully, although with all diligent speed.

For example, the President recommended deregulation of the price of natural gas at the wellhead. This has become, it seems, the holy grail of this administration. I am not convinced that the deregulations of natural gas prices will produce any more energy for this country. What clearly would result from such deregulations is an immediate and substantial increase in the price of this fuel to the consumer, without the needed exploration for new sources of natural gas. I know that you will be as shocked as I was when I was informed by representatives of the major oil companies sitting as a group in my office that they would not promise to use this new-found money for exploration for new gas. For as they said, "Our first responsibility is to our stockholders." And when pressed as to what they would do with the windfall increase, they replied, "If the return was greater in real estate we would invest in real estate." Until and unless there are assurances that the new money will be used for exploration for new gas, the Congress should remain reluctant to pad the pockets of the major oil companies at the further expense of the consuming public.

However, despite the controversial nature of this legislation and the others proposed 6 months ago by the President, Congress is going forward with the consideration of these proposals and will act when it is convinced that the national interests are indeed being served. The Alaskan pipeline conference report which we will vote on today is an example of this process.

In his energy message of last week, the President again urged Congress to act swiftly in extremely important areas. For example, he has asked Congress to roll back existing environmental protection laws which are the product of a decade of concern on the part of the American people. In many other respects, he has asked the Congress to grant him broad energy powers which he would use to meet the current energy crisis.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Power, I can assure the President that Congress will act on his proposals where we agree that the power is necessary and will be used wisely. But the Congress will not be rushed into precipitous action simply because the President claims that he needs special authority in order to act. Many of the proposals made by the President last week could have been implemented 6 months ago or even 2 years ago by the stroke of his pen. Others could have been adopted after consideration by the Congress before things reached the crisis proportions of today.

In effect, the President appears to be playing a kind of shell game with the American people by attempting, through a sleight-of-hand, to demonstrate that he has had a program to meet the energy crisis all along. In reality, the President has not even utilized the authority already granted to him by the Congress.

In April of this year, Congress, in the Economic Stabilization Act Amendments of 1973, gave the President authority to order mandatory fuel allocations. In May, I, in conjunction with Senator JACKSON and Senator KENNEDY, introduced mandatory allocation legislation.

The purpose of my bill is to provide a method to assure an equitable distribution of fuel sources to all regions of the country. It also assures that the independent marketer of petroleum products will not be forced out of business at the whim of the major oil companies. In addition, such an allocation program will insure that domestically produced fuel oil is utilized to meet domestic needs as the highest priority. Implementation of a similar program by the President under the authority given to him by Congress could have prevented what is reported to be an increase in the exportation of domestically produced fuel oil by the major oil companies at a time when our needs here at home should be overriding. The enactment of the mandatory allocation legislation which I introduced, and which was agreed to last week by House-Senate conferees, specifically prohibits such exports in the future. However, I would like the President to explain why he has allowed these exports to rise over the past 6 months in a time of increasing shortages.

The voluntary allocation program which the President announced last May failed to meet the needs of the country. It should have been clear at that time that the only workable solution was a mandatory program.

Typical of administration foot-dragging attitude in face of the energy crisis has been their reluctance to change from a voluntary to a mandatory allocation program. On July 10, appearing before the Commerce Committee to testify on my mandatory allocation bill, Deputy Treasury Secretary William Simon, who was Chairman of the President's Oil Policy Committee, promised administration action on a mandatory program within 7 days. Needless to say, no action was forthcoming, and it was in this period that Secretary Simon was replaced as "energy czar" by former Colorado Gov. John Love. I requested Governor Love's position on mandatory allocations but was told that he was unavailable to testify. On July 25, in my remarks in this Chamber, I expressed "a sense of regret and disappointment" at the lack of resolve on the part of the administration to take the steps necessary to implement a mandatory program. The following day Governor Love telephoned me and promised a decision within "a few days." Again, the promise was an empty one.

As a result, Commerce Committee action on H.R. 9681 was completed quickly and the bill was passed by the House overwhelmingly, 337 to 72. The conference report is scheduled for final approval by Congress this week.

What is important to note is that at no time during the period in which Congress was readying this legislation did the President exercise the authority we had given him in April to achieve the same goal. It is difficult to lay the blame for delay at Congress door in this instance.

In closing, I would agree with the President that now is the time for all of us to work together and to put aside partisan and personal differences for the sake of the American people. I can assure the President that he will have my subcommittee's complete cooperation to this end. However, I can only hope that the President will be able to follow his own advice and that he will stop taking bad advice himself from the major international oil companies.

THE MULTINATIONALS

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a group of us from the House met recently with a group of European parliamentarians here in Washington for 3 days of discussions on United States-European relations and other matters of mutual interest, including trade, investment, development, and energy policies.

During one of these sessions it was my privilege to present a discussion paper on the issues involved in the worldwide operations of multinational corporations—MNC's.

There was a great deal of agreement among those present at that session on the nature of the problems for governments which are associated with MNC operations. We agreed that at our next meeting, in March, we would discuss the specific points which could be included in a new international agreement on the taxation, standards of conduct and implications for competition of MNC operations.

I would like to insert my discussion paper on MNC's in the RECORD at this point and ask for comments which might be helpful to us in drawing up a proposed international agreement on this important subject:

THE MULTINATIONAL CORPORATION: ITS REGULATION, TAXATION AND STANDARDS OF OPERATION

(By Congressman SAM M. GIBBONS)

Prepared for presentation at a discussion meeting of U.S. Congressmen and European Parliamentarians, October 30, 1973, Washington, D.C.

The Honorable George Ball, former U.S. Under Secretary of State, once said this about the multinational corporation:

"The multinational corporation not only promises the most efficient use of world resources, but as an institution, it poses the greatest challenge to the power of a nation-state since the temporal position of the Roman Church began its decline in the 15th century."

Truly, it is fitting and most necessary that we focus our attention on the development of the multinational corporation (MNC)—now perhaps the dominant force in economic relations between nations—for we as representatives of the people of the world can continue to neglect this subject only at our mutual peril.

There is no denying the fact that the multinational corporation, as an instrument for greatly increasing commerce among nations, carries with it the potential for increasing greatly not only our standard of living but also the prospects for peace and understanding on this fragile planet.

The multinational corporation can be one of the most efficient economic units ever known to man. It has integrated world resource markets with great success, especially labor and capital markets. It has been the same kind of boon to the world economy as the domestic corporation was to the United States in the 1880s and 1890s when it integrated the various regional markets and resources of the country.

The development of the corporation in the United States was not without its problems, however, just as the development of the MNC is not. The most notable reaction by the U.S. government to the excesses of the corporation was the creation of the U.S. antitrust laws. Unfortunately, a similar reaction to the excesses of the MNC has not been so rapid and definite in appearing.

As so often happens in the case of rapid new developments, the governments of the world have, it seems, been tardy in recognizing the significance of the MNC and our common interest in keeping the operations of the MNC responsive to nationally and internationally agreed upon goals.

As far as effective monitoring or action regarding the development of the MNC goes, the nations of the world really have been "drifting" in their policies.

MAKING THE MNC ACCOUNTABLE

No multinational corporation in its right mind would of course voluntarily submit to government regulation. A Dow Chemical Company official admits to a continuing dream of "buying an island owned by no nation, and of establishing the world headquarters of the Dow Company on the truly neutral ground of such an island, beholden to no nation or society."

Anthony Sampson, author of the book, "The Sovereign State of ITT," observes that MNCs invariably regard governments, like other obstacles to management, as nuisances to be circumvented or overcome."

In the United States, the Federal Trade Commission brought suit against the Xerox corporation. At first, the company would not even meet with representatives of the Commission. Their response was "We don't believe that the Federal Trade Commission is the appropriate forum for the resolution of the problems of multinational corporations."

By what right should any MNC feel that it is or should be responsible to no one?

After World War II we were careful to set up agreements and institutions promoting agreement on divisive world issues—the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—but we failed to realize that the MNC would become a force and a problem to be reckoned with in its own right. Though we now seem to have recognized this fact, we are in large part still failing to deal rationally with the MNC, either as individual countries or on an international basis.

We have generally failed to make realistic accountings of the costs and benefits of the multinational corporation and have failed to make the MNC really responsible to anyone or any organization.

Thus, we face the real prospect that our individual and common social, economic and political goals and policies will be frustrated by the day-to-day operations of the giant MNCs—that individual corporate managers will make decisions that can overrule the decisions of national governments.

We face the likelihood that the MNC will continue to exploit its supranational advantages to escape a just burden of taxation, as well as to avoid our efforts to curb monopolies, moderate inflation, and so forth. The MNCs' great power to avoid the desires and rulings of national governments simply by shifting their production or their capital—and thus jobs and tax revenues—to other jurisdictions is an awesome power which cannot go uncurbed.

If we do not cooperate as governments to make the MNC accountable for its actions, we run the risk that the MNC, world-wide in outlook and understandably self-serving, will continue to promote its own supranational goals, such as profits maximization and market enlargement, with little legal obligation to consider other factors, such as national social goals.

While the conscience of the MNC businessman and public pressure can have some effect on this situation, they are obviously no substitute for an orderly and detailed assessment of the effects of MNC operations and national and international policies and laws designed to deal with these effects.

Very recently, a number of different groups have undertaken studies of the MNC. These include the United Nations, the OECD, the International Labor Organization, the European Commission staff, and the U.S. Congress. Although necessarily fragmented, these efforts should continue to have our strong support and their results should be studied very carefully.

Nonetheless, this question remains: Is not the importance and urgency of the problems associated with MNC operations so great that we ought to be pursuing, right now, a new international agreement and creation of a new institution, perhaps similar to the GATT? Would it not be wise to centralize and focus our efforts regarding the MNC and related problems in a new international body—perhaps a kind of general Agreement on Tax and Investment Policies?

It would certainly be appropriate for the United States and the European Community to exercise leadership in establishing such a new legal framework designed to promote cooperation between countries in resolving problems and disputes not now handled by any one institution or agency of an institution.

Whether this were an entirely new body or an adjunct of an existing organization, it would serve a most useful purpose in centralizing the collection of information and serving as a forum for discussions and consultations on mutual problems and concerns relating to the MNC. It could spell out generally agreed upon principles where possible and aid harmonization of policies where general agreement was not possible.

After all, efforts divided are efforts defeated. And surely it never was prudent for any of the countries of the world to believe that our best defense against the excesses of the MNC was to have more MNCs based in our country than the other countries had. This kind of competition, like unreasonable competition between the less developed countries for MNC investment (which erodes their tax base), can too easily result in the benefit of the MNC itself at the expense of all countries.

Some actions can of course be taken by individual countries on a unilateral basis to moderate the operations of the MNC.

In the case of the United States, for instance, it is the view of many who have studied this subject that we have encouraged U.S. foreign direct investment and the growth of the MNC, unnecessarily and at least to some extent, by certain provisions of our tax laws and by the operation of the insurance programs of our Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC).

What benefit has all of this brought to the United States? While we know that it has helped enrich some of those associated with U.S. MNCs, we have not even required these companies to supply us with the detailed information on their operations which would give us the opportunity to try to determine accurately whether these tax subsidies by the American taxpayer to the U.S. based MNCs has been of any general benefit to the United States or to other commonly agreed upon goals, such as that of development in the less developed countries of the world.

At the very least, our various national policies should aim at neutrality in our tax policies with regard to investment decisions—especially in the absence of strong evidence that tax subsidies in the form of tax forgiveness for certain kinds of business activities are really efficient in promoting vital national goals. Recent studies by the joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress confirm the view that the tax subsidy has been a very poor means for trying to promote national economic and social goals.

In like manner, our investment policies should be as neutral as possible, avoiding either subsidies or restrictions wherever possible. We are pursuing studies of the effects of these distortions on investment patterns within the U.S. government and also in the OECD. However, a new international institution, such as the General Agreement on Tax and Investment Policies suggested above, could be most helpful in centralizing our efforts and harmonizing investment policies, as well as tax, antitrust, and other policies toward the MNC.

Timely completion of our efforts to reform the international monetary system is, of course, vital to all of this.

THE NEED FOR MORE INFORMATION

Our first need to make us able to come to more prudent policy decisions toward the MNCs and toward foreign direct investment is for more complete and current data on the operations of the MNC. Although what we do know about the size and operations of the MNC is impressive, it is hardly detailed enough for good decision making.

Indeed, we haven't even been asking the right questions about MNC in many cases. In the United States, we've focused our attention on whether MNC operations were good or bad for our employment rate or for our balance of payments. While these issues should be considered, other very serious questions about the effect of the MNC on resource use, market concentration, income distribution, and tax policies simply have not been studied.

For Americans, one of the most disturbing indications that there are serious gaps in our knowledge about the MNC came to light in connection with the massive Tariff Commission Report to the Senate Finance Committee in February of this year. This report, "Implications on Multinational Firms for World Trade and Investment and for U.S. Trade and Labor," is generally considered to be one of our best sources of information on the MNC. Yet, in the letter transmitting this report to the Finance Committee, the Chairman of the Tariff Commission stated:

". . . Further, the difficulties imposed by the procedures involved in the use of an unlike data base for the two bench-mark years were increased by the failure of the respondents to answer fully with respect to certain key data. In turn, these difficulties were magnified for the reason that such data were reported to the BEA in confidence and, to prevent unauthorized disclosure, were re-

leased to the Commission in many cases only in the form of incomplete aggregated estimates.

"Data on 1970 employment by the MNCs, for example, were lacking or only partially available for about 600 of the foreign affiliates and for about 30 of their parents in the sample; about a third of the total data reported in 1970 was subject to disclosure considerations which necessitated numerous estimations."

Ralph Nader, the tireless spokesman for the American consumer and taxpayer, has submitted this list of what information MNCs should report to the United Nations for publication in the public interest:

1. Who owns what land, mineral and other resources in each country;
2. The amount, origin and nature of new investment;
3. The firm's total income;
4. Payments received on royalties, patents, licenses and management contracts from foreign affiliates;
5. Ties and interlocks with other financial, industrial and government corporations together with credit and debit relationships;
6. The amount of taxes paid by country;
7. All mergers and acquisitions and their terms;
8. Special governmental incentives to firms to settle where they did, including subsidies and other state-granted privileges and immunities;
9. All patents held and cross-licensing agreements;
10. Wages and benefit levels;
11. Occupational casualty and disease data;
12. Environmental pollution and depository data; and
13. Judicial and regulatory actions and judgments which are of public record.

Others have suggested that, at least for the immediate future, this kind of reporting will have to be done on a confidential basis and only to the government of the country in which the MNC is based—the government which has legal jurisdiction over the company and is able to enforce laws on it.

In any case, it is clear that a start must be made now toward requiring more complete reporting from MNCs. Also, the cooperation which has begun between governments such as the United States and European countries in exchanging this information for legitimate purposes, such as that of taxation, should be expanded. Nearly all governments have much to gain in this regard.

"Laissez-faire" is not an appropriate policy for any business operations having such far reaching effects as those of the MNCs. Any claims to confidentiality or privacy made by the MNCs in this connection will have to be weighed carefully against the very strong public interest in having access to certain of this information.

CHARACTERISTIC OF THE MNC

What we do know about the size and operations of the MNC should give us a healthy respect for its power and its potential.

The MNCs are indeed giants, both in size and in influence on the world economy. Attached at the end of this paper is a table showing the sales, foreign sales and subsidiaries of the 15 largest multinational corporations. (Table 1)

The MNCs are growing twice as fast as the 5 percent per year growth of the world economy. If MNC sales are compared to the gross national products of various countries, 51 of the world's 100 largest money powers are MNCs and 49 are countries.

The MNCs are now doing about $500 billion worth of business a year. This is nearly one-sixth of the world's production, or more than the gross national product of Japan. Each of the top 10 MNCs has annual revenues larger than the gross national product of two-thirds of the countries of the world.

The foreign investment of MNCs has surpassed trade as the main means of international economic exchange and has blurred national borders. It has caused some economists to literally rewrite their theories about the economic effects of trade and commerce among nations.

Germany apparently has more capital invested today in textile and chemical plants in the State of South Carolina in this country than anywhere else in the world outside of that country. Switzerland's largest corporation, Nestle Alimentana S.A., does 98 percent of its business outside of Switzerland. U.S. MNCs control something like 90 percent of Europe's production of microcircuits.

U.S. MNCs account for something like 50–60 percent of all foreign direct investment. MNCs based in the U.S., the U.K., Germany and France control 80 percent of the foreign operations of MNCs.

The United States has been the traditional home of the MNC. The book value of U.S. direct investment abroad increased from $12 billion in 1950 to more than $86 billion in 1971. Americans tend to think of this investment as being mostly in less developed countries. However, Western European and Canadian markets were early targets for this investment and today about 60 percent of this investment lies in these two areas of the world, with about one-third in Europe and more than one-fourth in Canada. Latin American investments account for about one-sixth of U.S. MNC investments.

Nonetheless, it is somewhat unlikely that U.S.-based MNCs will retain their dominance in the world economy. Two hundred non-American firms are now on the Fortune magazine list of the world's 500 largest corporations. European and Japanese foreign direct investment has been increasing rapidly. For instance, Japanese investment abroad has been increasing by more than 30 percent per year in recent years.

Many economists believe that it was not only the health of the American economy after World War II and the American technological lead in certain areas which contributed to the rise of the U.S.-based multinational corporation, but also the overvalued dollar of recent years. This phenomenon made it comparatively much cheaper than it should have been to use dollars to buy up plants and other facilities abroad.

Foreign investment in the United States amounts to less than half of our investment abroad. Further, direct investment, such as in plants and other facilities, amounts to only 28 percent of this investment in the United States, as compared with 74 percent of U.S. investment overseas. Portfolio holdings account for 60 percent of foreign investment here as compared with only 19 percent of U.S. investment abroad.

Our embassies are actively encouraging direct investment in the United States. The more realistic exchange rates which have prevailed recently seem to be a factor in promoting this investment.

Foreign companies are also investing in facilities here to serve their U.S. markets. In some cases, this is also being done to avoid any possible resurgence of protectionist U.S. trade policies. In this connection, the president of the United Auto Workers has expressed his approval of the building of a Volvo plant in the United States which will employ 1,500 workers. However, proponents of the protectionist Burke-Hartke trade and investment bill seem to be voicing as much objection to this kind of direct investment by foreign-based MNCs in this country as they did to the supposed export of American jobs by investment abroad by American-based MNCs.

MNC operations have generally been quite profitable. A Senate Finance Committee study reports that 21 of 30 U.S. multinational firms made higher profits abroad than at home. Earnings from the foreign operations of U.S.-based MNCs now contribute 20–25 percent of U.S. corporate after-tax profits. Thus, they have become a rather important element in promoting the growth of the U.S. economy.

1965–68 figures for U.S.-based MNCs show returns of 7.9 percent for developed country investment (9.6 excluding petroleum) and 17.5 percent for developing country investment (11 percent excluding petroleum). In this latter category, investment in Asia yielded 34.7 percent return (11.7 excluding petroleum).

There is of course a great difference in return for different investments. One study of return on net worth for 15 U. S. drug subsidiaries in Latin America shows returns ranging from 44.2 percent to 962.1 percent, with the average being 136.3 percent.

NATIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON THE MNC

The phenomenal rise of the MNC has prompted reactions to it. Even without cooperating with one another, nations are not of course completely defenseless against the MNC. Perhaps their first line of defense is to prevent the MNC from investing in their country.

The Andean Group has come up with very stringent regulations on any foreign investment. These are designed to insure that this investment benefits the host country and does not lead to further dependence on other countries. Mexico has adopted new foreign investment laws and Canada—with fully half of her capital assets now owned by U. S. or British-based MNCs—and Australia are also moving in this direction.

Some of the less developed countries are requiring that a certain percentage of the goods sold in a country be produced locally, while a special kind of "investment code" or local participation requirement is now forcibly being put into effect by the Arab oil-producing countries.

Expropriation is another power that the host country retains in connection with the investments of an MNC. Expropriations, especially in Latin America, have been on the rise in recent years. Hopefully, national investment codes will set the ground rules for foreign direct investment more specifically and both expropriations and home country attempts at remedy, such as OPIC, will become much less common in the future.

Most countries of the world, including the United States and the Europeans, seem to be rethinking their attitudes toward the costs benefits of the MNC. This is as it should be. The result has generally been more restrictive policies toward the MNCs, or at least the consideration of this kind of change.

Nonetheless, it would be unfortunate if this change in direction resulted in unnecessarily restrictive policies toward the MNCs, for our goal would seem to be that of harnessing the great potential of these giants and making them responsible to public policy rather than putting them all out of existence.

Two of the most troublesome problems in relation to the MNC are (1) how to assess and enforce a just burden of taxation on the MNC and (2) how to limit the monopolistic oligopolistic tendencies of these giants so that their operations do not have serious adverse effects on competition and on prices in world markets.

TAXING THE MNC

One day this summer the New York Times carried an article noting that the staff of the European Commission, in a working paper, had singled out taxation as the area in which MNCs were in sharpest conflict with host states. The working paper noted that:

Even leaving aside any problems with tax evasion, it is undoubtedly true that domiciliation in various countries, each with its own methods and rates and with independently conducted audits, . . . provides openings for tax avoidance.

The prices charged in a group's intercompany transactions and fees for industrial property or management can be used as a means of reducing the tax assessment basis or of consistently moving profits to countries with favorable tax systems.

Heads of multinational undertakings freely admit, however, that if tax avoidance is not their raison d'etre or their main source of profit, nevertheless they do logically operate a tax strategy that best serves the interests of their firm.

Merely by being true to themselves, the multinationals thus come into conflict with the [host] states.

Thus, for instance, a Belgian subsidiary of a U.S.-based MNC might help the MNC take advantage of the lower tax rate in Switzerland by charging a higher than reasonable price for management services rendered to the Swiss subsidiary of the same MNC, thus reducing its own income proportionately—income which would have been taxed at a higher rate than the Swiss subsidiary's income will. Some would call this just another phase of the company's tax planning.

U.S. Finance professor Sidney Robbins was quoted in Fortune magazine as saying "there is enormous potential for saving taxes by adjusting prices within the corporate structure" but that the MNC had not yet fully exploited transfer pricing.

U.S. Treasury officials have indicated that they are pleased with the progress which has been made by the United States and Germany in combatting the problem of transfer pricing by setting forth rules to be used by the MNC's for transactions "not at arms length." This problem needs to be pursued, however, to involve the cooperation of other countries.

If the MNC is to pay its fair share of the social costs of its operation, effective means must be worked out by governments to allocate the income of the MNC fairly among the different countries in which MNC subsidiaries may be located. The governments of the world have a great deal of work to do in tightening up their tax rules and their cooperation with one another if this is to be done—cooperation in such areas as the exchange of information, the enforcement of tax laws, the discussion of disputes, and so forth.

While the developed countries have made some good progress in these areas, and in achieving some harmonization of tax laws through means such as the tax treaty and consultations in the OECD, a great deal remains to be done both in this field and with regard to agreements between developed countries and developing countries.

Undue competition for the benefits of MNC home bases or foreign direct investment, as through tax forgiveness provisions or tax holidays, can only hurt the countries of the world by eroding their tax base to the advantage of the MNC. In all of these tax areas—including the consideration of border or value-added taxes in some countries, as well as the possible adverse implications for foreign investment of European steps toward integrating the corporate and personal income tax but allowing tax credit only to domestic investors—a General Agreement on Tax and Investment Policies, with a permanent secretariat, could serve a very useful function.

It has been estimated that the average effective tax rate for the United States on foreign operations of U.S.-based MNCs is 5 percent. This compares with a statutory tax rate of 48 percent for U.S. corporations. While it is perhaps reasonable that much of the taxes paid by a corporation should go to the taxing jurisdiction where the company's operations are located, the United States is obviously quite generous in our tax treatment of foreign source income. For instance, the tax treatment for a company establishing a subsidiary operation in Mexico is likely to be quite a bit more favorable than if that same company established a new operation in the United States. Also, in case after case, an American MNC has made use of a tax haven operation or certain provisions of the U.S. tax law to escape much of what would have been a fair burden of taxation.

For instance, the U.S. government does not levy a tax on any U.S.-based MNC earnings until they are repatriated to the United States. This "deferral" of taxes allows the company to reinvest earnings abroad indefinitely and, as many tax lawyers point out, to really escape taxation completely.

It is little wonder that representatives of foreign governments express the hope that we will not eliminate deferral, since it encourages re-investment in their countries and produces jobs and tax revenues. But why should we do this when there is no accounting of exactly what benefits there are for the United States from all of this, or for such goals as development in less developed countries?

Even though the U.S. government does not tax foreign source income on a current basis—when earned—we are rather generous in underwriting the losses of U.S.-based MNCs abroad. Generally, 48 percent of any loss incurred, even by an expropriation not covered by insurance, is allowed as an immediate deduction against U.S. tax liability.

Even by most conservative estimates, our tax breaks for foreign operations abroad—deferral, DISC (providing deferral for export-related operations), the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation allowance (a reduced tax rate for these investments; 34 percent) and others—cost the U.S. government at least $675 million a year in lost tax revenues.

We may never know how much the U.S. government has forgone in tax revenues in connection with the U.S. investments in Middle East oil, virtually all of which are now being nationalized.

Several committees of the U.S. Congress are now or will soon be taking a very close look at whether these tax subsidies to foreign investment—much of which would undoubtedly be made even if there were no subsidies—are justified. For instance, how can it be argued that we must provide further tax breaks for domestic investment in order to encourage additional capital formation in this country when, at the same time, we are subsidizing the export of our capital, both through a bias in our tax laws in favor of foreign investment and through the OPIC insurance program?

Minimal U.S. tax reform proposals would eliminate deferral and DISC and tighten up the foreign tax credit, which is the U.S. vehicle for preventing double taxation of foreign source income. Other proposals would actually penalize foreign investment by treating the foreign tax credit only as a deduction. The U.S. Treasury has proposed certain revisions in the tax laws relating to allowances for foreign losses and for operations in foreign tax havens.

MNC'S AND THE CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

The second major field of concern regarding the MNCs is the control of their vast economic power. While this is basically a problem of jurisdiction and the application of antitrust laws, the unique and growing economic power of the MNCs is of course at the heart of our concern about the political power of these giant companies.

In this area perhaps more than others the governments of the world have been tardy in acting. There is strong evidence that harm has already been done in the form of lessened competition, higher prices and lower quality, and that now is the time to act to recoup lost ground.

As the attached table (table 2) shows, much of the growth of the U.S.-based MNCs abroad is attributable not to new facilities but to mergers and acquisitions of existing companies. While bigness may mean economic efficiency, it may also mean "improper advantage of a dominant position," as the Treaty of Rome puts it.

Americans have been pleased at recent reports that the European Commission is aggressively enforcing the European "competition policy." We have not been so happy with European rules on government procurement, which favor European companies and give little regard to price competition. While our own less stringent "Buy American" laws have popular appeal, there is a severe questioning of their prudence with regard to costs and benefits by many U.S. Congressmen and government officials.

Americans have also been pleased at reports that our own government is taking a stronger stand against monopolistic practices in this country. IBM, the world's 6th largest MNC, has been found guilty under U.S. antitrust laws of trying to monopolize the market for peripheral devices for its computers and is likely to pay millions of dollars in treble damages for this. Also the Justice Department's Antitrust Division has been reorganized with a view to more attention to matters involving trade and MNC operations.

Nonetheless, U.S. efforts to apply our antitrust laws to subsidiaries of U.S. MNCs have met with resistance. This is another area in which care must be taken to avoid the MNC's possible escape from any governmental jurisdiction.

In 1970, the OECD warned that, with the rise of the MNC,

"The competitive pressures which have come from the dismantling of trade barriers may gradually weaken and there is a danger that international mergers and growing financial links between large companies in different countries may lessen competition between foreign and domestic suppliers.

"While the growth of multinational corporations and links across national frontiers have been a major factor promoting rationalization and higher productivity, they also provide increasing scope for monopolistic and oligopolistic practices."

Economists such as Stephen Hymer are warning that "direct foreign investment tends to reduce the number of alternatives facing sellers and to stay the forces of international competition."

Americans tend to think that we have a very competitive "free enterprise" system in this country, whereas the European and Japanese governments permit various cartel arrangements and even support them. This is of course not exactly the situation. The U.S. government provides a great number of de facto subsidies to its industries. However, it is very important that all governments realize and realistically assess the dangers of the MNC as far as reducing competition and raising prices goes. Another serious problem in this area is the control by MNCs of alternative technologies, such as giant oil company control of coal and uranium supplies as well. In view of the implications of this fact, and the existing problem of world-wide inflation, the need for attention to this area cannot be over-emphasized.

General Motors is the largest corporation in the world. It is a multinational corporation, with about one-fifth of its sales abroad.

In its U.S. operations, controlling such auto "divisions" as Chevrolet, Buick, Pontiac, Oldsmobile and Cadillac, it has long enjoyed an extremely dominant position, verging on monopoly, in the U.S. automobile industry, which has become a large segment of the U.S. economy. If it had not been for the availability of Volkswagens, Toyotas, and other small car imports, there would have been no pressure on GM to produce any small cars at all—since small cars yield GM less profit. Therefore, without the competition of the foreign imports, there would be even fewer choices of relatively small cars on the U.S. market today than there are. Further, our gasoline consumption and air pollution problems would be even worse than they are.

Certainly there has traditionally been little real competition for GM from the other members of the U.S. auto industry oligopoly, Chrysler and Ford. It is easy to see how a further take-over by GM or another giant auto company of world-wide auto production could put consumers even further at the mercy—choice-wise and price-wise—of the MNC and the decisions of its corporate managers.

To make matters worse in its U.S. operations, GM also controls mass transit divisions which make buses and other such vehicles. How could one expect much progress in the mass transit area from GM when its bread and butter comes from selling more and bigger cars?

A solution suggested by some is to break GM into its independent component divisions especially in the case of its mass transit operations. Unfortunately, this suggestion has not been accepted by many government officials.

Yet, given the resource limitations of this plant, which are daily becoming more and more obvious, can this government and the other nations of the world afford any longer not to cooperate in making vast vested business interests such as GM accountable to the public good?

MNC'S AND MONETARY DISRUPTIONS

The Tariff Commission report cited above notes that at the end of 1971 private corporations controlled some $268 billion in short term liquid assets, with the lion's share controlled by multinational firms and banks headquartered in the United States. This was "more than twice the total of all international monetary institutions in the world at the same date."

The massive economic power of the giant MNCs is reflected in their holdings of short-term liquid assets. Even unintentionally, a movement of only a small fraction of these holdings from weak currencies to stronger ones could create a real crisis in the international monetary system.

This fact of life has made even more urgent the reaching of an early agreement on a more flexible international monetary system with adequate means for financing large short-term capital flows among countries.

MNC'S AND DEVELOPMENT

With the current backsliding among the rich countries of the world in their commitment to aid the developing countries, private foreign investment has assumed a new importance for the developing nations.

There would seem to be further steps the United States and other countries could take to promote the kind of investment in developing countries which will really be of benefit to those countries as well as to the MNC, such as the huge new agribusiness project under way now in Senegal. Thus far, some of the tax and aid steps the United States has taken with regard to development have not been very selective in their effect. The U.S. government and private businesses as well could be helpful to developing countries by providing technical assistance to these countries. One area that would seem to be ripe for action is assistance to representatives of these countries in the mechanics of negotiating with the skillful representatives—lawyers, accountants, economists, etc.—of the MNC. This kind of aid could benefit the MNC, by reducing suspicions and the likelihood of future action against foreign holdings, as well as the host country.

Like the area of antitrust, the role of the MNC in promoting development is a sorely neglected area. Narrowing the income gap between nations is absolutely essential if any of us are to enjoy peace and prosperity in the future. It would be most unfortunate if we are not able to harness the potential of the MNC for promoting development, rather than its potential for exploiting low wage rates and low environmental standards to its own advantage.

NEED FOR ATTENTION AND ACTION

As has been emphasized throughout this paper, the magnitude and significance of the issues relating to the operations of the multinational corporation are far too great for us to do anything but turn our immediate attention to better cooperation among our countries to resolve these issues.

A good way to start on this would be for us to set a date for an international conference on the creation of a General Agreement on Tax and Investment Policies.

TABLE 1.—THE TOP 15 MULTINATIONAL COMPANIES

Company	Total 1971 sales [billions of dollars]	Foreign sales as percentage of total	Number of countries in which subsidiaries are located
General Motors	28.3	19	21
Exxon	18.7	50	25
Ford	16.4	26	30
Royal Dutch/Shell	12.7	79	43
General Electric	9.4	16	32
IBM	8.3	39	80
Mobil Oil	8.2	45	62
Chrysler	8.0	24	26
Texaco	7.5	40	30
Unilever	7.5	80	31
ITT	7.3	42	40
Gulf Oil	5.9	45	61
British Petroleum	5.2	88	52
Philips Gloeilampenfabrieken	5.2	NA	29
Standard Oil of California	5.1	45	26

Data: United Nations.

TABLE 2.—187 U.S. MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS: METHOD OF ENTRY INTO HOST COUNTRY

[Number of affiliates and percentage]

	Total affiliates			Acquisitions [1]			Acquisitions as percentage of total		
	Pre-1946	1946–57	1958–67	Pre-1946	1946–57	1958–67	Pre-1946	1946–57	1958–67
Developed market economies:									
Canada	537	414	639	158	187	370	29.4	45.2	57.9
Western Europe	1,105	693	2,754	256	194	1,193	23.2	28.0	43.3
Southern hemisphere [2]	152	185	511	30	57	240	19.7	30.8	47.0
Japan	17	43	198	5	17	53	29.4	39.5	26.8
Developing countries:									
Western hemisphere	508	735	1,309	110	157	477	21.7	21.4	36.4
Asia and Africa [3]	103	176	491	17	23	109	16.5	13.1	22.2
Total	2,422	2,246	5,898	576	635	2,442	23.8	28.3	41.4

[1] Acquisition refers to purchases by U.S. corporations of domestic companies previously under local control.
[2] Including Australia, New Zealand, Republic of South Africa, Rhodesia.
[3] Excluding Rhodesia.

Source: Center for Development Planning, Projections and Policies of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, based on James W. Vaupel and Joan P. Curhan, "The Making of Multinational Enterprise" (Boston, 1969).

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE G. V. MONTGOMERY AT LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. SPRUANCE

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 1973, a historical event occurred at Pascagoula, Miss. The first of the proposed 30 *Spruance* class DD–963 destroyers was launched. This multipurpose destroyer, with its sleek lines, vindicated the supporters of the "shipyard of the future." As it touched water by modern launching techniques, Congressman G. V. "Sonny" Montgomery delivered the principal address and very succinctly put the launching in its proper perspective.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE G. V. MONTGOMERY

Thank you, Admiral Zumwalt, for that very generous introduction. It is not often one has the honor and privilege of being introduced by the Chief of Naval Operations. It has been my good fortune on several occasions to talk with Admiral Zumwalt during appearances before our House Armed Services Committee and in less formal situations. I have always found him to be a man of immense capabilities and knowledge. One trait exhibited by you, Admiral, that is especially appreciated is your willingness to always speak your mind and let the chips fall where they may. You have been an inspiration to the officers and men serving under you and they should be grateful for the many changes you have instituted on their behalf.

Congressman Lott, Admiral Kidd, Admiral Johnston, Admiral Payne, Mr. O'Green, Mr. Marandino, Mrs. Spruance, Mrs. Bogart, my fellow Mississippians, ladies and gentlemen.

Before beginning I would like to express on behalf of Senator John Stennis his very deep regrets that important business pending before the Senate and especially the Senate Armed Services Committee prevented his being with us today. He really hated to miss this important event.

This occasion has been billed as the launching of the first of a new fleet of multimission U.S. Navy destroyers. Actually, it is much more than that. This event represents the beginning of an entire new naval concept to preserve the integrity of the high seas and ensure the defense of the free world. It also represents a revolutionary concept in shipbuilding made possible by the dedication and hard work of my fellow Mississippians and Alabamians that will result in a savings for the taxpayers over the long run.

Equally as important, this launching reminds us of the many men and women who fought bravely and against superior forces at times during World War II in order that the free world might remain free.

Mrs. Spruance, I believe your late husband

would have been very pleased to have known that the first of the DD–963 class of destroyers is being named in his honor. In fact, the entire complement of 30 ships will be known as the Spruance Class. As a former commander of the first true destroyer, the *USS Bainbridge*, Admiral Spruance might be a little surprised to find that his namesake is twice as long as the *Bainbridge* and can displace 7,800 tons fully loaded as compared to a loaded displacement of only 590 tons for the *Bainbridge*.

Of course, the *USS Spruance* has many other firsts. As I mentionued earlier, it is a new class of Navy destroyers developed to maintain America's strength on the world seas and deter war into the 21st century. This will be the first major combat ship in the U.S. Navy to be powered with four marine gas turbine engines making it possible to travel at speeds in excess of 30 knots. The *Spruance* will have the most advanced surface ship sonar operational in the Navy today. In addition to its major responsibility of antisubmarine warfare, this ship can be assigned to bombard shore positions, support amphibious assaults, escort military and merchant ships convoys, perform surveillance and trailing of hostile surface ships, establish blockades and undertake search and destroy operations. This class of destroyer will certainly strengthen our position in keeping the sea lines open for much needed oil coming to the U.S.

Of importance to the cost conscious taxpayers of America is the fact that Litton technology and expertise produced a ship that will require a crew of only 250 officers and enlisted men. This is less than 80 percent of the crew required for modern combat ships of similar size and lesser capability. The reduction in personnel alone is expected to save the Navy more than a billion dollars at today's prices during the life of these new ships.

Nor have the creature comforts of the men assigned to the *Spruance* and future DD–963 destroyers been forgotten. The ship is almost self-maintaining and the living and recreation quarters for the men will be the most modern and comfortable available, including carpeting and pleasing color schemes.

Much of this must sound like a scene from a Jules Verne tale or some kind of miracle ship. It is not science fiction, but it is part of a major nationwide defense effort.

As noted by Ned Marandino, from the time that the smallest component part was produced to the time of launching, people from 35 States, the District of Columbia and 2 foreign countries have had a part in producing this vessel.

Even though Ingalls has the total responsibility of producing these new destroyers, many of the component parts were subcontracted to firms throughout the Nation. So it's really not a completely true statement to say that Ingalls Shipbuilding was awarded the contract for the Spruance class of destroyers. The contract was actually awarded to American industry under the direct responsibility and supervision of Ingalls, and I can't think of a better company to handle this challenge.

Let me digress for a moment to comment further on Ingalls Shipyard in view of the unjustified criticism that has come its way.

Most of the critics have never been to Ingalls shipyard and as far as I know have never even taken the time to discuss their charges with any of the officials of Ingalls or Litton.

I don't deny anyone the right to make any charges they want to or bemoan the fact that Ingalls received the contract for the DD–963 destroyers and LHAs. But I am sick and tired of political office holders picturing our defense contractors as highway robbers. Nor do I appreciate the fact that they play on the lack of knowledge of the American taxpayers when they know full well that only a very few people fully understand the complexities of military procurement. The contracts held by Ingalls and its subcontractors throughout America are a perfect example of an extremely complex defense agreement.

While making these statements, I full well realize that Ingalls has experienced problems in meeting part of their contract on the LHA. But these have not been insurmountable problems and are problems that can be expected on the shakedown cruise of any new facility such as this new and modern shipyard.

In fact, the USS Spruance is five and one-half months ahead of the contract milestone for launch.

In conversations I have had with Mr. O'Green and Mr. Marandino, they have made known to me their concern and the concern of their company. But what is important is that they have taken steps to solve the problems of the past and improve on the efficiency of the yard.

In addition to the leadership being provided by company management, I think it is also important to stress the dedication of the 18,000 person labor force. They are a true example of the hard work and dedication that American industry has come to expect of Mississippians, and those from neighboring states.

These men and women are not so many time cards that have to be punched each day. They are flesh and bone with an emotional involvement in their craftsmanship. I would match their abilities with the work performance of people in any other State in the Nation. I am proud of them and I am proud of the role they are playing in our Nation's defense.

I would like to quote a part of a statement made by Senator John Stennis concerning the LHA and DD–963 contracts following an on-the-ground inspection made by the Senator last December. I quote:

"I want to emphasize that these contracts come under a new method of building ships. There is some trial and error in it, there always is in new things.

"There may be some added costs—there always is in things that are new. But I see clear evidence the Ingalls is not only building these ships, but they are going to demonstrate to the American people and to the world that this is a sound way to build ships. I think it will prove to be the best way to build them at the least cost. These contracts are going to be carried out in such a way as to clearly prove that this yard and this system is a great asset to the Navy and therefore to the Nation—the American people—and to the entire free world."

Since no one, absolutely no one, is able to question the objectivity of Senator Stennis in matters dealing with military procurement, I feel his statement is ample evidence that Ingalls and Litton are performing in a manner consistent with their 35 years of outstanding shipbuilding experience.

In closing, I would like to elaborate briefly on one of the original points I made. That is this launching represents the beginning of an entire new naval concept to preserve the integrity of the high seas and ensure the defense of the free world.

I might point out, Admiral Zumwalt, my comments will be obviously familiar to you since they closely parallel the very strong testimony you gave before the Senate Armed Services Committee this past April. I am pleased that we share mutual views on national defense and naval power.

In an era when the perception of national power will carry great weight at the negotiating tables of the world, the military position of that national power must remain strong.

Our economic and political interest demand that we maintain a posture such that no enemy will question our ability to protect the vital sea lines of our commerce.

Nor must our enemies or adversaries question our resolve to support our allies and their sovereignty or our intention to work for world peace from a position of benelovent strength. To achieve these goals we must have a modern naval force of adequate size and composition to offset the growing capabilities of our major potential adversary—Russia.

Detente with Russia and China is a constructive beginning toward a generation of world peace. But the words on paper outlining detente must be backed-up by the men and equipment signifying our determination not to be bullied into a position of weakness. Therefore, we must have the national will to provide these men and equipment within the financial capabilities of the United States. For by speaking from a position of strength, we will be able to translate the pledges of peace into the realities of peace.

The ship we launch today meets part of our requirements for men and equipment to make detente work.

Mrs. Spruance, I am truly sorry that I never had the opportunity to meet and know your husband personally. I know that he was a great officer and a great American and most of all a great husband and father. Just as Admiral Spruance fought to regain freedom in World War II, the USS Spruance will play a leading role in preventing World War III and maintaining America's position as a strong and free nation.

ROBERT EWING THOMASON

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, any person who has served in Congress in the depression years and the years that immediately followed, knows that Robert Ewing Thomason served the Congress with great distinction. I believe he was considered one of the top 10 Congressmen in the United States, and his achievements were so outstanding and his abilities so recognized that he was appointed Federal judge.

Over the years, I have heard many stories about this outstanding jurist. I have read his autobiography, and it is a heartwarming American story that proves that every young man has a chance if he applies his abilities.

As a Member of Congress, I have also heard many stories about this great judge, and I have pointed this out to many audiences in my district. The story goes that when a critical vote presented itself on the floor of the House, Ewing Thomason would rise and remind his colleagues of the difficult vote just a few minutes off. Then he would say:

The leaders of the Congress on this committee tell us that this is a good bill and that it is needed. The leadership of the House has likewise examined this bill carefully and have given it their approval. I am not an expert in this particular field, and I do not know all the facts related to it; but in a vote like this, I am going to put my faith in my committee and my leadership. I believe we reach a point in government where we must believe in somebody or someone. Because I do believe in my leaders, I believe also in my country, and though I may have doubts, I am going to vote for the bill because I want to believe in my country.

Mr. Speaker, in this day and time, that story must be told over and over. We must believe in someone. We must believe

in our leaders. We must believe that proper study has been given. The words of Ewing Thomason were true then and are true today.

When Judge Homer Thornberry was sworn in as U.S. district judge in El Paso, I flew to that happy occasion where Judge Thomason presided. It was obvious that everyone in the courtroom and in El Paso loved this man. He was pleasant, witty, thoughtful, and deeply philosophical. He was a great American.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE DIPLOMACY—KEY TO WORLD UNDERSTANDING

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the great advances in communication and travel have indeed made the world smaller. The increased contact between the American people and citizens throughout the world has led to an effective form of diplomacy. This "new diplomacy" was emphasized in a recent speech delivered to the Rotary Club of Houston by Mr. Alan A. Reich, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. I enter this excellent talk in the RECORD at this point:

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE DIPLOMACY—KEY TO WORLD UNDERSTANDING

(Remarks of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs Alan A. Reich)

Diplomacy has gone public. Foreign relations is no longer the exclusive domain of the professional diplomat. In almost every country of the world, foreign affairs communities, in varying degrees, have opened their ranks to public participation. It is a privilege to meet with the Rotary Club of Houston, which, I understand, is the largest Rotary Club in the world, because you play an important role in Houston's international outreach and leadership.

I shall talk today about the importance of people-to-people diplomacy, the interest of the State Department in furthering it, and comment on the significant contribution of your Rotary work.

Many Americans ask why we should concern ourselves with international problems when we have so many serious domestic concerns demanding attention. There are several good reasons for our getting "involved with mankind": First of all there is common charity. Then there is a sense of common humanity. In addition, there is common sense. Modern transportation and communications, not to speak of modern weapons, have brought our neighbors' problems to our doorstep. We have no choice but to become involved, because if the problems next door are ignored, they soon become our problems.

Poverty, illiteracy, hunger and disease recognize no nation's borders and travel under no country's passport. It is not a matter of the world's poor getting poorer while the rich get richer. The poor are getting richer, too. But their lot is improving so slowly that the difference—the gap—between rich and poor is widening, not closing. Unless some way can be found to reverse this trend, those who are better off must one day suffer the horrible consequences. Neither we nor our children will have the luxury of working on our domestic problems if we do not succeed in bringing about a climate of peaceful cooperation throughout the world during the next few years. Whether we cooperate with our international neighbors because it is good, or right, or necessary, we must get on with it *while* we are improving the quality of life at home. We can also take some solace in knowing that the job is not ours to do alone. Many other nations share with us the desire and the capacity to help close this gap between the have and have-not peoples of the world. The facts of international life today are that common sense and common survival dictate common action to solve common problems.

The geometric increase in citizen involvement in world affairs has special significance for the diplomat. It is a fundamental, irreversible, and irresistible influence for peace. Nations are less likely to deal with their differences in absolute terms when their citizens communicate and cooperate with each other freely and frequently.

When people-to-people bonds and communications networks are more fully developed, there will be a greater readiness to communicate, to seek accommodation, and to negotiate. The likelihood of international confrontation will diminish, and prospects for peaceful solutions will be enhanced. This rationale governs the interest of the State Department in the furtherance of meaningful people-to-people exchange.

DEPARTMENT-SPONSORED EXCHANGES

When you think of the State Department's conduct of our international affairs, the exchange-of-persons program does not come immediately to mind. It is, nonetheless, a significant and important activity of the Department. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs works constantly and quietly to improve the climate for diplomacy and international cooperation. The exciting, challenging job of the Bureau is to utilize its modest funds and manpower to reinforce the work of American individuals and organizations who want to help construct, a little at a time, the foundation of better relationships with the rest of the world. It also coordinates, as necessary, the activities of other government agencies with international exchange programs in substantive fields such as health, education, social welfare, transportation, agriculture, military training, and urban planning.

Having come not too long ago from the business world, I have a great appreciation for what is being done for an investment of some $45 million annually. There are several major elements of the Department's exchange program:

The Fulbright-Hays exchange program over 25 years has engaged more than 100,000 people in academic exchanges. Annually, some 5,400 professors, lecturers, and scholars are exchanged to and from the United States.

The international visitor program brings to the United States about 2,000 foreign leaders and potential leaders annually for one- or two-month orientation programs. This includes nonacademic leaders and professionals, from Cabinet officers to journalists. One out of every 10 heads of state in the world today has been a State Department exchange visitor, as have some 250 Cabinet ministers of other nations.

The Department of State sends abroad annually several leading performing arts groups and athletic stars; for example, in the past year under this program the San Francisco Symphony Orchestra and the New York City Ballet toured the Soviet Union; one of America's leading popular singing groups, the Fifth Dimension, performed in Eastern Europe; Robert Lee Elder and the Morehouse College Glee Club visited Africa; and the United States basketball and swimming teams just returned from tours to the People's Republic of China.

Some 150 prominent U.S. lecturers went abroad for six-week lecture tours in 1972.

Nearly 500 United Nations specialists selected by their home countries and funded by the U.N., are programmed annually by the State Department through 30 other government agencies for six- to nine-month training programs in the United States.

The commitment to these programs is substantial. They are administered, in cooperation with thousands of volunteers and many private organizations, by Bureau personnel in Washington and at our reception centers in Honolulu, Miami, New Orleans, New York, and San Francisco. Abroad they are administered, in cooperation with the United States Information Agency, by the cultural affairs officers in our embassies. In 50 countries there are binational commissions which have responsibility for supervising the academic exchange program.

The State Department's small but catalytic exchange-of-persons program with 126 countries stimulates constructive communication among leaders and future leaders in many fields here and abroad. It creates durable reservoirs of information, understanding, and empathy. It develops rewarding and lasting contacts of key people of other countries with their counterparts here.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

In government and in the private sector, there is much to be done. Service organizations, such as Rotary International, through its people-to-people programs, are doing an outstanding job. Rotary's international youth exchange, involving 700 youths throughout the world annually, is a model program with considerable impact.

The Rotary Club matching program, which links Rotary Clubs in 150 countries with counterpart clubs for direct Rotarian-to-Rotarian relationships and shared service projects, is equally impressive. Rotary's world community service program has helped people throughout the world. Through Rotary International's small business clinic program, many individuals in less developed countries have been helped to self-sufficiency and community contribution.

Two other elements of the overall Rotary International outreach are especially meaningful. First, the mere existence of Rotary joining 750,000 leaders around the world is a potent force for mutual understanding. As your new Rotary International president, William C. Carter, stated at the Lausanne Congress last month, "No country or empire in the world ever had in its embassies and consulates, so many outlets as Rotary International has in its 15,659 clubs in 150 countries and geographical areas of the world." Rotary is made up of leaders from all segments of society; this fraternal relationship—professional to professional, businessman to businessman, and so on—generates good will among millions throughout the world.

CRIME CONTROL NO. 7

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, far more than the police, who in most instances can act only after a crime has been committed and they have been notified by the victim or witnesses, an armed citizenry acts as a deterrent to crime and a force for the apprehension of criminals. Should guns be confiscated from private citizens, this enormously effective peacekeeping force would be gone, and, in all probability, a wave of crime would wash over the Nation, In order to illustrate the law-enforcement capability of privately owned guns, I ask that this article from the Tennessean, "Armed Neighbors Thwart Burglary," be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

ARMED NEIGHBORS THWART BURGLARY

(By George Watson Jr.)

Three burglars discovered yesterday that it doesn't take police to cause them trouble.

A group of neighbors—all armed with guns—also can be bad news.

Mrs. Nancy Cooley, of 4020 Bernard Road, Joelton, said she and her husband, Flem, had gone to work early yesterday when three men pulled into the driveway of their home and began their work.

"Mrs. Dot King, my nextdoor neighbor, saw them carry out my color television, a black and white TV, a radio and vacuum cleaner," said Mrs. Cooley. "Mrs. King then called my husband and Carl Tinsley, a neighbor who runs a service station up the street."

While the burglars went about their work, about 9:30 a.m., carrying the merchandise out of the Cooley home and putting it into their car parked in the driveway, Tinsley—armed with his pistol—headed to the Cooley home in a wrecker from his service station.

"As the men came out of the driveway and started up the street, Tinsley and another man blocked the street with their wrecker and so the men started backing down the street," explained Mrs. Cooley.

Mrs. Cooley, who pointed out that she lives on a deadend street, said the three men then "threw out all the merchandise over a hillside at the end of the street."

Meanwhile, a number of other neighbors armed with pistols and shotguns came up to the wrecker to join Tinsley and one of his workers.

"When the guys started back up the street," said Mrs. Cooley, "all my neighbors held their guns on them until the police arrived."

ALBERT IS AGAINST POTENTIAL COUP

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the deliberate delay in the confirmation of Vice Presidential-designate GERALD FORD which has been the result of political thinking of the majority party in both Houses, is clearly against the public interest.

A very interesting theory as to the reason for this delay is the subject of an article by columnist Frank van der Linden which I noted in the October 14 issue of the South Harvey Illinois Star Tribune. This article was written a month ago yet some of the points are still very pertinent.

The article follows:

ALBERT IS AGAINST POTENTIAL COUP

(By Frank van der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—House Speaker Carl Albert is moving vigorously to block a scheme proposed by radicals in his own Democratic party to make him President of the United States by a Congressional coup d'etat.

The Oklahoma Democrat is appalled by the idea that the Democrats controlling Congress could place him in the White House by first impeaching President Nixon before there could be a vote on confirmation of Vice Presidential-designate Gerald Ford.

It is not an entirely preposterous plot. Since the forced resignation of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew on October 10, the Speaker has been next in the line of succession to the Presidency. He will remain there as long as Ford's nomination is stalled in committee; and any tragedy befalling the President would make Albert automatically the next chief executive.

The Democratic majority of the House Judiciary committee is taking its own sweet time about considering Ford, and the Senate Rules committee isn't moving much faster. Now the same House committee is driving ahead with a stack of resolutions to impeach the President, making the most of the nation-wide roar of outrage that ensued when Nixon fired special prosecutor Archibald Cox.

Albert has publicly cautioned the Judiciary panel against holding Ford as a "hostage" while the impeachment campaign rolls on. But Chairman Peter W. Rodino, the finest flower of the Newark (N.J.) Democratic machine, is under intense pressure from Nixon-haters, in Congress and out, to "get" Nixon first and let Ford wait.

Rodino won re-election last year against two black opponents in his district, where white voters have been reduced to a minority. He is hearing threats that a strong black candidate will try to take his House seat away next year unless he goes along with the impeach-Nixon drive, which is being pushed by the Americans for Democratic Action, the Democratic Study group in the House, and allied groups.

So Rodino, although anxious to co-operate with the Speaker's efforts to cool off the radicals, is only a figurehead carried along by the violent partisans on his own committee. Rep. Tom Railsback, Illinois Republican on Judiciary, has protested that the Democrats on the panel are pressing their probe of "Watergate-related" matters and other issues concerning "the President's conduct" without bothering to consult the minority members.

The Speaker, who was born 65 years ago at Bug Tussle, a hamlet in the "Little Dixie" region of Southeast Oklahoma, has no desire to be President. He has a heart ailment, and is unhappy in his role as "the man only a heartbeat away from the Presidency." In times past he has had a problem resulting from too many Washington cocktail parties.

How could his health stand up to the pressures of being the commander-in-chief in a confrontation with the nuclear power of the Soviet Union? How, for instance, could he meet with the National Security council at 3 o'clock in the morning, as Nixon did when he placed the U.S. armed forces on the alert to checkmate Soviet troops from intervening in the war in the Middle East?

The radicals pushing Albert for President don't care about that problem. Once he is in the White House, he can nominate some good liberal—perhaps Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota—as his Vice President and then resign. Thus the Democrats, although overwhelmed by Nixon in the 1972 election, would seize the White House at last.

BAN THE HANDGUN—I

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, day after day the press reports felonious deaths by firearms. Most of these senseless homicides could be prevented by the adoption of strict gun controls. The New York Times on Sunday, November 4, included three such instances, the New York Post two. The clips follow:

[From the New York Times]

FAMILY DISPUTE ATTRACTS GANG; ONE DEAD TWO SHOT

(By Linda Greenhouse)

A family dispute in the South Bronx early yesterday morning spilled out into the street and ended with one man shot to death, another wounded, one 16-year-old gang member shot by a police officer, and three gang members under arrest for murder.

The police were looking for four other youths, reportedly members of the Black Stage gang, and trying to reconstruct the events that led the gang members to shoot at two men as they stood arguing in front of 607 West 140th Street.

According to the police, the dead man, Frederick Scott, 25 years old, of 1305 Amsterdam Avenue, had gone to the West 140th Street apartment of his sister, Minnie LaGrath, to try to make peace between her and her estranged husband, James.

ARGUMENT STARTS

At the apartment, Mr. Scott and Mr. LaGrath found Mrs. LaGrath's boyfriend, Joe L. Saunders. The three men started arguing, and soon after midnight Mr. Scott and Mr. Saunders went outside.

There, according to the police, they became involved in a dispute with seven teenaged gang members. Mr. Scott was shot fatally in the heart and Mr. Saunders was wounded slightly in the back.

Witnesses to the shooting hailed a passing police patrol car. The officer, Thomas Murray, chased three youths into an alley. When one of them, John Martin, 16 years old, of 1910 Marmion Avenue in the Bronx, allegedly made a threatening gesture, Officer Murray fired twice, wounding the boy in the back. He was admitted to Jacobi Hospital.

Officer Murray arrested the wounded youth and two others, Lawrence Brown, 16 years old, of 614 East 140th Street in the Bronx, and John Johnson, also 16, of 285 Cypress Avenue. All three were charged with homicide.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 4, 1973]

FROM THE POLICE BLOTTER

One man was shot and killed and another wounded in the attempted holdup of Club 83, 151 Lenox Avenue, near 118th Street. The police said the dead man, James Thomas, 43 years old, of 559 West 158th Street, was in the restaurant when two men wearing ski masks and brandishing pistols entered and announced a holdup. Mr. Thomas struggled with the gunmen and several shots were fired, one of which struck him in the head, killing him instantly. Another shot wounded Alexander Brown, 30, of 987 Union Avenue, the Bronx, in the abdomen. The police said Mr. Brown was holding a .45-caliber revolver. He was taken in custody to Harlem Hospital, where he was listed in critical condition. . . . Donald Moses, 26, of 221-43 114th Road, Cambria Heights, Queens, allegedly shot his wife, Marlene, in the chest with a shotgun, then held off the police for more than two hours before surrendering under a tear-gas attack. His wife was reported in fair condition at Queens General Hospital.

[From the New York Post]

NEW JERSEY MAN FOUND SHOT TO DEATH ON HIGHWAY

ALLAMUCHY TOWNSHIP, N.J.—The death of a man found with bullet holes in his head on a highway here was under investigation today.

State Police said they identified the man through finger-prints as Dominick Reo, 48, of Paterson.

BRONX STORE OWNER KILLED IN A HOLDUP; SUSPECT IS SEIZED

The owner of a dry cleaning business near the Bronx Zoo was shot and killed early yesterday morning in an apparent holdup attempt.

The two gunmen, who were waiting for their victim when he arrived to open his store at 4:45 A.M., fled after the shooting. Yesterday afternoon, dctectives of the Ninth Homicide Squad said they had one suspect in custody.

The dead man was Joseph DiGioia, 47 years old, of 4160 Digney Avenue in the Wakefield section of the north Bronx. He had operated a dry cleaning business at 2143 Prospect Avenue, at East 181st Street, for about five years.

The police said he had been shot once in the leg and twice in the head and that he might have been tortured with his own knife, which was found at the scene.

The police found Mr. DiGioia's body in the middle of the store, but also found blood at the back of the room near a hidden safe. They theorized that the gunmen had tried to force Mr. DiGioia to open the safe and that he had refused.

A woman in the apartment house next to Mr. DiGioia's store said that crime had been increasing recently and that there had been four robberies in her building in the last month. Asked for the name of the neighborhood, she replied: "I don't know, I just call it a bad neighborhood."

Mr. DiGioia, along with his wife, 16-year-old stepson, and 3-year-old daughter, had moved to Digney Avenue from the South Bronx about a year ago. Their new home was the top floor of a two-family house in a pleasant neighborhood near the Westchester county line.

A neighbor there said that violence was virtually unknown in the area and that everyone on the street was shocked and saddened by Mr. DiGioia's murder.

UTILITY SYSTEM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson Space Flight Center in Houston, Tex., has undertaken an important project in the conservation of energy. Applying the expertise of the national space program, this project is designed to provide new means to conserve and utilize resources in our daily living. Because of the importance of this article, I am including it in the RECORD for the review and consideration of my colleagues and the general public:

NASA To Develop and Test Integrated Utility System

Next spring the Johnson Space Flight Center in Houston will hook up the first integrated utility system. The laboratory scale test system is designed to assess the feasibility of large-scale modular integrated utility systems. These systems could serve highly concentrated population centers, such as hi-rise residential and commercial buildings and high-density housing projects.

The laboratory model, called MIST (for modular integrated system test), is being built by the Hamilton Standard Division of United Aircraft Corp. under a $700,000 contract awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

NASA and other government agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency, are cooperating in a broad-scale project with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to develop and promote the concept of a modular integrated utility system (MIUS).

Such systems envision the integration of water supply and sewage processing, solid-waste incineration, electric power generation and heating and cooling from a self-sustaining network. Utility subsystems would be mechanically integrated in modules that could function independently of area-wide municipal utility networks and with a minimum of external energy requirements.

MIUS has evolved as the ultimate or inevitable result of separate projects backed by the various agencies involved where waste treatment has been integrated, say, with heat generation. HUD recently began operation of a Total Energy system plant in Jersey City, N.J., which will provide electricity, heat, hot water and air conditioning for a planned community project embracing some 488 residential apartment units, schools and commercial facilities. Experience gleaned from the Jersey City demonstration will be fed into the more ambitious MIUS effort.

HUD officials emphasize that the MIST unit will not be a prototype MIUS. It is a small-scale effort to integrate the necessary hardware and mechanical processes to provide the desired outputs at a level sufficient to meet the needs of about 100 people.

The system is to be installed in a laboratory at the Johnson Center where the necessary typical inputs are available, such as solid and liquid wastes. As tests progress, new parameters will evolve for a second phase, the actual design, construction and demonstration of a full-scale MIUS.

Government engineers involved in the MIUS project have long held the idea to be technologically feasible. HUD's MIUS project director, Jerry Leighton, pointed out that no new technology is needed for MIUS. Each element within the conceptual network has already been proved feasible.

Leighton came to HUD from NASA where he had been a project engineer on the Apollo program. He noted that the challenges arising in the Apollo project did not involve the development of new technology. Like MIUS, the Apollo project was the integration of existing technology.

Government officials are understandably elated about the MIUS concept. By utilizing energy generated from waste, MIUS would make minimal demands on outside energy resources. At the same time MIUS will consume wastes that might otherwise pose an environmental pollution threat.

Economists point out that even if MIUS proves to be a technological success, the biggest hurdle to overcome in realizing the benefits will be in commercializing the concept. To be commercially feasible, MIUS will have to overcome both regulatory and financial barriers built into the existing public and investor-owned utility systems.

RECOMMIT THE LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL TO OBTAIN EQUITY FOR TITLE I CHILDREN

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I intend Tuesday to offer a motion to recommit the Labor-HEW conference report to conference with instructions to return to the House with a better formulation for the distribution of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Specifically, I will ask that the language contained in amendment 32 in the conference report be deleted and that the conferees be instructed to report back a bill giving local school districts 90 percent of the amount they received in 1973 and permitting local school districts to receive as much as they are entitled to providing that States in the aggregate not receive more than 120 percent of the amounts they received in 1973.

This change in the formula will permit the changes in population which have taken place since 1960 to be more accurately reflected both between States and within States. For the interest of Members, I am reproducing below a table which compares how much each of several major counties would receive under the provision in H.R. 8877 compared with how much they would receive under the provision contained in my motion to recommit.

TITLE I—ESEA

[All figures are in thousands of dollars]

County and State	Fiscal year 1973	H R 8877 provision	Quie proposal
Mobile, Ala	$1,876	$2,158	$2,356
Maricopa, Ariz	3,557	4,090	4,226
Los Angeles, Calif	45,181	51,958	55,156
San Diego, Calif	5,505	6,331	7,348
Denver, Colo	3,256	3,745	3,942
New Haven, Conn	3,459	3,978	4,187
New Castle, Del	1,481	1,703	1,899
Dade, Fla	3,619	4,162	5,132
Fulton, Ga	3,750	4,313	4,636
Cook, Ill	43,938	50,529	56,590
St. Clair, Ill	3,722	4,280	4,370
Lake, Ind	3,920	3,358	4,289
Polk, Iowa	1,221	1,404	1,612
Sedgwick, Kans	1,706	1,962	2,361
Jefferson, Ky	3,197	3,676	4,434
Orleans, La	4,306	4,952	6,845
Cumberland, Maine	943	1,084	1,274
Prince Georges, Md	1,649	1,897	2,352
Dukes, Mass	2,506	2,882	3,179
Wayne, Mich	22,254	25,592	27,430
Hennepin, Minn	4,404	5,065	6,679
Jackson, Miss	2,273	2,614	3,092
St. Louis City, Mo	5,074	4,835	6,852
Cascade, Mont	299	344	379
Douglas, Neb	1,956	2,249	2,437
Clark, Nev	540	621	733
Essex, N.J	10,996	12,645	13,262
Bernalillo, N. Mex	1,361	1,565	2,167
Bronx, N.Y	37,241	42,827	50,269
Kings, N.Y	57,507	66,134	73,035
Cass, N. Dak	180	207	225
Cuyahoga, Ohio	9,792	11,261	14,283
Summit, Ohio	1,912	2,199	2,567
Oklahoma, Okla	2,349	2,701	2,827
Multnomah, Oreg	2,557	2,940	3,107
Philadelphia, Pa	20,752	23,865	31,375
Providence, R.I	3,564	4,099	4,178
Pennington, S. Dak	257	296	401
Bexar, Tex	5,177	5,953	6,279
Harris, Tex	6,314	7,261	8,686
Salt Lake, Utah	1,666	1,916	2,078
Fairfax, Va	466	535	1,060
Richmond, Va	2,304	2,649	2,831
King, Wash	3,728	4,288	4,724
Milwaukee, Wis	5,039	5,795	7,395
Laramie, Wyo	171	197	283

Note: Col. 1 is based on actual 1973 HEW allocation of $1,600,000,000. Cols. 2 and 3 are based on $1,800,000,000, the amount contained in conference report on H.R. 8877.

The provision contained in the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill has some very strange effects. By holding local districts to 115 percent of the amount they received in 1973 after the first continuing resolution had no LEA ceiling, only a State hold harmless, some school districts will receive virtually no funds during two quarters in fiscal 1974. The provision in my motion to recommit will provide a great deal more equity. For example, here is what would happen to a selected number of counties:

County and State	1st quarter allocation	H.R. 8877 provision	Quie amendment
Comanche, Okla	915,000	450,000	708,000
Hennepin, Minn	6,800,000	5,000,000	6,700,000
Dakota, Minn	498,000	292,000	484,000
Crockett, Tex	31,000	15,000	27,000
Dallas, Tex	6,400,000	4,800,000	5,500,000
Kent, Tex	24,000	12,000	21,000
Chattahoocee, Tenn	77,000	20,000	58,000
Elmore, Idaho	88,000	43,000	88,000

RESULTS OF FOURTH ANNUAL PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I have today released the results of my annual public opinion poll which had been sent to the residents of the Sixth Congressional District. The questionnaire requested the opinions of my constituents on current issues facing the Congress and Nation. More than 47,000 responses have been received.

This response, which is well above the number who usually participate in polls of this kind, clearly indicates that the people of Berks, Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties are deeply interested in the major issues of the day and are eager to convey their views to their elected officials. Of the many thousands who replied, hundreds amplified their answers with comments detailing the reasons for their responses.

It was evident from this questionnaire that inflation is of high concern. In addition to the preference of the people of the Sixth District that inflation is a problem of the highest priority, separate comments on this subject were extraordinary. I could not agree more with the residents of the Sixth District and have sponsored many efforts to reduce the inflation which has been reducing the income of all Americans.

We know that the strength of our Government is dependent upon the existence of procedures to promote the regular exchange of views between Government representatives and their constituents. This questionnaire is one of my many efforts to involve everyone in this process.

I interpret the results of the poll as follows:

Significant numbers approved inflation, tax and welfare reform, crime, and consumer protection as the top priority items with education, drug abuse, mass transit, military defense, and rural development receiving the lowest priority votes.

A full 88 percent feel that the United States should not provide economic assistance for the rebuilding of North Vietnam.

Sixty-two percent feel that mass transit facilities would provide a partial solution to the energy crisis and that they would use these services.

Nearly three-quarters feel that construction of the Alaskan oil pipeline should proceed.

An overwhelming majority of 82 percent feel that capital punishment of criminals should be adhered to strictly.

Forty-seven percent would be willing to pay more for products if their manufacture, use and packaging could be made pollution-free.

Forty-six percent feel that Congress should approve Federal tax credits to defray the cost of tuition paid by parents whose children attend nonpublic schools, while half disapproved of such a tax deduction.

A full 61 percent feel that the Federal Government should help the Nation's railroads stay in operation.

Regarding the economy, 59 percent believe that no Government regulation is necessary since supply and demand should determine wages and prices under a completely free market economic system.

Sixty-seven and fifty-eight percent respectively feel that the United States should discontinue foreign military and economic aid, while 68 percent feel that we should continue foreign humanitarian aid programs.

A full 60 percent feel Federal funding should be approved for day-care and child development programs.

Fifty-seven percent believe that the Federal Government should approve a national health insurance program for all Americans.

A full 70 percent feel that the United States should continue to enter into economic and cultural trade agreements with China and Russia.

Eighty percent feel that legislation should be enacted to limit the President's warmaking powers in undeclared wars.

Regarding the energy crisis, top priority action included a search for new energy sources, more efficient use of fuel by machines and increased usage of coal while increased atomic powerplant construction, increased crude oil imports, and fuel rationing received the lower priority ratings.

A phenomenal 94 percent feel that a wage earner's investment in his private pension plan where he works should be protected by Federal legislation.

Eighty-five percent feel that Congress should increase its efforts to help the handicapped while only 45 percent believe that veterans should be allowed to use GI bill education benefits at any time during their lives.

This public opinion poll has proved to be extremely useful in measuring more precisely the attitudes of my constituents on some of the major problems facing Congress. I know it will help me provide the people of the Sixth Congressional District with effective representation in the weeks and months ahead.

While it is not expected that everyone will agree on every issue, it is hoped that we can all agree that the process of exchanging views is healthy and should be encouraged. I feel that, through my newsletters and questionnaires, this goal is reached and everyone's interests are served while permitting me to be more responsive to the needs of the people in the sixth congressional district.

Reproduced below are the full questionnaire results:

RESULTS OF THE POLL

RECONSTRUCTION AID

Should the United States provide economic assistance for the rebuilding of North Vietnam? Yes, 7%; No, 88%; Undecided, 5%.

MASS TRANSIT

As a partial solution to the energy crisis, would you use a mass transit system to travel to and from work? Yes, 62%; No, 28%; Undecided, 10%.

ALASKAN OIL PIPELINE

Would you support Congressional action to authorize the construction of the Alaskan oil pipeline? Yes, 72%; No, 13%; Undecided, 15%.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Do you favor a Constitutional amendment to permit passage of state laws reinstating capital punishment? Yes, 82%; No, 11%; Undecided, 7%.

CONSUMER PRODUCTS

Would you be willing to pay more for products if their manufacture, use and packaging could be made pollution-free? Yes, 47%; No, 35%; Undecided 18%.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Do you favor federal tax credits to defray part of the cost of tuition paid by parents to send their children to non-profit, non-public elementary and secondary schools? Yes, 46%; No, 51%; Undecided, 3%.

RAILROADS

Should the federal government, through increased financial assistance, help the nation's railroads stay in operation? Yes, 61%; No, 26%; Undecided, 13%.

PRIORITIES

1st, Inflation; 2nd, Tax Reform; 3rd, Welfare Reform; 4th Crime; 5th, Consumer Protection; 6th, Drug Abuse; 7th, Education; 8th, Military Defense; 9th, Mass Transit; 10th Rural Development.

ECONOMY

Which of the following courses do you think the federal government should pursue regarding the economy?

59% feel we should let supply and demand determine wages and prices under a completely free-market economic system.

14% feel we should continue with temporary wage/price freezes like those we have had since August 1971.

27% feel we should begin a price control program where government determines fair wages and prices periodically.

FOREIGN AID

Should the federal government continue:

a. foreign military aid programs? Yes, 20%; No, 67%; Undecided, 13%.

b. foreign economic aid programs? Yes, 30%; No, 58%; Undecided, 12%.

c. foreign humanitarian aid programs? Yes, 68%; No, 22%; Undecided, 10%.

CHILD CARE

As a means of providing mothers presently on welfare with an opportunity to become self-supporting, do you favor the proposal that the federal government fund day-care and child development programs for preschool and school-age children? Yes, 60%; No, 33%; Undecided, 7%.

HEALTH CARE

Health care costs have increased dramatically in recent years to the level paying for adequate health care is beyond the reach of many people. Should the federal government consider a National Health Insurance Program to cover all Americans? Yes, 57%; No, 34%; Undecided, 9%.

TRADE

Do you favor further economic and cultural trade with China and Russia? Yes, 70%; No, 21%; Undecided, 9%.

WAR POWERS

Our Federal form of government is based upon the Separation of Powers between the three branches of government—the Judicial, the Legislative, and the Executive. Do you favor legislation which would restore this balance by prohibiting the President from committing American combat forces beyond a period of 120 days without the consent of Congress? Yes, 80%; No, 14%; Undecided, 6%.

ENERGY CRISIS

What do you think the government should do to combat the energy crisis?

1st, search for new sources of energy, such as solar energy;

2nd, try to eliminate wastefulness by increasing the efficiency of machines which use petroleum products for fuel;

3rd, use more coal, America's most abundant resource, in the best possible way;

4th, increase atomic energy plant construction;

5th, increase crude oil importation; and

6th, begin a program of fuel oil and gasoline rationing.

PENSIONS

Should the Congress approve legislation to protect a wage-earner's investment in his private pension plan and allow him to take his contribution when he leaves the employment of one company to begin work in another? Yes, 94%; No, 3%; Undecided, 3%.

HANDICAPPED

Should the Congress increase its efforts to help the handicapped by providing more funds for rehabilitation and vocational education programs? Yes, 85%; No, 6%; Undecided, 9%.

VETERANS

Should the time-limit on the use of education benefits for Vietnam veterans under the GI Bill be eliminated so that veterans could go back to school with federal assistance at any time during their lives? Yes, 45%; No, 46%; Undecided, 9%.

THE MILITARY MAW—PART VII

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in her last speech before the United Nations as Sweden's top disarmament negotiator, Mrs. Alva Myrdal blamed the United States and the Soviet Union for lack of progress toward genuine disarmament at the 1973 session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. She also warned of dangers to world peace in the development of tactical nuclear weapons and binary nerve gas weapons.

In August, I attended the CCD and felt the same frustrations expressed by Mrs. Myrdal. While I was there Mexico, Sweden, and Brazil all publicly criticized the Conference for failing to produce any kind of agreement in the 2 years of its life. The SALT talks should make it clear agreements can be reached only if this country shows the way. Unless we begin to contribute some positive proposals, particularly in the area of chemical weapons, it appears our attendance at future sessions of the Conference will merely be an empty gesture.

Following is a report from the New York Times on Mrs. Myrdal's speech:

MRS. MYRDAL, LEAVING U.N., WARNS OF NEW WEAPONS

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Nov. 10.— Mrs. Alva Myrdal gave her last speech as Sweden's top disarmament negotiator this week, blaming the United States and the Soviet Union for lack of progress toward genuine disarmament.

In response, she received a chorus of tributes including two from her main targets.

"I bear many scars testifying to her effectiveness," Joseph Martin Jr., the chief United States negotiator, told members of the General Assembly's Political Committee. And Aleksei A. Roshchin, the Soviet member, recalled that he had differed with her on many occasions, but that her contributions had been appreciated.

Mrs. Myrdal was the "conscience of the disarmament movement," Masahiro Nishibori, the Japanese delegate, declared.

The 71-year-old diplomat and her husband, the economist Gunnar Myrdal, are going to the Institute for Democratic Studies at Santa Barbara, Calif., each to write a book.

Mrs. Myrdal, who held the rank of Minister of State, has been Sweden's representative on the 25-member disarmament conference, which ended its 1973 session in Geneva with most members complaining that it had reached virtual paralysis because of a deadlock between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mrs. Myrdal, speaking in the committee, said that there had been disquieting reports that the two superpowers were about to develop tactical nuclear weapons that could be used in much the same way conventional arms are used by infantry and artillery units.

"Such a development would drastically aggravate the nuclear threat against nonnuclear weapon states everywhere," she said.

"Most important as a question of principle, is, of course, that an introduction of such mininuclear weapons would blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons," Mrs. Myrdal said. "We are strongly of the view that an absolute 'firebreak' must be kept between nuclear and conventional war."

Mrs. Myrdal said she was encouraged that the United States was moving toward ratification of the Geneva protocol that prohibits the use of all biological and chemical weapons. But she also expressed concern over reported American plans to produce a lethal nerve gas by a new method that "might escape all attempts at control."

She said she was referring only to such reported plans for production of binary nerve gas in the United States because the United States was the most open of the major powers in disclosing its plans, suggesting that other countries might also be considering such production.

The new method mixes two nonlethal gases when they are fired in a shell, producing a lethal gas.

"We must issue a call for fresh action in the United Nations against the development of binary chemical weapons," Mrs. Myrdal said.

Her recurrent theme, however, was that superpowers should agree to "qualitative disarmament"—freezing the development of new weapons. This is the real key to disarmament, she said, adding: "May I end this last official statement of mine by asking my colleagues: When is some action for disarmament to start in earnest?"

WHY THE PRESIDENT SHOULD RESIGN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I introduced House Resolution 684 calling upon President Nixon to resign. I am pleased that many of my colleagues have publicly announced or privately informed me of their support for this resolution. I will soon be reintroducing the resolution with cosponsors and I hope that it will receive serious consideration by the House of Representatives as a way out of our present crisis of national leadership.

I do not use the word "crisis" lightly. On Wednesday the President indicated that he would not quit because his mother told him never to quit. As admirable as this advice may have been, the President certainly did not pass it on to former Vice President Spiro Agnew when it became clear that for Mr. Agnew to remain in office under the cloud of criminal indictment would be an unpatriotic act because of the harm that would be caused the office of Vice President. How much more harm is being caused our Nation by the cloud that now hangs over the office of President? Yet Mr. Nixon refuses to resign.

I believe the American people, in their mail to the Congress, through the Gallup poll, and in the voting booths last Tuesday, have declared their loss of faith in Mr. Nixon and his administration. We have begun impeachment proceedings in the Committee on the Judiciary, but this process will of necessity move slowly. Positive action on my resolution would show the President that his resignation would be in the greater national interest than a lengthy impeachment proceeding. I place the text of my resolution in the RECORD at this point accompanied by an article which I wrote for the New York Amsterdam News setting forth the reasons which motivated my introduction of the resolution:

RESOLUTION

Resolved, Whereas the President's action in summarily dismissing the Special Prosecutor caused an unprecedented outpouring of public demand for impeachment; and

Whereas the President of the United States is presently under investigation to determine his possible involvement in impeachable offenses; and

Whereas impeachment resolutions and resolutions of inquiry into grounds for impeachment have been introduced into the House of Representatives with the cosponsorship of more than 100 members of the House; and

Whereas the Judiciary Committee is presently investigating to determine whether the President has violated his oath of office and engaged in high crimes and misdemeanors; and

Whereas the name of Gerald Ford was submitted by the President prior to the initiation of impeachment proceedings by the House; and

Whereas the order of priority for the consideration of impeachment and the consideration of confirmation of the Vice Presidential nominee by the Committee on the Judiciary has not been Constitutionally established; and

Whereas Gerald Ford has publicly indicated that he does not desire to serve as President; and

Whereas the impeachment, resignation or the incapacity of the President to continue in office would cause the succession to the Presidency of the Speaker of the House, Carl Albert, a member of the Democratic Party whose Presidential nominee was defeated in the last National election; and

Whereas the facts and circumstances surrounding the investigation of impeachable conduct by the President of the United States has adversely affected the ability of the President to effectively lead both at home and abroad; and

Whereas this ability will be further im-

paired during prolonged impeachment proceedings;

Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives that it is the judgment of the House that the President should resign from office.

Be it further resolved that prior to said resignation, the President send forthwith to the House of Representatives a candidate other than Gerald Ford to be considered as a nominee to succeed him as President upon confirmation by both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

THE NIXON CHOICE: RESIGN OR BE IMPEACHED

Congressman Charles B. Rangel, representative for Harlem and the West Side, is a member of the House Judiciary Committee which will conduct any investigation into impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States.

This article is the first of a series concerning impeachment which Congressman Rangel is writing for the Amsterdam News.

(By Charles B. Rangel)

Last week the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives met to decide on procedures to be followed in its consideration of the several impeachment resolutions that have been referred to the Committee. To date, 97 members of the House Of Representatives have either introduced or cosponsored resolutions calling for the impeachment of the President.

In a series of votes that went strictly along party lines (the 21 Democrats on the Committee for, the 17 Republicans on the Committee against) the Committee voted to give chairman Peter Rodino full subpoena power to pursue all evidence related to the impeachable offenses charged against the president.

Although some of us on the Committee felt that our investigation of impeachment should come before any action on the President's nomination of Gerald Ford, all of the Republican members and some of the Democrats urged swift action on the Ford nomination and the Committee voted to proceed with both simultaneously.

LENGTHY PROCESS

As I look at what promises to be a lengthy process, with the need to review all of the evidence on the President's activities collected by the Senate Watergate Committee, the evidence uncovered by Special Procecutor Archibald Cox before he was fired, and the evidence which is now coming forth from other sources, it is clear that although the Judiciary Committee is now committed to the impeachment process, it will take some time, maybe several weeks, given anticipated delaying tactics by those on the Committee opposed to impeachment, for the Committee to decide on whether it should report a bill of impeachment to the House of Representatives.

POLITICAL FACT

Yet it is a political fact that the President has already been effectively impeached by the judgment of the people. My mail, running to 5,000 letters in the past two weeks was 99 per cent in favor of impeachment, predicted the results revealed this past week end in the nationwide Gallup poll that showed only 27 per cent of the American people in support of the President. It is now clear that the people have lost their confidence in the President. They are no longer willing to buy his evasion, divisionary tactics and out-right lies; they are demanding impeachment.

DESIRABLE ROUTE

Our system is based most fundamentally upon the consent of the governed. It cannot, and should not, operate in a climate of such widespread distrust of our national leadership.

The people have just as surely rejected Mr. Nixon as they elected him last November, and we have reached a point where President Nixon, like former Vice President Agnew, must decide that his resignation is required in the national interest.

If he does not resign, impeachment proceedings will go forward in the Judiciary Committee. But his resignation now appears to be the most immediate and desirable route to resolving this national crisis.

NEEDS OF SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Allegheny County Housing Authority in western Pennsylvania once again has visibly demonstrated its awareness and concern for the needs of the senior citizens.

The authority, under the able leadership of Mr. James Knox, executive director, recently dedicated its eighth high-rise apartment building for elderly residents, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Apartments, in Homestead, Pa., located in my 20th Congressional District.

I had the privilege of participating in the dedication of this new 11-story high structure, built at a cost of some $2 million, which includes 60 efficiency and 40 1-bedroom units as well as a large, bright community room.

Despite its impressiveness, the building itself is not important. What it represents is important. That structure, constructed of brick and mortar and steel, is a monument to what can be done for people if government at all levels, local, county, State, and Federal, work together to serve those they represent. Believe me, gentlemen, the look on the faces of those who will live in that new building left no doubt in my mind that this is the way government should work.

The Allegheny County Housing Authority has compiled an enviable record in this area. It now manages 30 housing communities in the county, comprising approximately 3,500 housing units to meet the needs of families and senior citizens.

I take great pride in bringing to the attention of my colleagues the people who took part in the dedication ceremonies: Frank Watson, president of the building's Tenant Council; George McGregor and Daniel O'Brien of Post 373, VFW; the Steel Valley High School Band, directed by Thaddeus Wawro; the Reverend John Little of Park Place AME Church; Thomas R. Finlon, chairman of the housing authority board; Stephen A. Zappalla, vice chairman; Thomas A. Nauman, secretary; Wayne P. Kelly, treasurer; Carol A. Tucker, assistant secretary-treasurer; Mayor James Armstrong of Homestead; County Commissioner Thomas J. Foerster; William Voekler of the North Borough's Men's Club; William Wardle, president of Crump, Inc.; Mr. and Mrs. William Martin, first key to the building; Mrs. Patricia Meyers, regional housing manager, and the Reverend Aloysius Jezewski, of St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of these dedicated people and my colleagues here in the House I extend to the new residents of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Apartments my best wishes for a long and happy life in their new home.

TRIPLE PLAY BY RUSSIANS

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week, I received advance information about a truly awesome story to be published in the Aviation Week and Space Technology magazine. I immediately brought the story to the attention of the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services and on Tuesday, after publication of the article, I issued a press release on the subject.

The subject is indeed a frightening one. A triple-prong Soviet threat has been revealed with the presence of nuclear warheads on the Russian Scub missiles in Egypt aimed at Tel Aviv; a beefing up of Russian artillery in Guantanamo Bay and Cuban patrol boats outfitted to carry Russian Styx surface-to-surface antiship missiles; and the massing of 194,000 North Vietnamese troops and 750 Soviet tanks at Quang Tri.

While national security will probably not merit a detailed elaboration of this story, I do feel the terrible potential of these actions should be known and borne in mind. To this end, I am including an excellent column by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post on November 9, 1973, which substantiates the facts as given in the magazine article:

THREATS ON THREE FRONTS

(By Joseph Alsop)

At the moment, Fidel Castro and his Cubans have thoughtfully prepared positions for the troops and artillery that would be needed to attack the historic American base in Cuba, Guantanamo Bay.

At the moment, again, it appears downright likely that the North Vietnamese will fairly soon tear up whatever remains of the truce agreement so painfully negotiated by Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger and Le Duc Tho. Hanoi's minimum objective, as indicated by massive military preparations in flat, violation of the truce agreement, would appear to be tearing away from South Vietnam the northernmost quarter of the South's total territory, Military Region I.

At the moment, finally, there is still an all too serious chance of renewed war in the Middle East, with the Soviets actively aiding in the destruction of Israel. As those words are written, in fact, the intelligence community is riven by an argument about why the Soviets have greatly diminished their airlift of supplies for the Arabs in the last couple of days. This could mean that the Kremlin has wished to cool off President Anwar Sadat and the Egyptian high command, so that they would negotiate more seriously with Secretary Kissinger. But it could also mean

that the Kremlin wants to be ready for prompt intervention in a renewed Mideastern war, with the big Soviet air transports revved up on the southern Russian airfields where the Soviet airborne forces are now on alert.

In sum, you may be careless of the most solemn U.S. commitments in Southeast Asia; but you still have to begin your calculations with Israel's future, and to end at Guantanamo Bay. These ugly signs are in fact cited in inverse order of importance. For the Cubans are highly unlikely to use their prepared attack-positions, unless this country has other, large troubles some where else.

You may also be in a righteous fever for President Nixon's impeachment. But you still have to include in your calculation the Watergate horror's hideous effect on the U.S. world position. All the foregoing threats are unquestionably Watergate-connected.

In truth, these ugly threats would either not exist, or they would not be such serious threats, if those making the threats had not begun to scent how badly Watergate has weakened the President, who has so often in the past proved his toughness and courage in threatening situations overseas. If you are in the currently fashionable fever of righteousness, you will, of course, say that if the President has been weakened, it is all his own fault. It is an arguable view.

But it is even more arguable that righteousness is less urgently important than the vital U.S. interests that are now threatened. So even the Congress and the famous media might well reflect a bit on what disasters may ensue for the American future, when you have public gloating in both Moscow and Hanoi because the President of the United States has been politically crippled.

As a guide to the calculations above-suggested, it is best to take the most important case—which is of course the Middle East. Before these words can be printed, Secretary Kissinger may have pulled a negotiating rabbit out of the hat in Cairo. Pray God he manages to do so. But you have only to examine the alternative to see what desperate trouble this country is now in, partly because Watergate is now viciously inter-acting with our neglect of our power.

If there is renewed war, and the Soviets intervene, Israel is likely to be humbled and at least half-crushed. Yet if this horrible result is avoided, no more than a couple of years will be gained for the United States to gather its wits again and to restore its lost standing of a serious giant power, by rearmament and in other ways.

The reasons for this bleak outlook are bleakly simple. The best imaginable settlement that Secretary Kissinger can negotiate will eventually involve Israeli withdrawal from most of a demilitarized Sinai, plus the subsequent re-opening of the Suez Canal. This best settlement will therefore permit the Soviets to pose as the Arabs' revenge-givers and to pour their evergrowing naval power into the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. For this, the Kremlin needs the canal re-opened.

Consider, then, the kind of states that own the crucial oil resources of the Arabian peninsula. The Soviets, as revenge-givers, will have their impact, even in Saudi Arabia. They will have infinitely greater impact, however, if the rulers of Arab oil almost all wake up one morning to find themselves looking down the throats of scores of missile-launchers on Soviet guided missile cruisers, with one of the new Soviet aircraft carriers in the immediate offing as well.

In other words, this game's stake is control of the oil-tap, which is now the jugular of the western world. If there is a settlement, the United States may have time to avert Soviet control of the oil-tap by really drastic measures. If there is no settlement, and Israel is humbled, Soviet control of the oil-tap will be prompt and automatic. These are not pleasant thoughts.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 44

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, John Lindsay, the mayor of New York City, has often made his position in favor of gun control quite clear. In a speech before the American Society of Criminology this month, Mayor Lindsay made the point that in Tokyo where owning a handgun is illegal, there were only three handgun murders in 1972. No major city in the United States can boast such a small number of handgun murders.

The statistics also indicate that in southern cities where gun control laws are lax, the murder rate is higher than in cities with stricter gun control laws.

It seems to me that reducing the murders in this country could be accomplished by eliminating handguns from their present easy accessibility.

Included below are two articles—one from the Boston Globe of November 4 quoting Mayor Lindsay and another from the October 31 New Jersey Courier News describing another tragic and preventable handgun murder.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston Globe, Nov. 4, 1973]

LINDSAY SAYS UNITED STATES NEEDS FEDERAL GUN CONTROL LAW

NEW YORK.—Mayor John V. Lindsay yesterday called for Federal gun control laws, asserting that nationwide permissiveness on the issue, particularly in Southern states, is "threatening the safety of police officers and citizens in New York City."

In remarks before the American Society of Criminology, Lindsay said: "It is illegal to own a handgun in Japan. And so in Tokyo, there were 217 murders in 1972, and only three of them were committed with handguns. In Detroit, with one tenth the population of Tokyo, there were more than twice as many murders in 1972."

Lindsay said Southern states, particularly South Carolina, have the most permissive gun legislation in the country, and their law affects people elsewhere.

"In one case, for example," he said, "one man in South Carolina purchased 600 handguns in one day so that he could resell them in northern cities.

"That," Lindsay asserted, "is obviously a Federal problem of the highest order."

Lindsay also criticized the gun industry, saying, "If these firms were also producing heroin, there would be Federal action and national outrage. But their outpouring of guns, which annually kills far more people than drug addiction, barely causes a stir in Washington."

"This country was founded on cherished ideals, not guns," Lindsay said. "The frontier was conquered by plows and axes and hope—not gun-slinging."

[From the New Jersey Courier News, Oct. 31, 1973]

SHOOTING VICTIM FOUND IN FLAMES

CAMDEN.—John Clark, an interior decorator who had been shot in the head and set afire, died Tuesday after firemen found him on fire on the floor of his south Camden home.

Police said it appeared that Clark, 28, had been burned in an attempt to camouflage the shooting.

Firemen answered an anonymous call Monday night and found Clark on the floor, with burning newspapers stuffed under him.

He died three hours later. Police said he had been shot in the head with a .38 caliber revolver.

ROGERS AND HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT SUBCOMMITTEE INTRODUCE BILL TO PRESERVE CLEAN AIR ACT AND AVERT ENERGY SHORTAGE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today, I and nine of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. HUDNUT, introduced legislation designed to insure an adequate supply of fuel to this country this winter, and also to preserve the purposes of the Clean Air Act. The specifics of the bill are as follows:

First. Authorizes the Administration of the Environmental Protection Agency to temporarily suspend any fuel or emission limitation with respect to stationary sources. This authority would cease May 15, 1974.

Second. Authorizes the Administrator to grant a second suspension for any period beginning after May 15, 1974 and ending no later than June 30, 1977. This second suspension would be made contingent upon the sources having entered into a contractual obligation to obtain an emission reduction system determined by the Administrator to be adequately demonstrated, if the suspension is based upon the fact that compliance with the limitations is not feasible because of an unavailability of clean fuels. Authority is given to the Administrator to establish priorities under which manufacturers of emission reduction systems shall provide their systems to users.

Third. Requires EPA to submit a detailed report to the Congress by March 31, 1974, with respect to the impact of the Clean Air Act on fuel shortages, the availability of "scrubber" technology and other matters.

Fourth. Preempts States and localities from enforcing requirements which are at variance with an EPA award of suspension or its determination of priorities for emission reduction systems.

Fifth. Requires the Administrator to conduct a thorough study of State implementation plans and if he determines that, by reason of the award of temporary suspensions, any plan must be revised in order to achieve primary or secondary standards, then he must require revisions in the plan in order that the standards may be met. Plan revisions must be submitted no later than July 1, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis is real and must be dealt with, but we must be certain that we do not act precipitiously and do damage to our national health

through vitiating the laudable and necessary purposes of the Clean Air Act. I believe this legislation accomplishes this purpose and look forward to its prompt consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BUILT SUCCESS THE HARD WAY

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to insert these words of approbation into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for one of my constituents, Mr. Jose "Joe" Aceves, of whom it can be said, without fear of overstatement, "built his success the hard way."

I can relate somewhat with Joe because I, too, built a successful business career through participation in the free enterprise system. But there the similarity ends, because Joe had to overcome obstacles that are uncommon for most Anglos. First of all, he is Mexican-American, a minority in this country. Second, he lacked education, having migrated from Guadalajara, Mexico, as a farm laborer.

Joe's ambition to succeed drove him from the fields of California into professional boxing, then into industry, and back to school. He had only an eighth grade education, but his aptitude for mathematics and mechanics stood him well at Laney and Chabot Colleges, where he studied machine shop practice, tool design, mechanical engineering and drafting. He became a machinist, learned moldmaking and die work, and eventually founded his own business, the only Mexican-American-owned machine shop in the bay area.

Today Joe Aceves, age 40, is president of Aceco Tool Corp., fulfilling contracts for the aerospace and commercial industries. He also owns Pronto Tool and Supply Corp. and holds interests in several other businesses.

His seemingly unlimited energy has carried him into other endeavors designed to help Latinos succeed in society and the business world. He feels, as I do, that it is possible for everyone to succeed in our system, but he also recognizes the added handicaps borne by members of minority groups.

This realization led him to found the Latin American Manufactures Association, a minority nonprofit business association, industrially oriented, designed specifically for the betterment of Latino businessmen. He is also active in other business, community service, social and cultural activities benefiting Latinos in San Leandro, Hayward, and other parts of the bay area, and Nation.

I am proud to be among those who can congratulate Jose "Joe" Aceves for winning the Latino of the Year Award presented tonight at the Bay Area Congress for Mexican American Affairs' third annual awards dinner.

Thank you.

AMERICAN LABOR SUPPORTS ISRAEL

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the very strong support of the American labor movement for the State of Israel and the close kinship between our AFL-CIO and Histadrut, Israel's unique General Federation of Labor.

The support and encouragement Israel has received from the AFL–CIO throughout its turbulent 28-year existence has been substantial. This close relationship is documented in a recent article by Les Finnegan, writing for Press Associates, Inc. This feature, which has been widely distributed to the American and Canadian labor press, deserves the attention of our colleagues and I present it herewith for inclusion in the RECORD:

CLOSE KINSHIP: AMERICAN LABOR HAS HUGE STAKE IN ISRAEL AND ITS VERY SURVIVAL

(By Les Finnegan)

(NOTE.—The author of the following article has visited Israel twice and has personally observed many of the activities of the American labor movement in that country.)

WASHINGTON.—The AFL–CIO swift announcement of all-out support for the State of Israel and for Histadrut, Israel's unique General Federation of Labor, immediately after the Arabs launched the "Yom Kippur War" came as no surprise to those familiar with American labor history.

If, as it is sometimes said, the State of Israel was a creation of Histadrut (the labor federation was founded in 1920, 28 years before Israel's independence), then American labor had much to do with the creation of Histadrut.

The extent of the moral and ideological support that U.S. trade unionism has given Israel and Histadrut, before and after the achievement of independence in 1948, is well known.

What is almost completely unknown is the amazing extent of American labor's economic and financial assistance to the country and its democratic labor movement.

That assistance might well prove the difference between life and death for Israel now that this "oasis of democracy in the Middle East" is once again fighting for its very existence.

Unpublicized have been these two impressive facts:

Since 1947, U.S. unions have contributed a total of $17,662,663 to Histadrut;

Since 1952, U.S. unions have purchased more than $800,000,000 worth of Israel bonds.

Just as impressive as these cash outlays and perhaps even more crucial to Israel's survival today are the more than 100 hospitals, clinics, trade schools, medical training facilities, children's homes and other structures built by American unions. They include the following:

In Nazareth, the George Meany Sports Stadium, one of Israel's largest, with seats for 30,000 spectators, has been a major center of athletics and physical fitness programs.

In Beersheba, the ILGWU (North Negev) Hospital, constructed by the Int'l. Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO, serves all of the vast Negev desert area including the nomadic Bedoins. It has trained the first Bedoin doctor in 2,000 years.

In Haifa, the modernistic, marble-faced Histadrut headquarters is the William Green House, a memorial to the late president of the AFL.

In Elath, on the Gulf of Aqaba, adjoining three Arab nations, scores of thousands of Israeli workers and soldiers have enjoyed the intellectual and recreational advantages of the Philip Murray Cultural Center, named after the late president of the CIO and built in desert surroundings of large, rugged, native stone.

In Holon, the Walter Reuther Children's Home, an imposing memorial to the late president of the United Auto Workers, has made possible a healthy growth and adolescence for many Israeli youngsters.

In Ein Kerem, the independent International Brotherhood of Teamsters erected the Teamsters Children's Home, a beautiful, long, low, two-story haven for children from broken homes and a treatment center for asthmatic youngsters.

In the Druze village of Isaphia, set on the slopes of Biblical Mt. Carmel, the SEIU Medical Clinic is a therapeutically priceless gift of the Service Employees International Union, AFL–CIO.

In Hatikvah, the Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Union, AFL–CIO, built the highly-valued Ed Miller Youth Center as a tribute to the union's president.

In Haifa, the ILGWU Trade School, filled with modern machinery, trains young Israelis not only for jobs and careers in the garment industry but also for skilled jobs in the construction industry and other fields.

In the Kfar Blum Kibbutz, the Painters Union Rest Home was constructed by the International Brotherhood of Painters, AFL–CIO.

In Krait Shmona, near the Lebanese border, a $200,000 cold storage plant was built by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL–CIO, which also raised another $50,000 to repair damages caused by Arab shelling.

In Bnai Brak, the most modern and beautifully-equipped multi-purpose clinic in Israel, the five-story Potofsky Health Center, was recently dedicated in tribute to the former president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, AFL–CIO.

OTHER LABOR CONTRIBUTIONS

However, these American trade union edifices that dot the Israeli landscape from the Lebanese frontier on the north to the Red Sea on the south, by no means exhaust the evidences of U.S. labor aid to Israel and Histadrut.

For example, the United Steelworkers, AFL–CIO, Scholarship Fund helps 24 Israeli boys and girls to obtain university educations each year. Other U.S. unions have established similar educational funds.

What makes these American labor contributions all the more significant is that no comparable relationship has ever flowered between U.S. unions and any other nation at any time.

Part of the answer, probably, is the traditional American admiration for the underdog, the fact that the infant levantine nation was trying to build a new democracy where democracy had never before taken root, in a barren land of desert and rock, a tiny strip of Mediterranean coastline about the size of New Jersey, devoid of natural resources.

Another part of the explanation for American labor's admiration and affection for Israel lies in the pleased recognition that Israel, like America, has been a "melting pot," an ingathering of the tired, the poor, the "huddled masses yearning to breathe free . . . the homeless tempest-tossed" as Emma Lazarus, a Jew, wrote for the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty.

HISTORIC BACKGROUND

The State of Israel was only a distant dream for Jews of the diaspora around the world when the Pittsburgh convention of the AFL in 1928 took its first historic stand on

Histadrut. The delegates could hardly have foreseen the birth of Israel 20 years later when they passed an eloquent resolution lauding Histadrut and praising its protection of the workers of the Holy Land against exploitation.

After that there was never a convention of the AFL or CIO, and seldom a convention of their affiliates, that did not support the vision of a free and independent homeland for the Jews. But the AFL and CIO, and later the AFL–CIO, did not rest with ephemeral convention resolutions. In Congress after Congress and in countless state legislatures, national and state labor bodies won support for a free Israel and the right of Jews everywhere to migrate to the Holy Land.

Later that huge lobbying and educational campaign took on a new character—Israel's desperate need for weapons with which to defend itself against Arab attacks and the equal urgency of shaping world opinion against Israel's enemies.

Both Israel and Histadrut, down through the years, have been generous in their acknowledgment of American labor's contributions to the young nation's creation, survival and development.

The merged AFL–CIO was only four years old when its 1959 convention was addressed by Histadrut's General Secretary Pinhas Lavon. Lavon was given a standing ovation as he concluded his speech with these words:

"Many institutions in Israel, in city and village, have been built for the welfare of the worker and his family thanks to the generosity of your hearts, a generosity which is common to American labor and the American people as a whole.

"We achieved all the things that Israel has achieved by the pioneering efforts of two generations of men and women," the Histadrut leader emphasized. *"But of course we could not have done it without the generous help given to us by our kindred and brethren in the free world and by the American labor movement."*

Standing on the AFL–CIO platform and listening to wave after wave of cheers and applause, Lavon may well have been thinking back to the very first international statement made by George Meany following his election as president of the merger labor movement.

MOSCOW MANEUVERS

"It should be obvious to our government and to our allies," said Meany, "that Moscow is maneuvering to instigate aggression and to provoke the catastrophe of war in the Middle East. The Communists have already ignited the fuse to the powder keg. The free world must act immediately to stamp out that sputtering fuse and safeguard peace.

"As the first step," declared the AFL–CIO chief, "the AFL–CIO recommends that the United States provide arms for defense of Israel."

And then in a 1956 prediction that came true in 1973, Meany said, "The growing imbalance in military strength against Israel will inevitably bring about war."

The AFL–CIO appeal for Israel's defense was no mere gesture. One month later, on the eighth anniversary of Israeli independence, the Federation asked President Eisenhower to "seek advance authority from Congress" to send arms "for the defense of Israel."

Solemnly Meany warned the President and Congress: "If we do not act now, Israel may become another Korea."

Of all the unions of free labor around the world, the AFL–CIO has been the most vocal and least compromising in attacking Arab aggression. The Arab warmongers, Meany said, represent "a part of the world where there is no such thing as democracy; where feudalism still reigns; where within a very few miles human beings are still sold into slavery, a part of the world that could very well be called the most backward area of the world."

Meany, himself the son of immigrants, emphasized the U.S.-Israeli kinship by reminding American working men and women: "We too are a nation of foreigners. We are a nation of people descended from those who came to America to find a haven from persecution and from oppression—economic, political and religious."

Nor has the AFL–CIO hesitated to side with Israel against United Nations resolutions critical of Israeli actions. One UN decision was blasted as contradicting the Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East. The AFL–CIO said it "supports this (Eisenhower) doctrine which pledges our country to be in readiness to resort to force if need be, and to halt aggression in that part of the world."

Meany proved, too, that he had an acute eye for military eventualities when he told Prime Minister Golda Meir, "The one bit of territory I would never give back would be the Golan Heights to Syria."

Meany summed it up for American union members on Dec. 17, 1972, when he declared:

"There is no disagreement within the American labor movement when it comes to the State of Israel. In supporting Israel we are not only defending the bastion of democracy in the Middle East—we are defending our own principles, the principles of free trade unionism; and nothing is closer to us than that."

GILMAN CALLS FOR RETURNING VETERANS DAY TO NOVEMBER 11

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation reinstating the observance of Veterans Day on November 11 instead of on the fourth day of October.

Veterans Day observances began back in 1919 as Armistice Day with the beginning of a cease-fire over the battle lines of a war-ravaged Europe. The significance of that cease-fire coming at the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month was crystallized into a national holiday initially honoring the veterans of World War I. With the increased service of our men overseas, Armistice Day in 1954 was renamed Veterans Day and its celebration was continued on the 11th day of November each year as a day honoring all of our veterans until legislation establishing 3-day holidays took effect in 1971.

Veterans Day is an important day—a day far too significant to be casually noted as part of a 3-day October holiday. We must not let our Nation forget the sacrifice, the courage, and the loyalty of our veterans for their country. It is altogether befitting that we set aside a special date in recognition of their unselfish devotion to their Nation.

With the advent of the 3-day holidays, Veterans Day observances have been met with apathy and have been sacrificed to the commercialism of holiday shopping. Recognizing this, 32 States have already moved their State celebrations of Veterans Day back to November 11.

By Congress reestablishing November 11 as Veterans Day, we will be giving added significance to the immortal, heroic deeds of our service men and women who gave so much for their Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this measure changing Veterans Day back to November 11 and respectfully request that the text of this measure be included in this portion of the RECORD:

A bill to reestablish November 11 as Veterans Day

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective upon the date of enactment, subsection (a) of section 6103 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by the Act of June 28, 1968 (Public Law 90–363), is amended by striking out "Veteran's Day, the fourth Monday in October" and inserting in lieu thereof "Veteran's Day, November 11".

SOKOL ASSOCIATION—TRADITIONS AND LIVING IDEALS

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Sokol Association of Cedar Rapids. This organization, founded and supported by Czechoslovakian people of the Second District in Iowa, has contributed much to the Cedar Rapids community. I recently had the pleasure of addressing the Sokol Association as it celebrated its 100th anniversary. I think the spirit and achievements of this group are worthy of wide notice, and I would, therefore, like to include the text of my remarks in the RECORD at this time:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE CULVER

It is a pleasure for me to participate in the 100th anniversary celebration of the Cedar Rapids Sokol Association.

Sharing close ties with the Cedar Rapids community, we all know the importance of maintaining involvement in a group such as this one, both to strengthen the fabric of our community and to heighten our awareness of our heritage and its cultural diversity.

Many nationalities make America what the country is today. The contribution of each nation's culture, its ideas, customs and talents helped build this nation and contribute to its greatness. Being proud to be Americans involves being proud of our heritage. Sokol is an excellent example of how we can keep alive the smaller community within the larger one.

If we had more such active groups, with stress on family, participation, physical fitness, and community involvement, perhaps we would be better able to solve and even end some of the problems in society today. As all of you here this evening know so well, young people particularly benefit from their involvement in this organization, as hopefully, their enthusiasm and interest here will lead to their strong development as future parents, citizens and leaders.

In a time of accelerated change and of changing moods, ideas, and institutions, it is heartening to see this group celebrate its 100th anniversary. As you look ahead to another century of development and growth, and share your interests with others in the community and nations, we can take renewed hope that the traditions and living ideals of this country will have as much permanence as this organization.

A TURN TO GOVERNMENT FOR HELP

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Brinkley, Ark., are working to breathe new life into the community. Mr. Albert L. Rusher, a concerned citizen, forwarded to me an article from the U.S. News & World Report entitled "A Turn to Government for Help." I commend it to my colleagues for their consideration:

A TURN TO GOVERNMENT FOR HELP

TOCCOA, GA.—Carl McCurry says he's getting customers in his men's shop in downtown Toccoa that he's never seen before. To him, that indicates that this town of 6,971 in the red-clay hills of Northeast Georgia is on the move again.

For years, the clothing merchant had seen the same faces—but fewer and less seldom—as the business district declined and young people left town to seek jobs in Atlanta.

"We were dying, like so many other small towns," recalls Mr. McCurry. "We had seven empty buildings in two blocks."

Until 1964, Toccoa had been on the main highway linking Atlanta and Greenville, S.C. But an expressway was built 17 miles to the south. Almost immediately, 11 service stations, two truck stops, a small hotel and two restaurants closed.

The community tried to attract industry. It built an industrial park adjoining the town in 1967, but the space went three years without a single tenant.

City Commissioner Lucius Alewine relates the town's efforts to lure business by using volunteer local leaders.

"We tried and tried; we used every gimmick you can think of, but we got nowhere. It was like a high-powered race car spinning its wheels and then running out of gas."

START: A MALL

Then, suddenly, the turnaround began.

First, downtown businessmen—desperate for off-street parking but unable to afford it—turned to the city and then to the Federal Government for help. The solution was a 1.8-million dollar downtown pedestrian mall, financed 75 per cent by federal funds.

Second, city leaders decided they could never attract industry without professional help. So in 1968 they hired Robert H. Evans from the Spartanburg, S.C., chamber of commerce to head a local chamber and development authority.

New Shopping Center in Toccoa, Ga., Is a Sign of Growth. Community Leaders Credit Professional Help for Spurring Expansion

"Any community attempting to evolve out of a state of stagnation cannot do it without full-time professional leadership," says Roy E. Gaines, a radio-station executive and city commissioner.

Within a year, Toccoa landed Thiokol Chemical Corporation, in the town's industrial park. However, by late 1969, the company's market for carpet-backing it produced in Toccoa vanished, and Thiokol was forced to shut down.

The plant sat idle for months until Mr. Evans negotiated its sale to a textile manufacturer, the Deering Milliken, Inc., which now employs workers turning out double-knit fabric. Later, Thiokol opened a smaller plant in the town's industrial park.

On another occasion, Mr. Evans heard of a business-form printer looking for a site with a building in Georgia. Toccoa had the site but no building. So Mr. Evans persuaded an Atlanta contractor to put up the building and landed the company, Uarco, Inc., of Barrington, Ill.

This kind of success re-awakened interest throughout the town's business community. For example:

A customer in Mr. McCurry's men's shop one day mentioned that he was a baker with a major Atlanta hotel, but wanted to move to a small town. Mr. McCurry thought the town needed a bakery, so he left the customer he had never seen before alone in the store for about two hours while the merchant went out to find a real-estate agent to lease the baker a site.

GROWING AGAIN

There are numerous signs that Toccoa is growing again. Two new shopping centers are under construction; a 100-bed hospital was occupied in 1968; a library was opened in 1970; and a 3-million-dollar high school and vocational school was dedicated in 1971.

In addition, the water and sewer system has been expanded at a cost of 3.7 millions. And since 1968, eight new industries creating 900 jobs have come to town.

"Not one of them has a smokestack," says Mr. Evans.

Downtown business is booming. The pedestrian mall started attracting curious shoppers almost as soon as the first spadeful of dirt was turned. Retail sales climbed even though rain during the autumn and winter of construction made a quagmire of streets and sidewalks.

Grocer J. R. Mitchell, downtown since 1935, says, "March was the best month we have had in a long time." John Mullinax, a jeweler who headed the Downtown Merchants Association during the initial search for off-street parking that led to the mall, says business now is the best ever.

"I've had a very nice increase in sales since completion of the mall, and an increase every month except one during its construction," he says.

While the mall was being built, 19 warehouses, pool halls, and other structures were demolished to provide off-street parking. Stores now have two entrances—one facing the mall and another leading to parking lots.

The pedestrian mall covers only one block, but it is spurring businessmen outside the block to renovate. Notes Commissioner Alewine:

"The surrounding area was pretty dilapidated but you'd be surprised how people several blocks away are sprucing up their buildings. The attraction rubs off."

Community leaders generally believe the town now is retaining its young. Mayor Troy L. Bowen says his son, a Georgia Tech graduate "is coming back to Toccoa to live. If it weren't for these new industries, he wouldn't be here.

Mr. Alewine offers another example of the interest of young people in the town, saying:

"Every Sunday, two to three young people join the church and that is good for the community."

FUEL OIL EXPORTS UP 350 PERCENT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, despite a mounting nationwide oil crisis, the latest figures show the U.S. exports of fuel oil rose about 350 percent in the last month reaching 642,000 barrels in September.

According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census U.S. fuel oil exports climbed from 200,000 barrels in August to 692,000 barrels in September. It is bad enough that we are exporting any fuel oil at all, but to increase the exports by 350 percent as the shortage worsens is an outrage and frankly incomprehensible.

As many of my colleagues know, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 8828) that will prohibit all fuel oil exports during the current shortage as well as overseas shipments of gasoline and propane.

During the shortage, there is absolutely no excuse for exporting any fuel oil overseas. The largest shipments during September were to Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Venezuela.

Last week I released results of the investigation by the Cost of Living Council which showed the fuel exports are expected to go up 284 percent in 1973.

Congress must bring this abuse to a halt by passing legislation to prohibit all petroleum exports during the shortage.

TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. CHARLES WORTHAM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when the objective eye of history records the actions and deeds of America, I would hope that the criteria used to judge our Nation is the quality of our people—our morality, our intellect, and our perseverance.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said it best:

The true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of man the country turns out.

By this standard, our place in history should be assured. And, of those who could best serve as examples of American morality, intelligence, and perseverance—with an added touch of humor—I would include Mr. and Mrs. Charles Wortham—two of the finest people I have been privileged to know.

Born in 1884, Charley Wortham settled in Redondo Beach, Calif., on July 4, 1932, where he was in the rental housing business.

In this community, he made his mark as an active participant in civic and cultural affairs, serving as the campaign chairman of the South Bay March of Dimes, the president of the South Bay-Torrance Symphony Association, and chairman of the American Field Service.

In addition, Mr. Wortham is a member of the Redondo Beach chapters of the Elks, Masons, and Eagles. He also serves on the Redondo Beach Roundtable, and is a life member of the coordinating council. Presently, Charley serves as the president emeritus of the South Bay Chapter of the City of Hope.

MAYOR OF REDONDO BEACH

His great interest in community affairs naturally carried over to governmental affairs, and he was elected councilman in 1941, and then mayor in 1947, where he served until 1953. Currently,

Mr. Wortham serves on the appeals board.

Charley Wortham's leadership and dedication led to his selection as a delegate to the 1948 Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia which nominated Harry S. Truman. Then, in 1952, he was a delegate to the convention in Chicago which nominated Gov. Adlai Stevenson.

In 1965, at the age of 81, he had the distinction of serving on the Los Angeles County Grand Jury, as the oldest person ever to do so in county history.

Referred to as "Mr. Redondo Beach" by the South Bay Daily Breeze, Charley Wortham was named Man of the Year in 1967 by the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce, and has received honors from the Elks and the Eagles.

ALMA WORTHAM

No mention of Charley would be complete without acknowledging and paying tribute to his lovely and charming wife Alma. In addition to her job as a housewife and mother, she, too, has been active in democratic politics, helping to form the countywide Democratic Women's Forum. She and Charley are the proud parents of five children, the grandparents of 19 grandchildren, and the great-grandparents of 30 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, the Worthams are the kind of people that all of us can be proud of—the kind of people who have built America and made this the great country she is.

JERRY MICKELSEN

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to give recognition and say thank you to one of Los Angeles' distinguished citizens for a job well done.

So often, individuals provide services to the community in an exceptional manner or go above or beyond the call of duty and receive no thanks for their efforts. I feel that these citizens deserve a word of praise and encouragement.

Jerry Mickelsen is assistant ticket manager for the Los Angeles Rams. In this position, Mr. Mickelsen handles season ticket sales, individual game sales, and all related work dealing with distribution of tickets for the Rams. I am sure that at one time or another we have all endured the frustrations of attempting to obtain tickets for a professional football game to no avail. With pro football being one of America's favorite pastimes, it is virtually impossible, in most cities, to get tickets to the games if you are not a season ticketholder and in some cities it is impossible even to get season tickets. Jerry Mickelsen has done a fantastic job of trying to eliminate some of the frustrations of Rams fans in virtually impossible situations. On numerous occasions, he has helped me and so many other Ram supporters obtain tickets to home and away games when they were difficult to obtain.

A native of St. Paul, Minn., Jerry worked in the Los Angeles Dodgers box office prior to starting with the Rams in 1968. He and his wife Lora Ann are the parents of two sons, Gregory and Kenneth.

To Jerry Mickelsen, I say thank you for myself, my family, and thousands of other Los Angeles Rams supporters.

IMPEACHMENT: TWO LEGAL VIEWS

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have now received more than 1,500 letters and telegrams calling for resignation or impeachment of the President. Most of these have been brief and pointed.

My attention was drawn to two more substantial statements from practicing attorneys in San Diego County, Louis S. Katz and Charles C. Renshaw. I have been acquainted with each of them at least a dozen years. Each stands high in the legal profession.

Messrs. Katz and Renshaw have separately pondered both the law and the facts touching on the impeachment issue, and reached similar conclusions. I offer both assessments for the RECORD:

NOVEMBER 8, 1973.

Hon. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR VAN: I have heard some talk that since the President agreed to turn over the Watergate tapes impeachment has now lost its appeal to many people in Congress and to the United States citizens as well.

For the following reasons I believe impeachment is still important and that President Nixon is not above the law, Congress or the people of this country and that immediate action should be taken to hold hearings on the President's impeachment.

The following items, in my opinion, are illegal and improper activities by a President:

(1) On July 23, 1970 the President personally approved a plan for political surveillance by use of burglary, wiretapping, eavesdropping and spying on students by the CIA and other agencies.

(2) In 1971, the President established with the White House a personal secret police force that engaged in burglary, illegal wiretaps, espionage, and perjury.

(3) While Daniel Ellsberg was facing trial in a Federal Court in Los Angeles, his psychiatric records were removed from the office of his doctor by White House aides who burglarized the doctor's office and who were acting under the direction of the President. At the same time and at the direction of the President, a White House aide discussed the directorship of the FBI with the judge presiding over the Ellsberg trial.

(4) Private detectives were hired by White House aides to spy on the sex life, drinking habits, and family problems of political opponents.

(5) A special list was made up of "enemies" who were opponents of President Nixon and supporters of possible presidential opponents. These names were placed on a special list and targeted for harassment by the Internal Revenue Service.

(6) During three days in May 1971, over 13,000 people were arrested in Washington, D.C. These arrests were declared unconstitutional by the courts and at that time a White House spokesman, William Rehnquist, invented the doctrine of "qualified martial law."

(7) In 1973, the President ordered bombing of Cambodia, a neutral country, without the authorization of Congress. We learned later that he had been authorizing the bombing in Cambodia for three years and and deliberately concealed the bombing from Congress and from the people, thereby usurping the war making powers of the Congress. Not only that, but when the President found that the deception had been uncovered, he said he would do the same thing under similar circumstances.

(8) Lastly, and most important, is the loss of the two tapes that carry key information about the President's advice to Mr. Dean and the Attorney General in areas that, if verified by the statements of these two witnesses before the Watergate Committee, would show that the President had acted improperly and unethically. For this reason alone, the "loss" of these two tapes is highly suspect and can lead me to believe only that President Nixon intentionally destroyed them or misplaced them so that his language could not be quoted to the nation.

To protect our system of individual rights under the law, and to restore the integrity of the Bill of Rights, for us and our children, as well as to make the lesson clear to all future Presidents in whose hands we place our lives, Richard Nixon must stand trial before the Senate. If he does not stand trial, what he has done will be done by others. I therefore strongly urge you to support impeachment of President Nixon.

I would appreciate your responding to my letter and giving me your views on this subject.

Very truly yours,

LOUIS S. KATZ.

NOVEMBER 7, 1973.

Hon. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR VAN: We received your response to our recent cry of outrage, and I must say that we concur in the views you expressed.

God knows, as California democrats, neither Ely or I have any reason to think kindly of Nixon. However, we both felt, for many long months, that he was entitled to all the presumptions of innocence due any citizen, and beyond this, by virtue of his office, perhaps greater restraint was due the President. These considerations, plus the national agonies that would be generated by impeachment, led Ely and me to feelings of ambivalence. The Cox incident, and subsequent events, eliminated all of our misgivings and we fully support your views.

I hope these next thoughts will not be inappropriate, but as a lawyer I have listened to the legal arguments advanced by the administration as to why the files, tapes, etc., relative to Watergate should not be made available to the Senate Select Committee and to the Special Prosecutor. These arguments are, in my opinion, without merit. As I understand it, two basic premises have been raised:

(1) Maintenance of the doctrine of separation of powers between the Judiciary, Legislative and Executive branches; and

(2) Confidentiality of Presidential communications.

The first position does not apply to the Watergate situation because while there is

no argument that the founders of our republic expressly provided for three co-equal branches of government they also provided that all three branches were, and are, subordinate to the law of this land, and every member of these respective branches is required, as a part of his oath of office, to swear to uphold that law. Simply put, it is the people of this country, in whom the ultimate law of the land resides, that are paramount to the government, not the reverse. Furthermore, at least as it relates to the Special Prosecutor, the issue is one solely within the Executive Branch and does not raise a conflict with either the Judiciary or Legislative.

The second argument is a bogus attempt to blanket everything that citizen Nixon does with the immunity given President Nixon. This is not, and never has been, the law. I think it entirely proper that the confidential communications, whether written, oral, or otherwise, of a President, that relate to the functions of his office and the performance of his duties as President, be kept confidential. However, this does not apply to the communications of citizen Nixon that relate to his activities, his private activities, for reelection to national office. Furthermore, as with any other legal privilege, if an otherwise confidential communication is disclosed to some third person, not otherwise within the orbit of confidentiality, then the privilege no longer exists. This certainly applies to the tapes that Haldemann was allowed to listen to when he was no longer a member of the Presidential family.

Frankly, after analyzing Nixon's position, I came to the conclusion that it is a cleverly designed smoke screen that has at least been partially successful in hoodwinking the public. I have really hoped to see someone prick that balloon in a simple, concise statement.

Anyway, again our appreciation for your letter, and our best wishes to you in what cannot be happy times.

Very truly yours,

C. C. RENSHAW.

THE TARNISHING OF THE PRESIDENT'S ENERGY SPEECH

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, when after long delay the President made his energy speech to the Nation last Thursday he began by setting forth the problem in a temperate and satisfactory manner.

It was unfortunate, therefore, even though seemingly characteristic, that the President's speech was then marred by a gratuitous slap at Congress.

Obviously, the national interest simply demands that the executive and legislative branches must work together in confronting the energy shortage. A conciliatory and cooperative tone would have been appropriate for the Chief Executive, especially in view of the administration's vulnerability on the issue and the fact that the occasion provided an opportunity for a positive gesture.

A very interesting article on this matter appeared in today's Evans-Novak column:

MR. NIXON'S POLICY ON ENERGY: BLAME CONGRESS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

An elite group of 32 businessmen invited to the White House last Wednesday for an advance peek at the new energy program also became witnesses to a momentary clash between President Nixon and his domestic counselor, Melvin R. Laird, which reveals much about both the administration's handling of the energy crisis and its general strategy.

Laird was listing energy legislation now in the congressional pipeline when he was interrupted by an obviously irritated President. "But there's nothing on my desk now, is there?" Mr. Nixon asked his counselor. The impression given the businessmen: While Laird was trying to solve the fuel shortage in close cooperation with Congress, the President wanted to blame Congress for causing the crisis.

This contrast between the President and his counselor transcends the energy crisis. But in this case, the presidential attempt to lay blame on Congress particularly infuriates Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill who believe their early warnings about the energy crunch were ignored by the White House. In truth, key administration officials admit the President delayed until it was too late to prevent disaster. Even at this eleventh hour, the administration's handling of the crisis seems fuzzy and uncoordinated.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, can claim to be the leading Cassandra. His June 13, 1972, letter to the President warning about U.S. dependence on Middle Eastern oil was ignored. So was Jackson's Dec. 10, 1972, call for Mr. Nixon to name an energy adviser.

One reason why Jackson's warnings went unheeded was that domestic policy chief John D. Ehrlichman then tightly controlled decisions on energy, as on everything except foreign affairs. Besides being spread thin by trying to monopolize domestic policy, Ehrlichman was busy attempting to keep from going down with the Watergate wreck, when energy decisions were needed.

When Erlichman finally fell last April, the dominant administration voice in the energy field became Deputy Secretary of the Treasury William Simon. A Wall Street investment expert, Simon at first opposed mandatory fuel allocations but later was convinced by Jackson and other congressional leaders of their necessity.

But on June 29 Gov. John Love of Colorado was appointed energy adviser and quickly ruled against mandatory allocations, delaying for weeks what Democrats in Congress long had been urging. Meanwhile, Simon disappeared from the energy picture along with his valuable expertise. As the crisis deepened last week, Simon was in Nassau attending a Time, Inc. seminar.

Love, popular and well regarded as governor, has been an almost totally unrelieved disappointment here. Even administration officials admit he lacks the background, temperament and governmental powers to be energy adviser. In fact, he does not want the power. One proposal to consolidate the government's scattered energy policymaking functions under him was killed by Love.

There is, therefore, a one-word answer to the question of who is running the government's energy policy: nobody. The consequence is a sloppy, sluggish performance by the administration which scarcely supports Mr. Nixon's attempts to blame the crisis on Congress.

When Jackson on Oct. 17 unveiled his legislation for fuel self-sufficiency, Love's office replied it would soon send up its own bill. But one week later, Laird informed Jackson that the many government departments involved had not agreed on anything. That same day, Love told the Senate Interior Committee the administration had no contingency plans in case of an Arab oil cut-off.

Mr. Nixon might not have avoided the crunch even had he heeded Jackson's first warnings. In any event, it is too late now to avoid terribly painful economic consequences resulting from the Arab cut-off. ("It's going to be wild in a few weeks," predicted one consultant who advises the administration.)

Nevertheless, almost everybody concerned believes Mr. Nixon should belatedly put somebody in charge of the crisis to at least minimize the economic dislocation. In business circles, Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz is talked about as the best choice. But Shultz, overburdened now as Mr. Nixon's economic adviser, does not want the job and probably won't get it.

Besides, the White House seems more interested in goading Congress. Rep. Torbert Macdonald (D-Mass.), chairman of the House subcommittee handling energy legislation and a critic of the President's energy policies, was not invited to last Wednesday's briefing. Macdonald said nothing publicly but, in private, trumpeted his rage in unprintable language. Although the snub to Macdonald might well be the product of new familiar incompetency at the Nixon White House, it also coincided with Mr. Nixon's desire for a cold war with Congress while a fuel-short nation faces a freezing winter.

CANADIAN WRITER APPRECIATES U.S. ASSISTANCE TO OTHER COUNTRIES

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Mrs. Weldon McNeal of Prospect, Ohio, sent me an article from the September 1973 edition of Country Living magazine. The article is written by a Canadian who is appreciative of the efforts of the United States in assisting the other nations of the world in overcoming natural disasters, monetary crises, and war devastation. In a time when the United States seems to reap only criticism of its international role, I would like to share this article with my colleagues:

[From Country Living magazine, September 1973]

U.S. HELP TO OTHERS IN TIME OF NEED

EDITOR'S NOTE: So we've problems! Dollar devaluation, energy shortages, Watergate skullduggery, galloping inflation, pollution and, at your Co-op, rising costs and the daily struggle of keeping up with the demands for service.

Newspaper columnist Jim Bishop says, "There is another side to the coin of crisis. America will survive it. America was stunned, yes—but not stupefied, rocked but not wrecked, puzzled but not paralyzed."

It is a tribute to the strength of the youthful vigor of the U.S. that the penicillin of our system heals wounds quickly.

In this summer of 1973 men harvested crops, appeared in offices on time or punched shop timeclocks regularly, and housewives went about their daily tasks.

Meanwhile, Gordon Sinclair took to the air over Radio Station CFRB, Toronto to editorialize about Americans. We appreciate Mr. Sinclair's thoughts—do you?

The United States dollar took another pounding on German, French and British exchanges this morning, hitting the lowest point ever known in West Germany.

It has declined there by 41 percent since 1971, and this Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and possibly the least appreciated people on all the earth.

As long as 60 years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the Yellow River and the Yangtze. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did.

They have helped control floods on the Nile, the Amazon, the Ganges and Niger.

Today the rich bottomland of the Mississippi is under water and no foreign land has sent a dollar to help.

Germany, Japan and, to a lesser extent, Britain and Italy were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions in debts.

None of those countries is today paying even the interest on its remaining debts to the United States.

When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who propped it up, and their reward was to be insulted and swindled on the streets of Paris.

I was there. I saw it.

When distant cities are hit by earthquake, it is the United States that hurries in to help. Managua, Nicaragua is one of the most recent examples. So far this spring 59 American communities have been flattened by tornadoes. Nobody has helped.

Why does no other land on earth even consider putting a man or woman on the moon?

You talk about Japanese technocracy and you get radios. You talk about German technocracy and you get automobiles.

You talk about American technocracy and you find men on the moon, not once but several times . . . and safely home again.

You talk about scandals and the Americans put theirs right in the store window for everybody to look at.

Even their draft dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our streets. Most of them, unless they are breaking Canadian laws, are getting American dollars from Ma and Pa at home to spend here.

When the Americans get out of this bind . . . as they will . . . who could blame them if they simply forgot the rest of the world. If they let someone else buy the Israel bonds. Let someone else build or repair foreign dams or design foreign buildings that won't shake apart in earthquakes.

When the railways of France, Germany and India were breaking down through age, it was the Americans who rebuilt them. When the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both are still broke.

I can name to you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the aid of other people in trouble.

Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the Americans in trouble?

I don't think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake.

Our neighbors have faced it alone, and I'm one Canadian who is tired of hearing them kicked around. They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their nose at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

I hope Canada is not one of these.

SOLAR ENERGY—A PRACTICAL SOLUTION TO THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow through Thursday the Science and Astronautics Subcommittee on Energy will hold hearings on H.R. 10952, the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1973. This bill, if enacted into law, will provide for a $50 million research, development, demonstration and evaluation program over a period of 5 years that will be extremely valuable in helping us to meet the challenge posed by the energy crisis.

I would like to point out, however, that we in the Congress, as usual, are following rather than leading the way—at least to some extent. There are many private citizens who have been looking into the potential uses of solar energy during the past several years, without governmental assistance, and their experience may prove valuable to us as we embark on the program that this bill will create, assuming that we in the Government are foresighted enough to pass this important piece of legislation. I wish to enter in the RECORD at this time an account of one such private citizen, Homer W. Davis, of Phelan, Calif., Quentin Foley, a reporter for the San Bernardino Sun-Telegram, in an article published on November 4, describes Mr. Davis' project. His article reads as follows:

FORTRESS OF SOLAR ENERGY: SUN TO PROVIDE WARMTH TO HOME

(By Quentin Foley)

PHELAN.—Hot rocks will heat the retirement home of Homer W. Davis in the San Gabriel Mountain foothills near here.

His 2½ acres is just off State Highway 138 at an altitude of 4,200 feet where foot-deep snows are not uncommon in the winter.

"But the air is smog free and the sun is almost always shining, so that is why I chose solar energy," Davis explained.

Unusual features have been designed into the solar energy house.

The concrete block walls are a foot thick and filled top to bottom with concrete, abundantly laced with reinforcing steel.

"It will be strong as a fortress," Davis boasted. "The thick walls of solid concrete give it excellent insulation, preserving energy, and increase its stability in case of earthquakes."

The San Andreas earthquake fault runs right past his front door.

After 32 years of teaching at Chaffey Junior College, what got him interested in building a solar energy house?

"It is a hobby and health activity," he explained.

His doctor prescribed exercise after he suffered a heart attack a few years ago and he decided to build a house to have something more to show for his effort than some old golf scores.

"And it has led to many friendships," Davis added.

You possibly think it would take an engineering professor to undertake building a home from the ground up. Not so. Davis teaches speech.

He learned how to build a house by reading all he could find in the library about masonry, carpentry and all the other skills it would take to do the job.

This will be his second effort. During the housing shortage years after World War II, he built the family residence in Claremont where he and his wife, Gladys, reared three daughters.

Rigging a Maytag washer motor to an old cement mixer, Davis has been working weekends on his house 3½ years and estimates he has 4½ years to go before it will be completed.

"I have had a ball," he said.

"And I've made a lot of friends."

The solar energy, possibly backed up by some wind generated power, will be used in a 12 volt electrical system in the house, but just to be on the safe side he has left room for 110 and 220 volt systems as well.

He plans to collect heat from the sun in either black boxes or black plastic tubes located outside the house in what will be the solar energy field.

Heat from these will be transferred to a rock bed under the front porch by hot air conduit and from there the heat will circulate through the house. The cooled air will return to the rock bed constantly for reheating.

"We are so high here, we don't have an air conditioning problem as we have few really hot days," Davis said.

Just to make sure, however, he has designed a series of louvers in the attic rafters to let hot air out of the house and to keep hot air from building up inside. At the lower level, cooler air circulates in through another series of louvers.

Since water retains heat longer than rock, he has a 500-gallon water tank in the rock bed where water is heated.

At one end of the living room is a fireplace and the circulating pipes pass beneath the hearthstone to pick up heat from it. Davis plans to use a steel Hetalator fireplace and pass the circulating water system through it. When a valve is turned, the water can be superheated.

Another valve will enable Davis to install radiant heat in the floor, if he wishes.

He even plans to cook with solar energy in an outdoor solar cooker, using a reflector to generate intense heat. You can cook a roast or broil a chicken with reflected solar heat.

"Solar energy can be stored in batteries for use on cloudy days," Davis said. He estimates he will be able to go seven or eight days without seeing the sun before his solar energy supplies run out.

"Wind power generating conditions should be excellent during such times," he said.

Davis believes he can power all the electrical needs of his house, with the possible exception of a TV, by solar energy.

"I'd like to see every home in this valley heating at least their water supply by solar energy," he said. "Water heating is a major energy cost and one that is most easily done by solar energy. Just leave a garden hose out in the sun for a while, then feel the temperature of the water in it."

He is building his retirement home entirely with his own funds, but would like to attract some foundation grants.

"This could become a sort of laboratory where people could come to try out new ideas and learn how to use solar energy," Davis said.

He has the walls up now, and as soon as he gets the roof on he can start with the finishing work. If all goes well, he should be finished well before he retires in five years.

"I'm a little ahead of schedule right now," he said.

And he poured another bucket of concrete into those foot-thick walls.

ENVIRONMENTAL RELIEF SOUGHT THROUGH COMMONSENSE REGULATION OF DDT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture ordered the bill H.R. 10796 reported today by unanimous vote.

This legislation is designed to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue a permit for the use of DDT on

forests and other agricultural lands whenever the Secretary of Agriculture deems it necessary because of a major threat to our environment, forests or agricultural lands due to a major insect infestation.

This legislation does not authorize uncontrolled use of DDT; rather, it is an exception to the existing law and would apply only to emergency situations and only then to be dispensed by licensed applicators.

This legislation is deemed essential because of the arbitrary refusal of the Environmental Protection Agency to grant the Secretary of Agriculture's petition to authorize emergency use of DDT to combat the massive infestation of our Nation's forest lands from the ravages of the Gypsy and Tussock moth.

The unimaginable extent of this damage from infestation to our forest was described in the testimony of Robert W. Long, Assistant Secretary for Conservation, Research and Education, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the Subcommittee on Forests, on October 23, 1973:

H.R. 10796 results from concern about damage caused by infestation of the tussock moth in the Pacific Northwest and gypsy moth in the northeast. An estimated 690,000 acres, up to date, of forest land in Oregon and Washington and an estimated 125,000 acres in northern Idaho have been defoliated in varying degrees by the tussock moth. Small areas of tussock moth damage have been discovered in Southern Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and New Mexico; however, the damages in these locations are not yet considered serious. This year the gypsy moth defoliated an estimated 1,773,000 acres within an area including New England, and the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

It was brought out repeatedly in hearings before our Forests Subcommittee that severe secondary environmental damage that threatened all forms of vegetation and animal life was occurring. As a result of insect infestation on epidemic proportions it simply does not make sense to allow our forest environment to be destroyed by an insect epidemic when they can be successfully controlled through the supervised application of DDT.

At present the damaged forest areas must either be clear cut for salvage or the defoliated and dead timber constitutes a major fire threat, both constituting a secondary threat to wild life and the natural balance desired in our environment.

DDT was banned under the theory of protecting our environment. Now we must understand that by banning DDT without exception or reason we are damaging the environment. There must be room for moderation and flexibility in both the use and banning of DDT. Because EPA exerts its authority as a prohibitive agency rather than a regulatory agency, the Congress must act.

Mr. Speaker, so that our colleagues might know the extent of this threat to our forest lands and the resulting environmental repercussions, I insert the related information in the RECORD at this point:

GYPSY MOTHS DEFOLIATE 1,773,846 ACRES IN 1973

WASHINGTON, Oct. 4.—Leaf-eating gypsy moth caterpillars defoliated an estimated 1,773,846 acres of woodland in nine northeastern states this summer, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports. This is an increase of about 400,000 acres over the 1972 defoliation.

Leo G.K. Iverson, deputy administrator of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), said the pest now is spreading from the New England area and heading through Pennsylvania. APHIS scientists also point out that the pest is moving from an area of less-favored food to a region where its favorite hardwood trees are more prevalent.

Pennsylvania was the hardest hit northeastern state this year with approximately 856,710 defoliated acres. Other states with defoliated acres include an estimated 333,215 in Connecticut; 254,865 in New Jersey; 248,441 in New York; 43,970 in Massachusetts; 35,925 in Rhode Island; 490 in Maine; 200 in Vermont, and 30 in New Hampshire.

Mr. Iverson said the Pocono region of eastern Pennsylvania was particularly hard hit. In several counties, 70 percent of the trees were almost completely stripped.

The gypsy moth was brought into this country in 1869 for scientific experiments, but accidentally escaped. A single 2-inch caterpillar can eat a square foot of leaves every 24 hours. In infested areas the pests annually attack foliage of trees in forests, homesites, parks and recreational areas.

THE DOUGLAS-FIR TUSSOCK MOTH—A CONTINUING PROBLEM IN NORTHEASTERN OREGON

INTRODUCTION

An outbreak of the Douglas-fir tussock moth developed in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington in 1972. About 172,000 acres were defoliated in the Blue Mountains of the two states.

Requests by the State of Oregon, State of Washington, and the U.S. Forest Service to use DDT to control the tussock moth were denied by the federal Environmental Protection Agency in the spring of 1973. The outbreak continued through this summer until over 500,000 acres have now been defoliated in varying degrees.

DAMAGE

Duglas-fir, white fir, and subalpine fir are the preferred hosts of the moth. The caterpillars (larvae) feed on the new needles in the spring. Older needles are eaten as the larvae increase in size. Infested trees begin to turn reddish-brown in June. By mid-July, entire trees may be defoliated and may die in following years. Sometimes, only tops of trees are attacked. These tops may die or a spiked top may develop.

LIFE CYCLE

Eggs hatch between mid-May and early June. Young larvae are 1/8" long and have long hairs. Their long hair and light weight allows them to be transported long distances by the wind. Full-grown larvae are about 1¼" long. They have two, long, dark tufts of hair just back of the head and a similar tuft on the other end. Four dense tussocks of hair grow along the middle of the back. The larvae feed through July until they enter the pupal or "resting" stage. This period lasts from 10 to 18 days when the moth emerges. The winged male and the wingless female tussock moth mate at that time. One female lays an average of 250 eggs on the cocoon from which she emerged.

CONTROL

Natural control

The Douglas-fir tussock moth has many natural enemies. These include a virus and insect parasites. The more important of these is the virus. It can kill large populations of the moth. Natural control normally lags several years behind the outbreak.

There was hope that the natural virus would control the tussock moth during this summer, but this has not happened.

Introduction of the virus artificially was one of the controls tested this year. There was some success, but the applications need more testing.

Chemical control

Aerial applications of ¾ pound of DDT in one gallon of fuel oil on an acre has been used to control past infestations of the tussock moth. Studies during and after past applications in the Northwest have uncovered little known impact from DDT on the environment in and near spray areas. Currently there is no insecticide registered by the Environmental Protection Agency for use on the tussock moth.

During 1973, four new chemicals were tested on 12,000 acres. One may hold promise as a future control, but a final evaluation is still underway.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Control

Two important jobs will be completed by next summer to provide knowledge to foresters planning control of the tussock moth. By October 1973, a population survey will be completed of egg masses that will produce next year's moths. The presence of the natural virus will not be known until studies are made next spring.

Based on this information, the State of Oregon and others will reevaluate their need for chemical control. A renewed request for emergency use of DDT may be made to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Fire protection

Increased fire protection is needed now in the infested areas. The 6,130 acre fire that burned at the edge of La Grange in August 1973 was aided in its spread by tussock moth-killed timber. Added protection will be needed for 3 to 5 years.

Salvage

Over 40 million board feet of timber were killed in 1972 on private lands. Another 140 million board feet were killed in 1973. A larger amount was killed both years on national forest lands. Salvage of the killed timber was started this summer and will need to continue at a fast pace to remove the timber before checking, insects, and disease make it unmerchantable. Over 300 individual forest landowners have been affected.

Reforestation

Many acres of the Blue Mountains will need reforestation once salvage is completed and the tussock moth is controlled. Department of Forestry service foresters and other foresters are developing plans to assist private landowners. A major problem will be having an adequate supply of seedlings of native species available for planting.

SALUTE TO A MEANINGFUL TELEVISION DRAMA

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, it is worthy of note that the television industry, essentially designed in its prime time programing to bring entertainment into the homes of millions of Americans, fre-

quently also achieves something meaningful, a program of contemporary importance and of inspiration.

The latest such accomplishment will be seen in homes throughout our Nation on Wednesday night, December 12. It is a simple story called "Joie," to be presented by Paramount television on the "Love Story" anthology series on the NBC television network.

One might not expect to find such a story on a program presented weekly under such a broad, all-encompassing title as "Love Story"—yet, it could not be more fitting. Because, love is the key to the young man named "Joie"—a handsome youth in his early twenties, yet a child in so many ways.

"Joie" is retarded.

There are many young people like him, some younger and some not so young, in special schools and classes, in centers and foundations throughout our country. These are organizations staffed by men and women dedicated to helping the retarded and emotionally disturbed children and adults.

To the observer, "Joie," like many of the young people being aided by such organizations, does not appear to be handicapped. To be sure, there is an occasional slowness of speech, a hesitation. He cannot read, or add, multiply, or subtract. But, much of the time, you are not aware that he is different.

Around him, there is an air of hope, not hopelessness. And love.

It is reflected in "Joie" himself. He wants so much to be a man. And, through love and the patient understanding and teaching of a volunteer in a foundation devoted to exceptional children, he develops an unsuspected talent as an artist. He learns he can look forward to a happy life, one to which he, too, can make his contribution.

As children are doing every hour, every day in schools and organizations across the United States, he responds to love and dedicated care.

It reminds that a few weeks earlier on this same "Love Story" program, another inspiring drama dealt with a young paraplegic. It has resulted in requests for special screenings at rehabilitation centers and hospitals, as a means of encouraging and aiding paraplegics in their struggle to resume a useful life.

Such television shows are not successfully produced by accident. They appear on our home screens as the result of the efforts of hard-working, talented men and women who not only strive to bring us entertainment but also to say something worthwhile. They start with the inspiration to inspire us and those less fortunate. They research their subject thoroughly in order to present it truthfully.

They and the companies who make it all possible are deserving of our commendation. Thus I feel it fitting that the Congress and the TV viewers of the Nation should salute those responsible for "Joie"—television's most distinguished award winner and the executive producer of "Love Story," George Schaefer; the former Academy Award winning director, Delbert Mann; the writer of the fine teleplay, Don Appell; the series' associate producer, Philip L. Parslow, its story editor, Esther Shapiro, and the outstanding cast headed by Kim Darby, John David Carson, and the Tony Award winning actress from Broadway, Sada Thompson.

To Frank Yablans, president of Paramount Pictures and Paramount Television and to the other executives of Paramount Television including Emmet G. Lavery, Jr., executive vice president; Bruce Lansbury, vice president, creative affairs, and Richard J. Winters, national director of publicity, advertising and promotion—and to the NBC television network—also should be expressed our appreciation for excellence and the tasteful treatment of a themes of such significance.

The program to be presented on December 12 is one of which the television industry can be proud, a dramatic entertainment that carries with it a hope and an encouragement for the unfortunate retarded and for their families.

Much is being done for them. Much more can be done.

"BLACKS ARE SLAVES TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY"

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, George Anthony Moore, of the Cleveland Press, published in the November 9 edition of the paper, a most perceptive column on the need for black people to search beyond party labels, when election time comes around, and study the men who request their votes.

Mr. Moore's observations, while specifically concerned with the recent election in Cleveland, have a universal relevance not only to black voters in other parts of the country, but to politicians and would-be candidates in every part.

I hope my colleagues in the House gives Mr. Moore's message sober attention.

The column follows:

"BLACKS ARE SLAVES TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY"

(By George Anthony Moore)

It had been my belief until this week after the general elections that black voters were becoming more sophisticated. But when I look at the results in which Mrs. Mercedes Coiner carried all of the black wards, I found it frightening because it was apparent that in those wards the people voted blindly on the basis that the candidate was a Democrat.

There could have been any other name picked at random and they would have voted for that person. The tragedy of this observation is that blacks in this city have not learned how to vote selectively. They have become slaves to party labels. In this case, the Democratic Party.

In other parts of this country, the mentality is that you evaluate each candidate and yet quiz him or her on the goals that you think the constituency in that community wants or needs and if they measure up, you give your stamp of approval. Party labels are only incidental.

I heard this philosophy confirmed several months ago at the National Urban League Convention in Washington, when six top black women politicians participated in a panel titled Women In Politics.

Cong. Shirley Chisholm was among those present. I was surprised when she came here to campaign for Mrs. Coiner since she contradicted the things that were agreed to on that panel discussion. Particularly when I learned that as a councilman Mrs. Coiner voted against fair housing legislation. Her defense was that she didn't think the time was right.

This has been the story of black people in this country; we have been standing in the wings, waiting until someone says the time is right.

The black voters I admire are those who were perspective enough to vote for Mayor Perk again. Not because they wanted to be on the winning side, but because they obviously made a candid appraisal of the mayor's past performance. I am not shilling for Mayor Perk, nor do I believe that he has done a spectacular job, but he has put the city on a basis of fiscal responsibility.

His minority employment record is good, although not necessarily spectacular. It's the rare public official whose minority employment record cannot stand improvement.

I was particularly pleased when Mayor Perk said he was going to be the mayor of all the people. It sounded good. But I'm from Missouri, he'll have to show me.

I don't feel that any member of a minority group can be wedded to either the Democratic or Republican Party, nor even a third party if you choose, since periodically there is talk about such. The key is the candidate and where his head is on certain vital issues.

This is what the 21st District Congressional Caucus is all about. Selective voting. And, as you know, its membership is not restricted to minorities. I have no illusions about the organization, it is far from perfect, but it is on the right track. The message is simple: Exercise your vote, don't sell it, don't let anyone commit it for you and above all know your candidates.

SURVEY RESULTS RELEASED

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, in August, I mailed a questionnaire to every resident of the Third Congressional District of Kansas asking for their views on a variety of topics.

Today, I would like to share with my colleagues in Congress the results of this questionnaire. I feel they show the residents of the Third District to be vitally concerned with day-to-day issues which they must deal with directly as taxpayers and citizens.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD the findings of this survey:

SUMMER QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

	Voter responses (percent)			
	Male		Female	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you feel that Federal or public employees should have the right to strike?	32	63	34	62
2. Do you favor combining single-purpose Federal programs into block grants for the States and localities to use according to their needs, within prescribed guidelines?	65	28	65	22
3. According to the recently signed peace agreement, the United States agreed to contribute to the post-war reconstruction of Indo-China, including North Vietnam. Do you agree with this provision?	24	74	21	74
4. Do you support the Administration's efforts to lower Federal spending through freezing (impounding) funds appropriated by Congress?	52	44	41	50
5. Do you feel that recently announced phase IV economic controls should be imposed:				
a. On a temporary basis?	52	34	51	28
b. For an extended period of time?	18	50	14	54
c. On a permanent basis?	5	66	4	63
6. Do you agree with the recent Supreme Court decision which bars Federal aid to private and parochial schools?	63	35	61	36
7. Should a news reporter have the right to refuse to reveal the name of the source of a news story:				
a. If national security is involved	42	54	50	43
b. If criminal activity is involved	44	45	44	45
c. If no injury to others is apparent	74	24	73	24
8. In the case of young men who have left this country to evade military service, would you favor:				
a. Unconditional amnesty and pardon	13	67	14	66
b. Prosecution of those who return	56	32	45	37
c. Amnesty or pardon, if they agree to an alternative type of public service	46	42	53	34
9. Rising gasoline and fuel prices, and the apparent shortage of fuel supplies is of concern to everyone. Would you support legislation to:				
a. Relax auto pollution requirements	47	44	30	53
b. Move ahead with the construction of the Alaskan pipeline	78	15	79	19
c. Urge the reduction of speed limits on Federally-financed highways	57	34	68	24
d. Establish mandatory fuel distribution programs	40	46	39	41
The House Ways and Means Committee is considering tax reform legislation calling for the following things. Would you favor:				
a. Reduction of the oil depletion allowance	41	41	36	38
b. Reduction of the Federal tax exemption on municipal bonds	41	43	38	35
c. Reduction of the capital gains tax	39	51	41	44
d. Institution of a property tax credit for the elderly	80	11	80	9
11. Do you agree with the recent Supreme Court decision regarding the liberalization of abortion laws	62	33	63	37

OBJECTIONS TO SONNENFELDT CONFIRMATION MUST BE ANSWERED—PART XIII

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated in the past I am especially interested in the nomination now before the Senate of Helmut Sonnenfeldt as Under Secretary of Treasury because of its relationship to the extensive hearings which the House Internal Security Committee has been conducting since 1971 concerning the Federal civilian employee loyalty-security program. A good illustration is the handling of Presidential appointments such as Mr. Sonnenfeldt's by various departments as required by the Federal program.

In testimony before our committee State Department representatives indicated that such appointments are investigated by the FBI and the initial evaluation of the investigative material is evaluated by State's Division of Evaluations of the Office of Security. In his letter to me of August 7, 1973, Secretary of Treasury Shultz stated that "pursuant to normal procedures" in all cases involving President appointments requiring Senate confirmation security and conflict of interest reviews are initiated and conducted by the White House. In the case of the State Department, according to the testimony, the initial evaluation is made at State whereas Treasury was not involved at all in the case of Mr. Sonnenfeldt who was nominated to hold a high Treasury position.

Also, as I have indicated before, neither Treasury or the Civil Service Commission, in listing the investigations of Mr. Sonnenfeldt, made mention of an investigation in the 1960–61 period in which Mr. Sonnenfeldt was questioned by State security investigators, submitted to a lie detector test and had his phone tapped. In addition, the list of investigations by the two departments differed in part as to the dates of the investigations, each citing an investigation omitted by the other.

In obtaining necessary information the Congress must rely heavily on the accuracy of data supplied by the executive branch departments and agencies. If congressional committees do not have independent sources of information to check with, they are largely at the mercy of the executive branch data. The Sonnenfeldt case has become a matter of controversy precisely because independent sources were available to question the executive's presentation of the case. One such source is Mr. John Hemenway, a former Foreign Service officer who worked with Mr. Sonnenfeldt at the State Department. His testimony on May 15 of this year before the Senate Finance Committee was the initial statement in opposition to the Sonnenfeldt nomination.

Additional hearings on October 1 and 2 brought forth other witnesses, unassociated with the executive branch, who questioned the nomination. Had these sources been unavailable or unwilling to testify, many questions involving the Federal civilian employees loyalty-security program would not have been raised. As knowledgeable sources are not always available to question executive branch presentations, one can appreciate the importance of having an efficient and reliable Federal security program.

I insert at this point the letter of Mr. Hemenway to Senator MANSFIELD of November 12, 1973, a copy of which I have received, indicating the complexity of this case to date:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *November 12, 1973.*

MAJORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Today's *Newsweek* discloses a massive cover-up in the *Sonnenfeldt* Case. (See: "Wheeling and Dealing, Senate Style" in "Periscope", page 23, *Newsweek*, November 12, 1973, enclosed.)

This matter is called to your attention because the report published in *Newsweek* calls into question the integrity of the entire Senate and its leadership, if true. I am not able to evaluate the report myself, but I am not aware that anyone in a responsible position has repudiated it as inaccurate. It seems to me that the question of honest parliamentary proceedings is raised by the article.

You will recall that, on November 1, I wrote to you concerning the Sonnenfeldt Case. I alerted you to the fact that numerous key witnesses in the matter have not been called and that there is a great deal of evidence that perjury has been committed, all available in the Hearing Transcript, now published. (*Congressional Record* of November 1, 1973, page 35705.)

On November 7, 1973, I also wrote to Senator Long detailing a long list of important witnesses whose evidence was not in the Hearing Record, simply because those witnesses have never been called to be heard. (*Congressional Record* of November 8, 1973, page 36461.)

Subsequently, I learned that Secretary of the Treasury Shultz, to his great credit, put a "hold" on the Sonnenfeldt nomination until he can get the facts concerning the "wheeling and dealing" that went on behind his back without his permission or knowledge in order to secure Senate confirmation for Helmut Sonnenfeldt as Under Secretary.

The chronology in this matter is as follows:

May 15, 1973—John Hemenway testifies that Helmut Sonnenfeldt is unfit to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Oct. 1, 1973—Stephen Koczak testifies *under oath* on details of Sonnenfeldt's leaking highly classified information to agents of a foreign power.

Oct. 2, 1973—Otto Otepka testifies *under oath* on further details of Sonnenfeldt's propensity to "leak" classified information and other violations of the law.

May 15, Oct. 1, 2—Mr. Sonnenfeldt denied the above accusations *under oath;* the Committee reported the matter out of Committee "unanimously" with the following senators absent: Sen. Talmadge, Sen. Byrd (Va.), and Sen. Mondale.

November 1, 1973—John Hemenway writes to the Attorney General, U.S. Attorney for the D.C. and to Sen. Mansfield (See: Con. Record Nov. 1, '73, p. 35705) noting that the published hearing transcript establishes commission of perjury and other high crimes during the Sonnenfeldt Hearing.

November 7, 1973—John Hemenway writes to Sen. Long to report numerous matters left unresolved by the Hearing Transcript, including more than 15 witnesses not called who would corroborate the Hemenway/Otepka/Koczak testimony in matters capable of proof where issues are simple.

November 12, 1973—*Newsweek* publishes "Wheeling and Dealing, Senate Style" (p. 23, "Periscope" in the *Newsweek* of November 12, 1973.) The report suggests a Watergate-type deal made between Sonnenfeldt supporters and senators in a position to influence the Senate leadership's handling of the Sonnenfeldt confirmation. Reportedly, a voice-vote would remain unrecorded, attenuating blame against individual senators. Sonnenfeldt would then resign and go to work for Dr. Kissinger at State requiring confirmation, if any, by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Subsequent to Nov. 12 issue of *Newsweek*—Secretary of the Treasury Schultz orders a "hold" on the Sonnenfeldt nomination until matters reported in *Newsweek*—unknown to him personally—are cleared up and made a matter of public record.

Senator Mansfield, the purpose of this letter is to alert you, the leader of the United State Senate, to the scandalous series of events noted above. No one in the U.S. Senate should treasure and guard the respected reputation of that great body more than you; in fact, it is your responsibility to be jealous and vigilant of the Senate's reputation. The American people can expect you to do your duty in this matter, of that I am confident. To do less, in the shadow of Watergate would seem hypocritical.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. HEMENWAY,

WHEELING AND DEALING, SENATE STYLE

The long-delayed confirmation of Helmut Sonnenfeldt as Treasury Under Secretary was the result of delicate dickering—and a deal—between Sen. Russell Long and the White House. Charges that he had leaked classified information had held up the appointment of Sonnenfeldt, a longtime colleague of Henry Kissinger, in Long's Senate Finance Committee for five and a half months. The deal that broke the jam called for approval by voice vote (which is noet recorded), plus an "understanding" that Sonnenfeldt will resign shortly and move to Kissinger's State Department. "And if the new job requires confirmation," Long says, "let the Foreign Relations Committee worry about it."

ESEA, TITLE I

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the announced effort on the part of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) to recommit the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill when it is brought to the House floor tomorrow, I thought my colleagues might be interested in taking a look at a recent letter from the Commissioner of Education, John Ottina, spelling out the problems facing us under the terms of the current formula for ESEA Title I. Keep in mind that the language in the continuing resolution, to which Dr. Ottina refers, is identical to the language in the conference report which will come before us tomorrow.

I urge the Members to take a few minutes and read this letter, because it is important background for the debate that will occur tomorrow:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1973.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: The Under Secretary informed me of his telephone conversation with you on the Title I, ESEA, situation in 1974.

As you are aware, the problems which have currently surfaced due to language in the continuing resolution are a result of a more fundamental problem with the Title I formula. The formula we are using for distribution of funds includes the use of a $2000 low-income level which was an equitable definition of poverty in 1960 but is inadequate for the distribution of funds using 1970 Census data. We had hoped to have a new formula in place for the Fiscal Year 1974 distribution using the new data, but this was not accomplished. The problem we face now is working with a makeshift arrangement to achieve the most equitable possible distribution of funds until Title I, ESEA.

School districts have been operating on an annual allocation made during the first quarter of Fiscal Year 1974 based upon the first continuing resolution, P.L. 93–52. These allocations did contain the provision to guarantee each State 100 percent of what it received in Fiscal Year 1972. The effect of the 100 percent State hold harmless was to partially mitigate changes among States which resulted from the use of the 1970 Census data for the first time in the 1974 Title I, ESEA, formula. Without the 100 percent State hold harmless at the Fiscal Year 1972 level, allocations to the large suburban/urban States would have increased substantially above the 1973 level and the rural States would have experienced severe reductions below the 1973 operating level. *Within* States, the overall effect of the new allocation generally was to shift Title I money from rural areas to suburban/urban areas. Some areas deserved these increases or decreases; others apparently did not. However, lacking a better definition of poverty, the actual equity of changes is difficult to assess.

The present continuing resolution, P.L. 93–124, will minimize the dramatic differences between 1973 and 1974 and restore allocations in the rural school districts to at least 90 percent of their 1973 allocation and restrict the maximum amount a large, suburban/urban school district could receive to 115 percent of its 1973 allocation. The language of the continuing resolution also guarantees that each State in aggregate will receive no less than 90 percent of the amount that State received in 1972.

With second-quarter allocations now long overdue, the Office of Education will have to make allocations no later than November 9 in accordance with the provisions of P.L. 93–124 unless a final appropriation bill is enacted into law or alterations are made in the continuing resolution.

One major difficulty with the provisions of P.L. 93–124 is that the allocation to the State of New Mexico cannot be made in accordance with the provisions of the law. If New Mexico is given its entitlement of $8,666,553 which is 90 percent of the Fiscal Year 1972 State amount. Its LEA's will be above the 115 percent Fiscal Year 1973 LEA ceiling. If the LEA's are held at the 115 percent LEA ceiling, New Mexico only receives 88 percent of the $8,666,553.

In addition, I want to call to your attention problems which will arise as a result of satisfying the language of the law. The impact of the change between 1973, the first quarter of 1974 and what will result under the continuing resolution is shown for a sample of States and selected counties within each State in Enclosure A. One table illustrates these differences at the Fiscal Year 1974 appropriation level of $1,810,000,000; the other is shown at the Fiscal Year 1974 operating level of $1,629,000,000. These tables provide a comparison between the 1973 operating level, the allocations under the first and second continuing resolutions, and the effects of lifting the 115 percent ceiling.

From our analysis, we believe that the large southern cities which have had population gains are penalized by the 115 percent ceiling and thus the allocations do not recognize the 1970 Census data. In contrast, rural counties which lost population and money have their losses minimized when brought up to 90 percent. In the northern cities, the results are not the same, although the outcome for the northern areas is similar for both the $1,810,000,000 and $1,629,000,000 levels.

An analysis of several different options was undertaken to determine whether a more equitable distribution could be achieved. The following variations were analyzed:

1. the present continuing resolution—

LEA's at 90 percent of 1973 and no more than 115 percent of 1973, and the State at 90 percent of 1972;

2. the effects with no LEA ceiling—

all LEA's at 90 percent of 1973 and the States at 90 percent of 1972;

3. all States at 90 percent of 1972; and

4. all local education agencies at 90 percent of 1973.

The results indicate that there are no completely satisfactory solutions, although certain ones do minimize some of the disruptions which will result between the first- and second-quarter allocations but also let the Census data take effect in counties where substantial gains have occurred. The results are shown by State in the enclosed table (Enclosure B) which compares Fiscal Year 1972, and 1973 operating levels, and the annual rate upon which first-quarter allocations were calculated for Fiscal Year 1974 under P.L. 93–52 by the four variations above.

From my analysis, it would appear that the disruption between the first and second-quarter could be reduced if the 115 percent ceiling were removed. The major effect of eliminating the ceiling is that the remainder of the funds which were previously concentrated in and perhaps artificially inflated the counties between 90 and 115 percent of 1973 now is more evenly distributed to all counties over 90 percent by the rate of their entitlement.

Although not totally true in every case, the counties which reflect the greatest gains appear to be those which have the largest numbers of children in families with incomes under $2000 and children in families with incomes above $2,000 receiving AFDC assistance. Most southern cities seem to be the gainers here as is partially illustrated in Column 4 of Enclosure A. The counties held harmless at 90 percent of the Fiscal Year 1973 allotment remain the same and the counties between 90 percent and 115 percent of the Fiscal Year 1973 allotment will lose some money as a result of the ceiling being lifted. For example, Somerset County in Pennsylvania (Enclosure A, Exhibit 1, $1,310,000,000) dropped by approximately 50 percent between 1973 and the first quarter of 1974. The continuing resolution then brings the rate to $731,490 from $322,451. The $731,490 represents 115 percent of 1973 because the concentration of funds in those counties between 90 percent and 115 percent ha. tended artificially to elevate the amount this county will receive. Without the ceiling, this county stays at 90 percent of 1973, which

is $572,000. Somerset is one type of county which appears to sacrifice some gain when there is no ceiling in order that those counties which would be above the ceiling are partially funded. Also, cities in the large, urbanized and northern States do appear in most cases to gain slightly without the ceiling under the $1,810,000,000 level. With the $1,629,000,000 amount, this trend is less evident since fewer funds are available for redistribution after the 90 percent county and State floors are satisfied.

Consideration should be given to the possible effects of lifting the 115 percent LEA ceiling with regard to any new Title I formula which is enacted into law for Fiscal Year 1975. A revised formula may result in different State and county allocations, however, without the new formula we cannot be certain of the effects.

In summary, I believe that the least disruptive formula is the option that States receive 90 percent of 1972 and counties are guaranteed 90 percent of 1973 with no 115 percent county ceiling. While we have not proposed dropping the floor, we believe that equity would support a 75 or 80 percent floor instead of the current 90 percent. Since a floor would not represent a severe hardship in most cases since the districts benefitting from the floor have already faced more severe potential cuts. Census shifts would certainly justify at least a 20 percent change under "hold harmless" circumstances. A lower floor would provide greater equity for those districts between 90 and 115 percent which now bear the brunt of the adjustment penalties when the 115 percent ceiling is dropped.

My staff and I stand ready to assist you in any way possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN OTTINA,
U.S. Commissioner of Education.

THE AGNEW CASE: PRISONS ARE NOT FOR VICE PRESIDENTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are truly concerned about law and order with justice in this society as opposed to those who merely used the term "law and order" as rhetoric to mask political, moral and criminal atrocities perpetrated against the American people, continue to be appalled by the cynical deal by which former Vice President Agnew was allowed to trade his office for an escape from justice.

Prof. Leroy Clark of New York University School of Law, writing in a recent edition of the New York Amsterdam News, points out that the Agnew deal was based on a double standard of justice that should not be permitted in our society. I commend Professor Clark's article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) News, Nov. 3, 1974]

PRISONERS ARE NOT FOR VICE PRESIDENTS

(By Leroy Clark)

The mild treatment of instant ex-convict Spiro Agnew is an insult to the American people and a mockery of criminal justice.

Facing charges of income tax evasion, bribery, and extortion, in which he stole over $100,000, the ex-Vice-President bargained himself into a minor plea of "nolo contendere" to tax evasion, with a $10,000 fine and three years of unsupervised probation.

While many in the white press feel obliged to "go easy" on Agnew for fear that right-wingers will claim vindictiveness because of Agnew's prior attacks on the press, the Black community should not hesitate to denounce the man and feel deeply affronted by the powder-puff penalty he received—which no Black person, politican or otherwise, would have gotten under similar charges.

AGNEW IS A HUSTLER

The cold, hard story of Agnew is that he was a calculating, hypocritical hustler of public anxiety—and it is the Black press that should tell this story since 85 per cent of Black voters were wise enough to reject the Nixon-Agnew gang last year.

The rest of those who elected Nixon-Agnew by a landslide must feel particularly stunned and impotent since they cannot vent their disappointment on either official.

Nixon has been arrogant enough to fire his special prosecutor, despite the fact that the Congress clearly wanted the prosecutor to be independent, and it is unlikely that Congress will impeach him. Now, Agnew, facing a possible 20 years in prison, in a case against him which prosecutors have claimed was "air-tight," receives the functional equivalent of exoneration.

Mr. Agnew used a successful tactic of threatening Nixon and the Republican Party with a long legal battle which would have jeopardized their chances in upcoming elections.

DEVICE TO CONFUSE

Mr. Agnew was not required to plead guilty, but was permitted to plead "nolo contendere." The "nolo contendere" is technically the equivalent of a guilty plea, but this form of plea was accepted as a device for confusing a lay public about the extent of his guilt.

The major reason that defendants plead "nolo contendere" is that it cannot be used against them in any subsequent civil proceedings, but this was not a concern of Mr. Agnew. Mr. Agnew's recent sanctimonious speech to the Nation was an attempt to capitalize on the nolo plea in the interest of "the Nation," "his family," and anyone else you can name, except himself.

PLEA-BARGAINING AT WORK

Furthermore, permitting Agnew these assertions can only deprive Agnew's plea process of its prime value: namely to warn other politicians with similar extortion intentions and to educate the public to be skeptical of crooks in law-and-order clothing. The judge would be well advised now to vacate the plea and to require a trial or a plea which cannot be instantly repudiated.

Note that Mr. Agnew is permitted to plead to the tax evasion charge which the public will obviously see as less serious than bribery and corruption. The tax evasion charge is also weaker evidence should a bar association ever get around to disbarring Agnew from law practice, since it, unlike the other charges, is not a crime involving "moral turpitude."

Despite the fact that Mr. Agnew could now be tried in Maryland for state criminal charges, their State Attorney General says that he does not plan to prosecute. The Justice Department has created an impression that it is part of an arrangement to bar the state charges because it will not give the state the evidence it has, and Eliot Richardson, before resigning, openly advised the state prosecutors not to prosecute.

QUESTIONABLE MOVES

Both moves are highly questionable. Federal law enforcement officials have always actively cooperated with state officials, especially where some major public interest is at stake. (Obviously, the public interest is only threatened by the Black Panthers, the Weathermen, etc., and not by thieving politicians.)

Secondly, it may not only be unprecedented, but improper, for a federal official to tell a state official how and whether to enforce his state laws. Thirdly, Richardson's announcement might hamper the state should it prosecute Agnew because jurors, having been told by a high federal official that a prosecution is needless, would see it only as vindictive.

Richardson's explanation of the unprecedented leniency accorded Mr. Agnew is patently transparent. He claimed that the loss both of the Vice-Presidency and a future political career was punishment enough.

In the first place, the Vice-President does not have important executive powers, a fact which Mr Richardson's office itself argued in its brief asserting that the Vice-President, unlike the President, could be indicted by a grand jury.

Also, unlike a cloud over the President, the Nation and its institutions are not likely to be seriously disrupted because the person occupying this largely ceremonial office is under charges.

Secondly, Mr. Agnew's potential for the Presidential nomination in 1976, if not eclipsed by his association with the group that brought us the Watergate "horrors," was certainly ended by leaks, perhaps from Richardson's own department, that they had solid evidence against Agnew. So what, in terms of political future, did Mr. Agnew give up?

This is not a blood-thirsty call for revenge or imprisonment. However, it is offensive for a man to callously abuse the public trust and, solely on the basis of high position and "pull" to receive a light penalty.

This is especially true when we know that one-third of our federal prison population is Black and many are there for offenses that are far less serious. In addition to all the usual inhumanity persons experience in prison, they can only be more bitter when they learn of this perversion of justice.

ESPECIALLY GALLING

Mr. Agnew's case is especially galling since he tried to manipulate the anti-Black racial signal of "law and order" to build a safe, silent (white) majority for the Republican Party. He harangued us during the last five years with speeches about criminals, radicals, students, and other "rotten apples" as a device for projecting himself as a righteous, virtuous figure.

And when caught knee-deep in bribery, corruptions and income tax evasion, his only explanation is that his was an American, and not an un-American crime. (As he said, it was a "long-established pattern" for Maryland State officials to take money under the table from contractors.)

Mr. Agnew's case must stand as one of the most outrageous deals ever to be made, and the lesson that an all-too cynical public may learn is that if you want to steal $100,000, spend no time in jail, and come out $90,000 ahead because you are fined only $10,000, then you better get elected Vice-President of the United States.

THE PHONY CURE OF CONTROLS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I voted against the legislation which gives standby economic controls and have consistently voted against that authorization, I direct to the attention of the Members a column in the Washington Star-News of Saturday, November 10. The article by Jenkin L. Jones which very ef-

fectively describes the pitfalls involved in the controls placed on rising prices.

The article follows:

THE PHONY CURE OF CONTROLS

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

In the evil old days when patent medicine manufacturers could get away with anything, it was customary to lace "consumption cures" with large dollops of opium. The results were marvelous.

The coughing stopped, for the cough mechanism was effectively anesthetized. The astonished and delighted patient fired off a glowing testimonial. Sometimes he had time to write two before lung congestion took him to the undertaker. By interrupting nature's effort to remove infection, the medicine provided a brief appearance of health, and then zap!

Price controls are like the old consumption cures. They "cure" inflation. Prices suddenly cease going up. The consumer is delighted. But generally the producer, caught in a cost squeeze, stops producing. The controlled commodity vanishes from the shelves. So the buyer does without or hunts up a black market.

A classic example is what happened to housing in Germany and France following World War II. The French sought to ease rising rents by slapping on stiff ceilings. It became uneconomical to build housing. Rents were cheap enough, but you had to practically inherit an apartment. Today, 28 years after the war's end, the urban Frenchman is still scrambling for a place to live.

Most German cities were largely destroyed. People were living in cellars, boxes, tents. But the Germans didn't put on controls. Rents rose astronomically. It was so profitable to produce rental space that the building business roared. Everyone rushed to bulldoze up the rubble and clean the bricks for re-use. The cement mixers churned.

In consequence, within five years the housing crunch vanished. People could become choosy and rents slipped back.

Cheaper beef is no good if there's no beef. We found that out last August. Still, there remains the wistful hope that if some bureaucrat writes a magic number on a price tag, without regard to demand, supply and production incentives, the consumer will be served.

Efforts to fix prices for everything go back 41 centuries to the kings of ancient Sumer. They probably caused the invention of counters so that business could be carried on under them.

It is a sad fact of life that free prices remain steady only as long as supply and demand are in perfect equilibrium. When inventories are drawn down, prices edge up, and when things gather dust in the stockroom, cut-rate sales are offered.

These fluctuations distress everyone, but they are nature's corrective. For, in general, higher prices encourage more production, which meets demand, which softens the market, which causes prices to fall, which increases demand, which strengthens prices.

But what we are beginning to run into in this country is the phenomenon of shortages we never felt before. In a time of higher-than-ever personal incomes, spaghetti-eaters upgrade to ground round and ground round eaters go for sirloin.

If there were limitless pasturage and limitless grain for feed yards, supply would eventually catch up to demand. But the number of head of cattle you can carry on any given acreage is not easily expanded, and the whole world is bidding for our grain supplies. So meat goes up. To artificially hold down the price and thus discourage breeding is nut-house economics.

The cheap energy days are drawing to a close in America. For years it was the Federal Power Commission's policy to hold down the price of natural gas. So most of America threw away its coal shovels and oil burners and hurried to tap into this lovely clean source of instant heat.

As the odds against hitting a good gas well went up and the cost of drilling went up and the price stayed the same, the chances for profitably exploring for gas went down. So wildcatting languished as the market soared. And now we have a gas crunch.

How much better off we would be if we had let the mechanism adjust itself—higher prices, slower conversion from more plentiful fuels, less incentive to waste this most versatile hydrocarbon in inefficient fireboxes, more incentive to find new reserves and a more gradual and orderly adjustment toward the inevitable day when natural gas is gone.

Monkeying with prices seems irresistible to Washington. But a rigged priced is not the same as a true value. And value eventually triumphs. The kid who traded a $1,000 dog for two $500 cats stayed happy only until he tried to sell the cats.

SENATE—*Tuesday, November 13, 1973*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the light of the hearts that see Thee, the life of the souls that love Thee, the strength of the minds that serve Thee, from whom to turn is to fall, to whom to turn is to rise, and, in whom to abide is to stand fast forever, grant that as we turn to Thee we may have light for our hearts, life for our souls, strength for our minds. As we pray for ourselves so we pray for our Nation that it may be born again of the spirit, redeemed by Thy grace, stand secure upon Thy word, and henceforth be obedient to Thy law that it may fulfill Thy purposes in this time of trouble.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. 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., November 13, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ABOUREZK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Heiting, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ABOUREZK) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1081) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way across Federal lands where the use of such rights-of-way is in the public interest and the applicant for the right-of-way demonstrates the financial and technical capability to use the right-of-way in a manner which will protect the environment.

The message also announced that a bill (H.R. 9142) to restore, support, and maintain modern, efficient rail service in the northeast region of the United States; to designate a system of essential rail lines in the northern region; to provide financial assistance to certain rail carriers; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4771) to authorize the District of Columbia Council to regulate and stabilize rents in the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ABOUREZK) subsequently signed the enrolled bill.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9142) to restore, support, and maintain modern, efficient rail service in the northeast region of the United States; to designate a system of essential rail lines in the northern region; to provide financial assistance to certain rail carriers; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of