

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 19, 1973

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

Come ye, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord that He may teach us His ways and that we may walk in His paths.—Isaiah 2: 3.

Almighty and everlasting God, who art the Lord of love and the light of life, we bow our heads and open our hearts unto Thee at the beginning of another week together. As we live through these days of Lent may we be conscious of Thy presence and be every ready to do Thy will and to obey Thy commandments. Help us by prayer and self-denial to receive strength for daily tasks and be given wisdom to walk worthily in Thy winsome ways.

In the anguish of anxiety, in hours of haste, in times of temptation, in ways of weakness, and in solitude of spirit stir us to lift our eyes unto Thee and to keep our minds stayed on Thee that peace and patience may come anew into our hearts. So may we sincerely love our country and surely serve our people; through Jesus Christ our Lord. 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. Ar- rington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Naoyo Campbell;
- S. 89. An act for the relief of Kuay Ten Chang (Kuay Hong Chang);
- S. 278. An act for the relief of Manuela C. Bonito;
- S. 280. An act for the relief of Leonor Lopez;
- S. 464. An act for the relief of Guido Bel- lanca;
- S. 502. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;
- S. 537. An act for the relief of Mary Danos Nayak;
- S. 666. An act for the relief of Slobodan Babic;
- S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1973; and
- S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution au- thorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the sudden infant death syndrome.

RESIGNATION FROM U.S. DELEGA-
TION OF CANADA-UNITED STATES
INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the U.S.

Delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 19, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with the deepest regret that I write to advise you that I find it necessary to resign from this year's Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Conference. This action is necessary because of several complications arising from my recent surgery. My complete recovery does not appear to be progressing as rapidly as I had originally hoped, and it will be several weeks yet before I will be able to resume a full-time schedule of activities.

Consequently, I felt it best at this time to advise you of these circumstances in order that you may appoint another House Member to replace me in the United States delegation.

I am indeed very sorry that I will not be able to participate in these important meetings in April. Thank you very much for your understanding of my situation.

With warmest regards,
Sincerely,

JAMES HARVEY.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE
U.S. DELEGATION OF THE CAN-
ADA-UNITED STATES INTERPAR-
LIAMENTARY GROUP

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section I, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. Delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. MALLARY, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

JUDGE AND MRS. EUGENE BLACK
CELEBRATE 70TH WEDDING ANNIV-
ERSARY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, a great gentleman, able jurist, and my distinguished predecessor in the Congress, Judge Eugene Black and his lovely wife celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary. This is indeed a wonderful and rare milestone, and while no Member of this Congress served during his tenure—March 4, 1915, to March 3, 1929—many know of his long years of outstanding service on the U.S. Tax Court.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Patman and I would like to add our personal congratulations to Judge and Mrs. Black. There are very few people who attain the great distinction of celebrating their 70th anniversary, which is really a diamond-studded occasion.

For the interest of these Members and their many friends, I include the following press release on this momentous occasion, issued by the U.S. Tax Court, March 15, 1973:

Judge and Mrs. Eugene Black will celebrate their seventieth Wedding Anniversary March 15 at their home in Washington, D.C.

with a family dinner party for their children, grandchildren and great grandchildren. They were married March 15, 1903, in Blossom, Texas; Mrs. Black was formerly Miss Mamie Coleman. They moved to Clarksville, Texas shortly after their marriage and lived there until they moved to Washington.

Judge Black was born on July 2, 1879 in Blossom, Texas. In 1905, he obtained his LL.B. from Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tennessee and was admitted to the Texas Bar later that year. He practiced law at Clarksville, Texas from 1905 to 1915. He was elected a Representative to Congress from the First Congressional District of Texas in 1914 and served in that capacity from March 4, 1915 to March 3, 1929. On November 5, 1929 he was appointed to the U.S. Board of Tax Appeals (now the U.S. Tax Court) by former President Herbert Hoover. He was re-appointed for two succeeding terms and had served as Chairman (now Chief Judge) from 1933 to 1937. Judge Black received an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Cumberland University in 1937. He retired from the Tax Court on November 30, 1953 but served under recall until March 31, 1966.

Judge Black (Retired) had served the United States Tax Court continuously for over 37 years. As a token of respect and admiration, the Judges of the Tax Court have presented to Judge Black a picture of an oil-portrait of the Judge which hangs in the Judges' Conference Room at the Court. The portrait was made when Judge Black was still active as a Judge of the Court.

OUTRAGEOUS

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that this Congress has failed to reduce the emissions requirements of the 1970 Clean Air Act to a level compatible with public health, industrial capability, and sensible energy conservation at this time of energy crisis.

The American motorist is being forced to suffer from this congressional persistence in an unreasonably high emissions requirement. He will have to pay several hundred dollars more for his new 1975 car for gadgetry that will make his engine get a whopping third less mileage. For what? For going the last 6 percent in emissions requirements that nobody honestly needs to stay healthy.

In the process U.S. cars in just 2 years will burn up 3 million barrels more of oil every single day because of these standards, adding enormously to our oil and balance-of-payments deficit. This is the equivalent of the entire Alaskan pipeline flow when constructed.

Such requirements are sheer stupidity in a nation that has many areas having no clean air problem whatsoever with or without any emissions requirements much less 90-percent pollution free. It is a criminal waste of energy and a horrendous burden on both industry and consumer alike.

My bill, H.R. 4313, will reduce emissions requirements from 96 to 90 percent. This is all we need, all the Nation honestly requires and all the motoring

public should be forced to endure. It should be enacted without further delay.

IN THE MATTER OF COMMON CAUSE, ET AL., AGAINST W. PATRICK JENNINGS, CLERK, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ET AL.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 313) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 313

Whereas in the case of Common Cause, et al. against W. Patrick Jennings, Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, et al. (civil action numbered 2379-72) pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a notice of taking of deposition was issued by the said Court and served upon W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear at the office of counsel for plaintiffs at 10:00 antemeridian on the 15th day of March, 1973, as if under cross-examination for the purposes of discovery, and to bring with him certain documents in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary course of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when the said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the notice of taking of deposition, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, be authorized to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House, to take the deposition of W. Pat Jennings, Clerk of the House, as specified in the notice aforementioned, and to take copies of those requested papers and documents which are in possession or control of the said Clerk; and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents or papers in his possession or control that the court has found to be material and relevant and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under the said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the notice of taking of deposition a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communica-

cated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 15, 1973, the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 334. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second full calendar week in March 1973 as "National Employ the Older Worker Week."

H.R. 3694. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, as amended; and

REPORT ON NATIONAL PROGRESS AND SPACE ACTIVITIES DURING 1972—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93-63)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit a report of our national progress in aeronautics and space activities during 1972.

The Apollo program was successfully concluded with the flights of Apollo 16 and 17. These missions were designed to obtain maximum scientific return and provided almost half the lunar exploration time in the Apollo program. Though it is far too early to attempt a definitive assessment of the value of this program, it is clear that one result will be a quantum jump in both our scientific knowledge and our technological expertise.

Our unmanned satellites include a variety of vehicles ranging from meteorological, navigational, and communication satellites to a new experimental spacecraft providing information on our resources and environment. Increasing practical applications for satellite technology confirm the immediate value of our efforts in space, while observatory satellites and others carrying specialized scientific instruments provide accurate and dependable data never before available to scientists on earth.

The conclusion of the Apollo program marks only another step in this Nation's push into space. In the current year we expect to launch Skylab, which will permit extended experimentation in a manned vehicle. After Skylab, a joint mission by this Nation and the Soviet Union will rendezvous and dock two spacecraft, helping to link our two space efforts in a mutually productive manner. The space shuttle presently under development will make the launching of satellites and laboratories less expensive and more productive. The shuttle will be augmented by the sortie laboratory which the Western European countries intend to develop as part of our joint cooperation in space.

The past year has also seen advances in aeronautical research and development. It should be emphasized that work in this field is particularly vital if America is to maintain its leadership in

the development and production of civil and military aircraft and engines.

Our efforts in aeronautics and space will continue through programs balanced at levels which will allow us to meet demands in these and other important domestic and foreign areas.

RICHARD NIXON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 1973.

THE WOOD FIBER CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, we have a genuine crisis in the United States today because of the rapid escalation of the prices during the past months of lumber, plywood, and wood products. Accompanying this rise has been the increase in the price of timber and logs.

As a Congressman from the State of Oregon, the No. 1 producer of commercial wood fiber in the United States, I have been acutely aware of the crisis as it has been developing.

We have many visiting homebuilders in Washington this week, and I am certain that all of my colleagues will be even more aware of the rise in prices in the area of wood products before this week has passed. Therefore, it is important at the outset to examine what has happened, what the present situation is, and what the options are by way of solutions.

During the next 2 weeks I intend to discuss in considerably more detail different aspects of the problem. My purpose today is to draw an outline, perhaps more in generalities, to engage in discourse with interested colleagues on this matter, and to attempt to focus attention on some obvious courses of action which are presently available to us.

During calendar 1972, the home building industry responded to Federal Government goals by commencing 2.4 million new housing starts, the highest number in the history of our country. You may recall that in 1968 the Congress established a target of 2.6 million new starts per year for a 10-year period. We never have achieved this goal, but came the closest in 1972. Other construction boomed in 1972, and as a result, the demand for the domestic use of wood fiber in the United States was at an alltime high.

Meanwhile, in Japan, Prime Minister Tanaka, as a very important part of his program for domestic progress in Japan, established a national policy requiring the construction of 2.4 million housing units. Since Japan's population is about half that of our country, this would be the equivalent in the United States of nearly 5 million units. Japan began serious preparations for this construction boom and increased its purchase of wood fiber in many parts of the world.

In 1972 the United States exported 2.78 billion board feet of round logs; 91 percent of these exports went to Japan. Bidding for logs in the United States, particularly along the west coast reached astronomical proportions. Last year, roughly one-half of Japan's imported

wood fiber came from the South Seas area. The balance came principally from the United States, Canada, and the Soviet Union. Canada prohibits the export of logs, except under very strict conditions. Japan buys about 75 percent as many logs from Siberian woods as it does from the west coast of the United States.

Because of this developing crisis, I flew to Japan in the middle of last month, and spent 3 days in Tokyo, talking with Japanese Government officials and with private trading companies interested in and in most cases engaged actively in the importation of logs into Japan. I found no evidence that the Japanese intended to increase its imports of logs from the United States, but it is obvious that they intend to continue on about the same level as 1972.

It appeared clear to me that the Japanese Government would not, and in fairness, could not limit its imports of logs. After all, our government has been pressing the Japanese for months to step up all of its imports from the United States. The Japanese have a voluntary association of log importers. It consists of approximately 40 members, including about 10 very large ones. Because it is a voluntary association, it cannot enforce any agreement to moderate the imports of logs. Therefore, it appears unlikely that we can expect any action in Japan to relieve this problem. If action is taken to force a reduction of log exports from the United States, it will be done in the United States, either by legislation, or by executive action.

My feeling is that we should immediately embargo shipment of logs grown on Federal lands into the export trade. This is a small step but one which can be done without delay. In addition, I would advocate immediate executive investigation, and legislative hearings to attempt to pinpoint so far as possible how near our mills have been running to capacity, and how much more manufacturing of our logs can be done, and to attempt to determine what cause and effect there may be in the rise of lumber and plywood costs as associated with log exports.

It is a fact that the price of lumber and plywood has about doubled in the past year. On the surface, it appears that the big increase in the cost of logs is directly related to this rise, but full hearings should help resolve this question with near certainty.

The mills in the Northwest have a very limited supply of logs remaining for manufacture. They are concerned about having a log supply in the pipeline for the future. Some mills have been tempted to sell their cold decks of logs, rather than to continue manufacture, because of the enormous prices being paid.

The export of logs is not the only problem we have, and may not even be the most important.

Some mills have had to reduce shifts, and to cut back production because they have already felt the log supply squeeze. I am concerned about maintaining, and even increasing the capacity of our saw-mill industry. We cannot afford to lose jobs in this industry. There are 83,000 jobs in the forest products industry in

Oregon alone. These generate double that number of other jobs. The cash the forest industry brings into our State is nearly \$2 billion per year. Forestry, plus the other soil crops of agriculture, is the basic foundation of Oregon's economy. Including families, our forests support 44 percent of Oregon's population.

My immediate concern is maintaining these jobs. But we must look far beyond today's problems and take a long look into the future. We have had ups and downs in the wood fiber industry every few years since I can remember. The industry does not like the feast or famine situation any better than anyone else. And the industry knows better than anyone else that it cannot indulge in the turn of the century practice of cutting and running. Any of us knowing anything about the forests realize that the most important single factor in the management of our forests is the principle of sustained yield. We must not cut more than we grow each year. The industry knows this, and knows that it will be out of business ultimately unless this principle is adhered to strictly.

This is the reason that I have been long advocating a sensible program to increase the reforestation of America and on a crash basis compared to the present snail's pace. We need a quantum jump in reforestation efforts and in intensive management of our Nation's wood supply if we are to meet both today's and tomorrow's needs.

By way of example, the Forest Service has estimated that it will take about 50 years to complete the reforestation job of the 4.8 million acres of commercial timber land in the national forests alone at the present rate. Last year the budget request for reforestation on Forest Service land was \$18 million. The Appropriations Subcommittee on which I serve, and chaired by our very able colleague from Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, added \$3 million. This money was impounded by OMB despite the emergency in this industry. About 1 year ago, the President requested an immediate program of cutting 300 million additional board feet of salvage timber—otherwise subject to deterioration and loss because of disease, insects and rot—but the Forest Service was never provided with the \$2½ million required to finance this sales program.

The important point to emphasize here is that trees are a renewable natural resource. For every dollar invested in reforestation and intensive management, the Federal Government receives several dollars in return. It is good business for the Federal Government just like it is good business for private industry. Trees are a crop. If you don't plant and manage, you have no crop. Trees are green gold because they are a renewable resource. It makes no sense whatsoever to have a gold mine which is continuously renewable, and to fail to mine it.

Almost 2 years ago I outlined in general terms a national commitment which we can still make which, if adopted, can still provide an answer to the worldwide wood fiber shortage which we now have, and which is absolutely certain to be-

come worse as the standard of living improves and the population of the world increases.

I called my program "The Real Greening of America." My proposal in short is the adoption of a concept of total reforestation, and that we aim our program for the successful achievement of this goal in a 10-year period.

I would suggest that the program be divided into four separate parts. First, that we commit ourselves and the necessary dollars to forest every acre of federally owned land capable of high-growth trees. These lands would include our national forests, public domain lands, lands managed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all other Federal Government agencies. This would require the announcement of a policy and a program, and then its implementation by the allocation of sufficient dollars to finance it. The Federal Government would, by way of example, lead the way to this program.

Second, the Federal Government would intensify its cooperative efforts with State and local governments to see that the same result is accomplished on all non-Federal lands. This concept would include furnishing seedlings, education, encouragement, technical assistance, and perhaps, through direct aid or through the Youth Conservation Corps, some of the manpower to see that this job is accomplished.

Third, is in the area of the third forest where a great total land area of small wood lots and timber-capable lands remain unused. Here the Federal Government, by use of various incentives possibly including tax devices, free seedlings and technical assistance could see that a maximum effort would be made to return these lands to productive use for the common good.

Besides replanting I would propose that in all three of the areas I have outlined here—the Federal area, the State and local area, and the private area—that wholesale programs of thinning and salvage be undertaken for the maximum use of these lands and to discourage timber insects and disease.

Finally, the last part of my proposal involves the reforestation of the cities of America. You all know how barren Tokyo and Berlin were left immediately following World War II. Many of you, I am sure, have seen what has been done in these cities in the last 25 years, and in many other war-ravaged areas of the world. You also know what has been done in most of the suburban developments of America. You have seen developers bulldoze areas naked, lay out the streets and sewers and then start construction minus trees. There are a few exceptions to this practice, but they remain the exceptions in the development of the suburbs of this country.

We must make ornamental seedlings available to cities for this use in making parking lots and other center strips decorative for park and private use. We must help the horticultural industry to meet the needs in our cities for varieties of ornamental trees suited to each geographical area. Each tree planted is a

small oxygen factory. Each tree planted in America will contribute to the beauty of our environment. Each tree will help absorb the increasing noises of the urban environment.

In my judgment, and based on preliminary estimates, the program I have presented in rough outline would command an investment of an average of \$250 million per year for 10 years. It may be grandiose in concept but clearly something like this commitment is required, and immediately, if we are to satisfy the multiple purposes for which we manage our forest lands and if we are to leave our children a United States of America as rich in natural resources and beauty as the great country which we ourselves inherited.

During the next 2 weeks I intend to discuss various aspects of the problem in a series of one minute speeches. I urge my colleagues to join me in a careful examination and evaluation of this important problem.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join my distinguished colleague from Oregon—Congressman WYATT—in expressing deep concern over the national crisis on lumber shortages and spiraling prices. I am extremely interested in the recommendations my colleague is making today. May I also take this opportunity to express the admiration and appreciation countless Oregon citizens have for the outstanding leadership you have given not only this year, but throughout your congressional service in trying to do everything possible to bring about improved forest management. I particularly agree with your demand for a "quantum jump," as you just phrased it. The forest products industry is really the lifeblood of our economy in the State of Oregon. The current situation is working a real hardship on not only Oregon but the national homebuilding industry and the consumers as well. The shortage of housing units for the elderly especially is critical. The elderly citizens, of low income, find previous promises for low rent units—now hollow promises. No doubt Japanese competition has played a role in prompting this critical situation. I am not yet persuaded that the suggestion, by some, of a complete embargo on all log exports is the answer. May I suggest, though, that this be weighed with other factors, particularly forest management, which may have contributed greatly to the severe shortage price crunch.

First, I would like to emphasize something which, in my belief, has been discussed all too casually within the Halls of Congress. That is, the estimate by the U.S. Forest Service that the current annual loss of merchantable timber in our national forests due to insects, disease, fire, and so forth, is 10 billion board feet. This is approximately 7 billion board feet more than our exports to Japan in 1972. In the State of Oregon alone, about 4 billion feet of saw timber die annually—more than a billion more than last year's sale to Japan.

Last year, about this same time, attention was focused in this Chamber on the particularly urgent need for replanting some 5 million acres of national forest lands which had been damaged or else were marginal to begin with when first acquired by the Forest Service. Attention was focused on U.S. Forest Service statistics indicating that in 1 year only 11.5 billion board feet had been harvested from our national forests. At that time the Congress took steps to provide for accelerated programs of tree planting on national forest lands in critical need for reforestation. I actively supported this endeavor. In light of the fact that replanting efforts are still woefully behind schedule, it is incomprehensible to me that the administration has seen fit to freeze these critically needed funds for accelerated reforestation.

Going back to the 10 billion board feet annually lost in our national forests—when asked by the chairman of the then Senate Banking and Currency Committee in hearings 3 years ago what was needed to salvage the mortality, the Chief of the Forest Service responded, "an adequate road development program." He estimated that with accessibility half of the 10 billion board feet could eventually be salvaged. Many of my colleagues are aware of the current problem resulting from the 430,000-acre infestation of the Douglas Fir Tussock moth in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington.

In an environmental statement filed by the U.S. Forest Service, that agency recommended three measures to minimize losses from this timber killing moth: First, intensive salvage logging; second, aerial spraying; and third, reforestation. It is my understanding, though, that salvage logging will occur on well less than half the affected acreage because so many of the lands are inaccessible. At the same time, the administration has requested a \$105 million cutback in forest development road and trail authorizations for fiscal years 1974 and 1975—before the national forest transportation system has been completed.

On another point—the Forest Service has an annual allowable cut of 13.631 billion feet which experts agree is consistent with good timber management and ecology. In the new budget request for fiscal year 1974, the President has requested operating funds for only 10.8 billion. This is approximately 3 billion less than the annual allowable cut or equal to our exports to Japan last year.

These are but a few of the forest management decisions by the Executive which affect our supply of timber. Obviously, a more soundly managed forest cannot eliminate all—or even most—of the causes of recurring lumber shortages. But it should go a long way in alleviating these shortages.

One final note—I believe it is a real tragedy that we still do not have a specifically stated national land use policy. I commend my colleagues in this body and the other for the efforts that have been made and the work that is underway now. We have seen all too frequently the consequences of our hodgepodge approach to land management in the past, and I am hopeful that we will move swiftly during this Congress in enacting a comprehensive land use policy.

Again I wish to express my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, for his eloquent statement, and his leadership.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) for her generous remarks, and for her past strong support in this area, and for her continued support.

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) for the excellent statement he has made, and I find myself in strong support of his statement. I compliment the gentleman on his broad and expert knowledge in this very important field. I share the gentleman's interest in Federal forestry programs. He and I have long worked closely together in this field. I shall support the gentleman's efforts and I concur in his aims toward the realization of the problem which he has so well outlined.

Mr. Speaker, The problem of lumber scarcity and high prices has struck home forcefully in recent months. Most observers feel that unless our country can grow more trees on less land the problem will steadily worsen.

There are many here who have warned of the likelihood of this development. We have pointed to the fact that the amount of productive land which is devoted to growing timber is steadily shrinking. We have sought to impress our colleagues and our Nation with the fact that timber production by United States forests is far less than it should be. We have sought to improve this situation by passage of legislation to encourage production. Now a new factor has entered into the picture. Foreign buyers are outbidding domestic users of important stocks of U.S.-grown timber.

All of this is taking place at a time the Nation's timber needs are increasing and we are becoming more dependent on imported lumber.

Now what is it that can be done?

Because of the concern expressed by people in my own State on lumber scarcity and high prices, I have made a number of inquiries seeking to determine

what action now is being taken by Government to cope with the problem. Regretfully I must state that all I have been able to learn from Government agencies about their efforts toward coping with lumber scarcity and high prices is that they are just as confused as the industry and apparently they are about as helpless to deal with it. The Cost of Living Council says the lumber sector of the economy is the voluntary classification and the industry is expected to self-administer the standards which were outlined for phase III. All that means is that the controls are off. The Cost of Living Council also says they are engaged in a thorough study of the lumber industry and wood products problem. Study is a bad word on Capitol Hill. Essentially it means nothing is being done.

The National Association of Home-builders has recommended that an embargo be placed on log exports. This comes under the Department of Commerce. That agency is conducting a study on export control but no decision on action has been reached. In other words, more of the same.

The Government agencies state that supply in the lumber industry has not been able to keep up with the demand caused by increased housing starts and by exports. This we already knew.

I am also told that the President knows about the problem and is concerned. I know the President's problems are many and they are great. He cannot be expected to know all of the details of all of them, but surely there are those entrusted with authority who can do more than is being done now.

There should be government-to-government discussions on import and export policy and there should be Government-to-industry and Government-to-consumer discussions in an effort to alleviate the domestic aspects of the problem.

We in the Congress passed last year one of the most significant forestry legislative packages in history. It provided the framework for very substantial expansion of most of the programs which assist in timber management and production. It is being implemented only to a small degree. The Congress last year approved a rural development plan which will offer side benefits of significant encouragement to timber production and sound use. Very little is being done today to implement that act. It will receive modest implementation in the fiscal 1974 budget year if Congress approves the program which has been submitted. A vigorous effort should have been put in motion simultaneous with the signing of the bill.

There is also before us a bill which can be truly important in helping to stimulate timber production. This is the forestry incentives bill, a bill which passed the Senate in the last Congress but which we were unable to get favorably reported from the House Committee on Agriculture. That bill is again awaiting action by the committee. The administration has not given its support to the measure despite the fact that officials of

the Forestry Service plead in private for its passage.

Let me look back in history. Four years ago an attempt was made by responsible Members of the House to pass legislation to assure a continuous supply of wood building materials to the Nation. It will be recalled by my colleagues that the House of Representatives, responding to an outcry from those opposed to forest management, declined to grant the reforestation bill a rule. It was never debated and the country is the poorer for that fact since it did not become the law of the land.

Since that time the southern forest products industry, with the cooperation of the States and the Forest Service has conceived a plan to enhance growth on private timberlands in the South. It is called the "Third Forest" and has received widespread approval for its vision and measurable benefits. It will grow trees and, in view of the persistent failure to grow trees on the National Forests of the West, it is becoming increasingly urgent for the South to prepare to assume its inevitable role as "the woodbox of America." We in the South are out to grow all the trees our fertile commercial forest acres can produce. And we had best do it as quickly as possible if we are to deliver pulpwood and sawtimber in sufficient quantities to meet high levels of demand for paper, cartons, and houses and schools and all the other thousands of products we must have.

Regardless of the productivity of our pine forests, however or of the beautiful hardwood forests of such importance to the furniture industry in our Appalachian Region, the Nation is clearly going to have to depend in considerable measure upon reliable wood supplies from the Federal forests which have been woefully neglected for too long.

It is high time that the scientific foresters be backed up on public lands with the commitment of funds for accelerated timber growth and efficient management of this national resource.

The Nation has waited much too long to undertake a comprehensive, large-scale attack on the problem of inadequate lumber supply. We have warned of the threat. Now the problem is here. It will become worse before it can be overcome. It is time for action.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) who has been a leader in this area over the years, and with whom I have cosponsored measures in the past that would have helped to alleviate the situation we find ourselves in right now.

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

Mr. WYATT. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. SHOUP).

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) and my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) in commendation of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) for the lead he has taken in the problem that faces this country in the price of wood products, and also the supply of these wood prod-

ucts. I would like to join in the gentleman's remarks.

I would also like to state that I have joined with the gentleman from Florida in the introduction of a forestry conservation bill which I think goes hand in hand with the remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Oregon.

I would ask the gentleman one thing: I noticed that throughout the gentleman's comments at no time did the gentleman recommend price controls as a solution to this problem. Am I correct in the assumption that the gentleman agrees that price controls at this time would be nothing more than useless in that we do not have a sufficient supply of wood products to meet the demand?

Mr. WYATT. I think, I will say to my distinguished colleague, that I can see no step the Federal Government could take that would more rapidly bring to a screeching halt the progress that we have made in home construction during the past months than that.

We have a situation, as my colleague well knows, I am sure, where we have imports on manufactured wood products from Canada coming into this country completely free of price controls, and which effectively set the market on such wood products that come into this country.

Such controls in the past have not been effective, and I think they would stifle construction and certainly could bring home construction to a terminal period at this stage of our country's history.

Mr. SHOUP. I certainly agree on that.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the age-old forces of supply and demand, although sometimes distorted through outside pressures, are still the dominant factors in the current price structure. With this in mind when we discuss problems in the timber industry we must always return to current and projected needs for wood fiber. We are not meeting those needs today and the outlook is far from encouraging.

In the West both my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, and I are concerned with softwood timber. Here is what the projected demand for the year 2000 looks like:

First, demand for saw logs will double; second, demand for veneer will triple; and third, demand for pulpwood will quadruple.

There are several areas to be explored in efforts to meet these projected needs; available lands, timber harvesting and management.

It appears that we are faced with definite limits on available land for timber production. Withdrawals of public lands for study and for designation as wilderness, use of forest lands for highway construction and recreational uses has already had an impact. Timber sales and resultant harvests are down in many areas. We must look to better management of the available land.

A virtually untapped source of wood fiber is salvage and thinning. Improved technology will allow us to utilize diseased trees, those that have been killed by bug infestation and trees removed in

thinning operations. We have to utilize these trees and develop better methods of removing them from the forest. Aerial logging will most certainly fit into this picture of better harvest methods.

We must manage our forest more intensively. Reforestation must get the attention and assistance that it needs so badly. When we grow a tree, we must use it. In the face of our growing needs for wood fiber, we can no longer leave a third of each tree in the forest.

It is essential that we review our wood fiber need, set aside lands for growth of the trees we need and then manage them in a businesslike manner. I am convinced that if all concerned are made aware of our needs and our problems, we can produce the needed wood fiber and maintain a healthy and livable environment.

Mr. Speaker, I would again like to commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) in taking the lead in this matter.

Mr. WYATT. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. SHOUP). I have long known of the gentleman's very intense interest in this subject, and the great deal of activity the gentleman has engaged in to help alleviate the situation.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Oregon yielding to me, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

I think the gentleman from Oregon recalls that some 4 years ago a number of us cosponsored the Timber Supply Act, which I felt would have taken a great step forward in bringing about better management of our national forest assets.

Unfortunately, under the emotional mood of the times we were unable to get it passed; but I do think that it is essential that at this time of ever-increasing prices and at this time when our national forests are continually being depleted and we are not plowing back in the resources that are needed to restore these forests to their former place in our national heritage, we need to give attention to this problem.

I do want to reserve any personal commitments about any export ban on lumber to Japan. My committee, the Subcommittee on International Trade, is going to begin hearings this week in which we are going to start investigating this very matter. We may very well find that the Japan exports are not the source of the problem to the degree that some of us might have thought.

Again I thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to our attention, and I congratulate him.

It was my privilege in May 1969 to appear as the first witness before the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Agriculture Committee in support of H.R. 10961, which I sponsored, and several

other bills "to provide for the more efficient development of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund." That bill was subsequently substantially revised by the subcommittee, reported out by the full committee, and seemed to be moving toward passage by the House.

The distinguished Members of the House may recall that the Earth Day movement had begun and there was a real or contrived revulsion to using natural resources for the benefit of man. The House declined to grant the National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act a rule. There was no debate and, when the bottom fell out of the housing market, the need for growing timber on the national forests was forgotten—by all except those industries dependent upon an assured source of raw material.

Here we are 4 years later facing extremely high lumber and plywood prices. Here we are faced with the prospect that more of our citizens will be denied the decent place to live which we so plausibly identified as the right of every citizen in the Housing Act of 1968. Here we are wringing our hands because roofs, and siding, and floors, and doors, and windows, and framing and sheathing and moldings and the myriad other wood products derived from trees are in short supply. We ought to know whose fault it is. And having agreed that the Congress and successive administration have failed to keep their faith with the people and have denied them the richness of their own forest property, we should undertake to correct that situation and do it quickly.

My support of timber growing as a means to overcome deficiencies in wood product supply stemmed from my membership on the Banking and Currency Committee. In 1969, we conducted a thorough investigation of the causes for the sharp rises of the prices for lumber and plywood. Then, as today, the home-builders and other major consuming groups were making charges that manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers were driving prices up to their own advantage.

Our careful investigation at that time, confirmed by a similar investigation by the Senate Banking Committee, revealed conclusively that the root of the problem was the failure of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture to realize optimum growth of timber on the lands under its charge. The reason for that deficiency could not be attributed to unwillingness on the part of the foresters but rather to the fact that the Congress simply had not provided an appropriate means for timber sale dollars to be reinvested in tree growing.

I am not prepared at this time to submit legislation in that direction. I am prepared, however, to state without fear of contradiction by any reasonable person that the only way we can have adequate supplies of wood products for lumber, plywood—and for pulp and paper and containers and flexible packaging materials—is to grow more timber on all

of the commercial forest lands suitable for growing trees.

I want to commend my colleague from the State of Oregon, Congressman WYATT, for his leadership in this great challenge and to offer assurances that I will do all I can do to persuade members on my side of the aisle that we can no longer indulge in the folly of permitting our national forests to decline in importance as a source of natural resources our people so badly need.

Mr. WYATT. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

I only mention two things. First, I think it is important to distinguish between the problem involved in the export of unmanufactured round logs to Japan, or out of the United States, and manufactured wood products which are processed in this country.

With respect to the gentleman's comments about the Timber Supply Act which was defeated here on the floor of the House, I think one important thing should be observed at this point, and that is that at that time there was a great deal of emotion, and there was almost unanimous opposition from conservation groups, to the trust fund theory of funding our Federal lands. At this time I am asking that we appropriate adequate funds out of the general treasury for reforestation and for intensive management of our great forest resources.

This is an approach, I believe, that will have the wholehearted support of conservation groups, as against the opposition produced the last time around.

I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. VEYSEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) for bringing this important matter to the attention of this body. I think that he has devoted an exceptional amount of time and effort to the study of this problem of maintaining our forests and maintaining a satisfactory supply of lumber to meet our needs, not only as a service to his district but also as a service to this Nation.

His recent trip to Japan to study the export situation, I think, led him to some very interesting conclusions there.

I have the good fortune to share a seat on the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, where I have been exposed, along with my colleague (Mr. WYATT) to the proposed budget for the Forest Service for this next year. My concern about the type of budget that has been presented to us has led me to do some investigation about that, and I have some interesting figures that I should like to report at this time. The Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress tells me that the budget that has been suggested to us is not the "optimum budget" as they see it for the development of maximum timber sales and for maximization of our assets in the national forests. The budget allocation of \$36.8 million for timber sale

preparation and harvest administration would be beneficial in accordance with their views. This would be a \$4 1/2 million increase, but would enable the agency to sell 1.1 billion board-feet more timber than the budget plan presently calls for, and we certainly at this time are in need of that additional amount of lumber falling into our supply channels, in view of the rapidly rising prices caused by a short supply.

This would advance gross revenues by \$40 million, so it would not be a net outlay on the part of the Federal Government. It would raise revenues from sales to \$430 million and the net revenue therefore after deducting net cost and the 25-percent payment that goes back to the counties, by about \$25 million of net increase to the Federal Government. I am not a big spender, but this seems to me to be a prudent additional expenditure that could be made that would bring back several fold in return for the dollars laid out.

Likewise the Congressional Research Service points out that the proposed budget for reforestation is \$8.5 million below the 1973 budget and \$16 million below what they term the optimum level. They would set that at \$37 million, the optimum level compared to \$21.1 million in the present budget request.

Of course this money would not be returned to the Federal Government at any shortrun period, but it would be many years down the road, but surely it would be consistent with the gentleman's plan for rebuilding and enhancing our national forests. However, the Congressional Research Service does point out that this additional expenditure for reforestation would be more than paid for out of the additional returns from timber sales which I have earlier mentioned.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and for giving me the opportunity to make this additional note.

Mr. WYATT. I thank my friend, the gentleman from California. I think he has pointed up a very important fact of life that is not recognized generally in the Congress or elsewhere, which is that appropriations for the regeneration of renewable natural resources, such as we have here, should be on a completely different basis from other appropriations which represent a net outlay to the Federal Government. I am talking about appropriations for foreign aid and welfare and various other things which are a one-way street. This is not a one-way street, yet it is treated that way by the Office of Management and Budget.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, Idaho has much to offer the Nation, including a large amount of wood products on a continuous basis. We could do more if the Federal Government would regularly sell the allowable cut of timber from the national forests.

Although established by law to provide a supply of timber to meet the needs of the citizens, the national forests are not meeting that responsibil-

ity. There is no question about the current needs. The Forest Service's own allowable cut figures show what should be done. The record shows how far we are from accomplishing that goal.

These allowable cuts for sawtimber have totaled nationally more than 11.5 billion board feet per year. The programmed—financed—level has been less in recent years. In fiscal year 1971, the Forest Service sold less than 9.7 billion, and in fiscal year 1972, less than 9.3 billion board feet. Sales in the last year were below the financed level by more than a billion board feet and 20 percent below the allowable cut.

The problem is even worse in region 4 of the Forest Service. That area includes much of Idaho. For example, only 471 million board feet were sold there in fiscal year 1971. The allowable cut is 740 million. The deficit in the 1 year was nearly 35 percent of the allowable cut.

There has been much concern expressed in the past about overcutting our forests. Such practice should be deplored. However, it is equally deplorable to undercut grossly the commercial forests. By so doing, the unused timber-growth potential of these lands is lost forever. Further, overmature timber is permitted to deteriorate when it should be converted to products needed by man. It is time we applied sound principles of forest management to the national forests and regularly harvest the allowable cut.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I received the following letter from a lumberjack in Orofino, Idaho, who states the problem far better than I can. I include his letter in my remarks at this time:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SYMMS: This is an appeal to you to do whatever you can to help this timber sales problem.

I am 47 years old and have worked and lived in these wooded hills of the Clearwater Forests all my life. I have lost my job two times in the past year. My last employer put up with me for 11 years and then he had to shut down because of the timber shortage and of course increased costs to his business because of various ecological reasons.

I am not a learned man of means, just a working wage earner like most of my fellow workers (several hundred) who are losing or lost their jobs. I have never been fired from any job and could furnish references.

Timber and lumber is the main base for all our economy here in north central Idaho. Mining is nil and farming is so-so. Most of us lumberjacks own our homes and do not want to move to another area and some cannot.

I cannot see why the allowable cut of timber can't be maintained. I also realize that we must have a balance. This drastic cutback of federal timber sales is really hurting. Here is a clipping from the Lewiston paper. Maybe it can tell you more. Six sawmills already have closed since last June. If the Big Company starts shutting down—like they told us 2 weeks ago (Ahoahisa Unit) this would affect another 150 men and families. Surely something can be done. Also, the Dworshak Dam construction is mostly done and people who really want to work cannot.

I want you to give this a full going over. I and we would appreciate anything you can do to solve this.

(Mr. SYMMS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-

marks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Idaho for his excellent statement and contribution to this dialog.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to commend the gentleman from Oregon for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the House.

I must confess at the outset that I know little or nothing about forest management, but I do know the effect that these skyrocketing lumber prices are having upon the building industry and upon the consumers of this Nation.

I really rise not to contribute to the fine points the gentleman from Oregon already has made but to seek information. I note consistent reference throughout this dialog this afternoon to the "allowable cut" on public lands. As I understand it, that is about 13.6 billion feet annually.

I would like to know for my own education just how the allowable cut figure is arrived at and if that figure represents sound forest management and is consistent with ecologic principles and whether or not automatic opposition to the allowable cut figure for conservation reasons is well founded.

Mr. WYATT. I would say to my colleague from California that his question as to how sound the present allowable cut figure is with regard to the national forests is a subject that is much debated.

The professional foresters I have talked to feel that it is a very, very conservative figure and that the real figure should be higher; further, that figure should relate at all times to the annual growth in the national forests.

I personally believe, from having sat on the Interior Subcommittee which funds the Forest Service—and this is my fifth year—we have heard testimony from the Forest Service, and I do feel that the allowable cut figure which they have testified to is a conservative figure. I do not feel that we are overcutting the national forests.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think, to add to this, I would ask if the gentleman in the well, Mr. WYATT, would agree or disagree with the point I make:

That is, the question of allowable cut conceivably could have a number of variables. One of the most important would be the manner in which the so-called timberlands are managed and whether or not we have the kinds of intensified forest management, the increase of tree plantings at this point in the growing cycle which could conceivably affect the overall allowable cut on a given piece of land.

We have some areas that lend themselves to very rapid growth and intensified reforestation, so this is itself could provide for increasing the allowable cut, so long as it was known there were trees to be grown now for future use.

Mr. WYATT. I would say to the gentleman that he is absolutely right in that there are variables. There are many variables that go into the construction of this so-called magic figure of the allowable cut. Certainly at the very heart of these variables is the intensive management, the thinning and salvaging that is done, and the reforestation, certainly. These are examples of the type of intensive management which permits accurate calculations as to what the allowable cut should be, at all times not exceeding annual growth in our forests.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WYATT. I yield further.

Mr. GUBSER. Having had considerable experience in the agricultural field, I know that frequently one gets a much better yield if one thins out the plant population. Is this true in forest management, that allowing forests to become too thick will actually impede the growth and destroy some of the beauty of the forests and let it more or less rot on the ground?

Mr. WYATT. The gentleman is correct. One of the important tools of good management of the forests of this country is the practice of thinning, because if we have too many trees growing too close together, none of them prosper. Everyone has seen what happens in his own yard as applied to flowers and small shrubs.

One of the important tools of management is a proper thinning program, and this thinning program can accelerate the growth of produce wood fiber. This is related also to the species of tree in the various geographical areas we are talking about. Some require more thinning and others require less.

Mr. GUBSER. At this risk of trying to put words in the gentleman's mouth, would the gentleman say that this statement is true: That cutting the full 13.6 billion feet which is represented in the allowable cut is actually a pro-conservation act rather than anticonservation act?

Mr. WYATT. Having seen some areas in this country with my own eyes where there has been no cutting at all, and having seen other areas where there has been intensive cutting and replanting and intensive management, I would have to agree with the gentleman 100 percent. It certainly makes no sense at all, when we are in this area of wood fiber shortage worldwide as well as in this country, to just permit trees to rot and become subjects of attack by disease or insects.

Mr. GUBSER. Then if I may summarize what I believe is the main thrust of what I have heard here today—unfortunately, I was not here at the beginning—if a dedicated effort toward reforestation were to be made and if we were to fund that effort properly we would have real conservation, and we are not making a pro-conservation move if we cut down on the allowable cut?

Mr. WYATT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my colleague from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. In further answer to the question of the gentleman, I believe it is of interest to note that in my State of Idaho we are losing more timber to insects and pests than we are to chain saws. An acre of well-managed forest produces 4 tons of oxygen and 4 tons of wood per year, and soaks up 6 to 8 tons of carbon dioxide. This is in line with the question of the gentleman.

What will happen, if we allow the trees to rot and to fall, is that they go past the balance and start using nitrogen and taking oxygen, in the process of breaking down the wood.

So we are going backward on our environmental program by not cutting the timber.

I have personally been a tree grower and an orchard grower all my life. We plant a peach orchard every 20 years to replace the old one; we plant an apple orchard about every 40 years to replace the old one. But yet plans have to be made for the replanting of forests, and I think it is very interesting that in developing the forest programs we have to fertilize the timber and consider all the other factors and up the allowable cuts, and thereby we are helping the environment and helping the overall game management.

Mr. Speaker, this is the story that sadly has not been told much, and the story needs to be told over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) for taking time to present this special order today.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

I can furnish figures indicating that we have an annual loss of wood fiber in the United States in the area of approximately 10 billion board feet. Putting this in perspective, the exports of logs from the United States in 1972 were at an all-time high of 2 1/4 billion board feet.

If we can do anything to salvage our losses, the losses just from disease and insects, we will be taking a great step forward to supply the fibers which are now in short supply—and they are in short supply—thereby driving the price of wood up.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but move in here to clinch the point the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) has made.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), mentioned the loss of board feet annually to insects and disease. I would like to take a little issue with putting it that way, because that sounds a little commercial. It sounds like it is so much lumber, so much wealth that has been lost. But I would like to convert that, if I could do it fast enough, into the figures given by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Speaker, that represents a loss of so many tons of oxygen into the air and it represents a misuse of many of the

things which contribute to a better environment. I think if we worded it that way, it would be much more meaningful than just using the term, "board feet."

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is right. This is affecting the people all over America who would like the opportunity to live in a wooden house.

To go further, the tree converts carbon dioxide, water, and solar energy into wood fiber products. When we go into the employment of a steel mill, we have to burn up oxygen and go the other way, so we have a building product that we are wasting when we listen to people who are suggesting in their "ecologomania" that we should not allow people to go in and cut the timber. I think this is the point that needs to be made.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague's point is well taken.

We hear a lot about wood fiber substitutes, about the desirability and advisability of using these substitutes for wood, so we will not require so much wood products.

Mr. Speaker, what many people do not realize is that by using these substitutes, we are using a finite resource. There is only a certain amount of it left. Some day our children and their grandchildren will run out of these substances. Also, in order to convert these finite substances to something we can use for homebuilding or other construction, we must use very large amounts of energy. Of course, I do not have to emphasize the fact that we do have, at the present and in the future, an energy crisis in this country, a crisis which is not affected at all by the use of wood in homebuilding and other construction.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), for having taken this special order, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Let me just build very briefly on what I think is a very significant point which has been made as a result of this colloquy between the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER), and the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT), wherein reference was made to the substitution utilizing these finite resources.

As the gentleman pointed out, there is a genuine wood fiber crisis, in addition to an energy crisis associated with oil consumption, and so forth. But I think the very significant point and a key point that needs to be made here is that with proper reforestation and proper land and timber management programs we are dealing with a renewable resource that can go forward forever and supply the housing requirements that are so definitely needed in all sections of the country.

So I think a very excellent point has been made as a result of this dialog, and I again commend the gentleman for taking this time on this special order.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman from California very much.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WYATT. I yield further to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add additionally to the remarks of both the gentlemen from California in pointing out that this is being done in many places. It is something that we have the technology to do today, to have good forest management.

Thirteen percent of the forests of the Nation are owned by the industrial lumber industry, of which 33 percent of all the fiber and wood are coming from that land on a sustained basis. It is my belief that we could do the same thing with our national forests if we would try to de-politicalize the Forest Service.

We have been hearing in the last 10 years some distorted pictures that have come back to Washington from some of the public hearings that have been held. And this is a message that I again want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, for bringing this out to the Members of the House. We have been in many, many instances hearing of hearings that do not present the actual picture to the public concerning this problem—and anyone who has tried to buy a house in Virginia or in the northern district of Maryland ought to be aware that the price on wood products is too high.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT) for having taken the leadership in what we realize is a most critical matter. I join in the thrust of the statements which he has made today, and which have been joined in by a number of our colleagues from other parts of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize two points particularly which have to a degree been already touched upon in this discussion. One of the points the gentleman from Oregon made was on the renewability of this unique resource.

Many of our resources that are being dealt with in construction of all kinds are basically nonrenewable, such as when we go into plastics, metals, and material after material, we are then talking about using up resources which are already in short supply.

The gentleman in the well also spoke very soundly about the energy crisis, and there we are talking again to a substantial degree about nonrenewable resources. And as has been said—and I add this primarily for the purposes of emphasis—when we deal with wood fibers we are dealing with a substance which, if properly used, is renewable, and thus can be of value ad infinitum to the people of this country. I think this is extremely important.

The second point which again has already been touched upon, and again I

am commenting upon it merely for the purpose of emphasis, and that is the problem that when we talk about wood fiber and the need for doing something about our largest forests that people sometimes believe this is an area problem, but it is not. It is not a problem or a responsibility solely of the Northwest, and it is not a problem or a responsibility solely of the Southeast, and in other areas where trees actually grow in such abundance, but this is a national problem. And although we represent the area, as indeed we do, where the bulk of the supply must come from, the need is a nationwide need.

But that has already been commented upon by the gentleman in the well, and I, as I say, am making my comments merely for the purposes of emphasis.

If we do not, in the areas where trees grow, get the support we need from this Congress, from the administration, and from the people of the Nation to back up what we must do to protect our wood fibers, then it is the Nation that will suffer, and not just our particular areas.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman in the well for what has been for a number of years, and is now, his continued leadership in a problem of critical importance to us, and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents reside in possibly the most richly forested congressional district in the Nation. Their future is inextricably bound up in the future of Oregon forests both public and private.

The district contains vast Federal timber stands, including national forests and Oregon and California Railroad grant lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. The Fourth District of Oregon supports numerous small mills, most of which are substantially if not totally dependent upon public timber as a source of raw material.

Understandably, I have long been interested in intensive forest management on the Federal acreage in my district. And I have been part of numerous efforts in the Halls of Congress to increase and stabilize funding of our Federal timber managing agencies.

I must say, however, that the principles of intensive forest management have ramifications extending far beyond the southwest corner of Oregon. If it is true that our mill operators and their employees and our communities benefit from modern forestry in practice, it is equally true that home buyers in Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles benefit from a steady flow of wood building materials at reasonable prices.

In this regard, it is a fact that 75 percent of the lumber production in the West is consumed at points far removed from the producing region. Let us keep it flowing because we all have a stake in meeting the Nation's housing requirements.

As I see it we have at this time at least four direct pressures and one indirect pressure on the lumber and plywood market. One is the sudden price upswing when phase II controls were removed. The second is the static or decreasing timber supply picture arising in significant

part because of environmental pressures. The third is an ever-increasing demand for lumber and plywood. The fourth is our export situation. The indirect pressure of very high concern today is the perennial short supply of freight cars. It is the combination of these factors which have so seriously impacted on our lumber and plywood supply and price situation. Let me address each of these major points.

First, I believe that a free market economy, controlled by supply and demand, is what we should be striving to reach and maintain in the lumber and plywood industry. Consequently, I would dislike seeing the reimposition of price controls on this segment of our economy. However, if the price and supply situation cannot be brought under control, there exists a real danger that controls of some kind will reappear on the scene.

Second, strong environmental pressures both to more soundly manage our forest lands and to specially designate unique areas as wilderness or some other classification are with us whether or not we like it. I believe these pressures are by and large good and should be welcomed. However, we must guard against those who would have us set aside excessive acreages as wilderness or in effect cut no more trees on our Federal lands.

There are areas which clearly should have some special designation and where no timber cutting should take place. There are other areas which should sustain both recreation and other multiple uses along with commercial harvesting operations. Finally, there are areas where timber harvesting is the highest use of the area and where we should concentrate our efforts in producing as much timber as technically possible. In all timber cutting we should insure that the most environmentally sound methods and practices are being used, but we cannot fall victim to the cry that we radically reduce the harvesting of our forests.

Third is the picture of timber supply. Timber supply has two parts—the short-range and the long-range aspects. In the immediate future timber supply can be aided by having as much as possible unregulated timber in salvage and removal of dead and dying put up for sale. Also, we must insure that the Federal agencies managing our timber resources, most particularly the Forest Service, have the funds and manpower to program sales for the full allowable cut. I am working with both the Forest Service and the administration to see that these goals are reached.

Our long-range timber supply picture must be improved through a commitment on the part of the Federal Government to increase the yield from our public forest lands and to both keep and bring back into timber production private timber lands. I am working on legislation to help accomplish both of these goals aimed at increasing our long-range timber supply picture. Unfortunately, such long-range goals, as necessary as they are, do nothing to alleviate the supply-price crunch of today.

Fourth and probably most crucial to the immediate problem is our log and

lumber export situation. Exports of timber have increased drastically over the last year, reaching a total of approximately 2.8 million board feet. Every indication is that when figures are compiled for the first quarter of 1973 the runaway export picture will even be worse. From the best indications I get, as far as the demand of the Japanese is concerned, exports are no longer limited to logs, but since the beginning of 1973 lumber exports have also been rising drastically.

Our timber supply problem will not be solved miraculously by a total ban on log exports. To attack only log exports is to do nothing more than chip away at the tip of the iceberg. Legislation I am developing on timber supply will also deal with log exports where I see it necessary to: First, decrease the present 350 million board-foot limit on the export of Federal timber; second, put into effect strong and effective antisubstitution regulations.

I am still studying the entire picture with respect to private timber and am trying to determine the best course of action we might take as to possible limits.

Some have chosen to ask the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to place an immediate embargo on all log and lumber exports. I have chosen not to support these efforts because I believe first there is no chance such an embargo will be put on and second to stir the fires with a plea for an embargo could potentially hurt our chances to get effective timber supply legislation and log export controls.

Adding to these direct pressures on the timber and lumber supply-price crunch is the indirect pressure of limited transportation services. Each year we suffer from a shortage of freight cars caused by the competition of forest products and agricultural goods for rail transportation. This normally barely tolerable situation is worsened by the recent grain sales to Russia which have heightened the freight car supply problem to crisis proportions.

The answer cannot and should not be sought in the Federal subsidization of freight car construction. The easy answer of looking to the Federal Government to solve the problem is surely not the best. Legislation is necessary which will encourage the rail lines to increase their rolling stock without the Federal Government—and that means taxpayers—paying for that increase.

I am presently deeply involved in the development of legislation in four fields: First, increasing timber supply from our Federal lands; second, encouraging higher yield management and increasing our timber-producing land base on private lands; third, limiting log exports; and fourth, increasing our freight car supply. All these areas I believe are deeply needful of our efforts here at the Federal level.

The hue and cry of today is for log export controls. To deal just with that issue would, I believe, be short-sighted in the extreme. I have been pursuing this whole issue in discussions with forest products industry representatives, high officials in the Forest Service and the

Bureau of Land Management, and other experts in the field of exports and forest management. In the development of legislation, I am and will continue to seek the advice of other knowledgeable people. I am however fearful that we will lose the opportunity to do something really meaningful regarding our timber supply situation because we are all going so many different directions. I pledge my best efforts to make our congressional action a cooperative effort to solve this problem and I call upon my colleagues gathered here today to join me in that cooperative effort.

In conclusion, let me reiterate my concern: Any legislation we propose must be aimed at the larger timber supply picture. To move precipitously just to ban log exports is like cutting out the visible cancerous sore without attempting to deal with the deep cancer which produces that sore.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) for his comments. The gentleman has been a leader in this resource fight during his entire congressional career. The gentleman represents a district, unless I am mistaken, that has more commercial forestry land than any other congressional district. I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield still further?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, one last point that I would like to make, and that is with respect to this subject of the coordination between good timber management and game management. This is often a misunderstood point.

My State of Idaho used to be famous for great elk hunting. It is interesting to note that that great elk herd in central Idaho came from the forest fire of 1911 which burned off millions of acres in Ahoahlsa, Idaho. The scrub brush was allowed to grow, and the elk did grow and proliferate in that area.

Every time we allow the forests to fall and the trees to fall it makes it more difficult for the deer and elk herds to survive. Timber management is a help to good game management.

There is presently a study under way to burn off 300,000 acres in the Kaniksu Forests in northern Idaho, Montana, and eastern Washington. I think the thought in this day and age of burning off 300,000 acres of timber in order to help game management, even makes our point better that what would make a lot more sense—to me anyway—would be to cut some timber so that people who need wood products could have it, and we could also get the same results as far as game management is concerned. This is, I think, another point that we should share with our colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman from Idaho for his comments.

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

Mr. WYATT. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. A moment ago there

was much made of the fact that the Southeastern United States was also a great timber producer, which is true. The State of Georgia, for example, in my district, the Third District of Georgia, produces a great deal of pulpwood. For this reason and others I am very much interested in what the gentleman from Oregon had to say. I wonder if he would care to comment on the role that pulpwood, that is, slashed pine and softwood, has to play in his efforts.

Mr. WYATT. I would say to my colleague from Georgia that certainly pulp is an integral part of our overall problem—not in the short supply presently that some of our construction lumber and plywood, for example, are. We all know that the demands for paper and all sorts of paper products have increased rapidly and certainly is going to increase substantially in the years ahead, so we must look to ways that we can increase the supply of pulp trees in the future.

I know the gentleman's concern in the State of Georgia, which does a great job of producing pulp timber and other varieties of timber.

Mr. BRINKLEY. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman. If the gentleman will yield further, we have some concern in our State over the long-range tax system which is being contemplated for capital gains tax on the cut timber, and we would just say, if we could, we think that the importance of pulp and other trees is great enough that reforestation needs to be encouraged in the form of taxation, or Government help, instead of there being a lack of incentive. We appreciate the remarks of the gentleman today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I would like to commend my good friend, Congressman WYATT, for securing this time in order that we might direct our attention to a very pressing problem in the construction industry.

I am sure everyone saw and read the article in yesterday's Washington Post which elaborated on the increasing costs of homes in that area. In my opinion, one reason for the tremendous jump in housing costs within the last year has been the steadily rising price of lumber.

A retail lumber dealer in my district was telling me only last week that he never knows from day to day what the price of lumber is going to be. He also mentioned that his inventory is well below the levels it should be in order to supply the builders in his area.

The man went on to say that the rising lumber prices leaves the building supply dealer in a very hazardous position since they are unable to make a price commitment for anything like the time it takes to build a house.

Of course, the lumber wholesaler is also facing the same problems that the retailer is since the cost of the raw product of timber is rising far too fast and too much.

Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that the main cause of the recent increases in timber prices is the great demand for American timber in foreign countries, especially Japan.

I see no alternative but to limit the amount of timber we are exporting in order to insure that our needs in America are being met and also in order to bring some stability to the price of timber.

The people being hurt the most by this rising price of timber is the average American family trying to buy a home. In order to preserve the integrity of the housing market and help the wholesalers and retailers of lumber to stay in business, I urge quick action by the President or Congress or both to stabilize the price of timber and stop the inflationary spiral in the lumber and homebuilding business.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the export limitation possibility, I would urge the Forest Service to take a more active interest in promoting better management of privately owned, small tree farms. Despite the comparatively small acreage—about 13 percent—the lands owned by the timber industry produce about a third of the Nation's annual harvest. Individual ownership, even with the valiant effort of the tree farm program, fall far below this productivity rate. Comparatively, the small ownerships are unmanaged but do possess substantial productive potential. These small tree farmers cannot afford to employ full-time foresters, but they could benefit from the advice and help of the U.S. Forest Service on how to maximize the use of their land and increase their potential timber production.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Ponderosa pine timber stands on the national forests of Arizona, as well as the mixed conifer stands, are unique in the world and are important to the economy of the State and to the people who live and work in timber-dependent communities.

It is obvious to me that the Forest Service needs more money and manpower to engage in more intensive forest management, and not just in Arizona. By this I am not implying that the Forest Service has been derelict in facing its responsibilities—by no means—they just need help from the Congress.

There are forest land inventory projects under way on the Mogollon Rim and others in the Southwest are planned and I think this is an immense step in the right direction.

Primary use designations should be established and management should be adapted to what the land can sustain and produce. If the inventory determines that the land is best suited to watershed or game management, then those are the uses indicated. If the land can sustain a mix of uses, then that is all to the good also.

With well-funded intensive forest management—and the men of the Forest Service have the necessary know-how and our school of forestry is turning out able graduates—Arizona's timber industry and the men and women who work for it can be assured of stable and maybe increasing timber supplies. Our schools and counties will know that the 25-percent funding will continue and the communities and counties assured of economic stability. Action is needed and we should take it now.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, a review of my recent mail indicates we are long overdue in taking up an issue of critical concern—not just to building contractors, but to millions of Americans trying to acquire a home.

The Lion Property Co. in San Diego writes to me in part:

It is ridiculous for the price of a dwelling unit we are constructing to be increased approximately \$3,000 in six months, just for the cost of lumber. It is unbelievable that the cost would increase approximately \$1400 per dwelling unit in one month, just for lumber.

Thompson Associates writes:

On January 9, 1973, we received a quote for lumber for one house in our building program of \$3,410.80. On February 14 we were requested to approve a new price before delivery would be made of \$3,982.47, an increase of \$571.67 or almost 17% in one month.

Hallcraft Homes, large builders, sends me an itemized breakdown of lumber costs for various types of homes, showing increases ranging from \$487 to \$1,053 per house in the past 6 months. The average increase in cost per house for lumber exceeds 45 percent.

Barrett Construction Co. writes:

In the past few months lumber prices have increased to the point that we are paying from \$1,000 to \$2,000 more per single family residence than when we obtained lumber bids three or four months ago.

Other contractors and builders write to complain of increases ranging up to 65 percent in less than 6 months. In February of this year I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce to express my concern and to ask what steps were being taken to halt continued price increases of lumber.

The reply I received did little to raise hopes that effective relief would be forthcoming. In a two-page letter, a deputy assistant secretary acknowledged that a price increase had indeed taken place. Instead of outlining, as I had hoped, action to alleviate the hardships, the Secretary merely concluded:

Let me assure you that the softwood logs and products market is under careful study in the Department, and that we are watching the situation closely for further developments.

I find little here to warm my hands on. The Commerce Department's spectator sport is of little practical value to a young couple who find their dreams of buying a home suddenly disappearing because of a \$3,000 additional cost, or to a contractor who finds that he may be forced out of business because suddenly increased costs of lumber have demolished his cost estimates.

I do not believe that we can sit on the sidelines, as the Department of Commerce is apparently prepared to do, and "watch for developments." If the Department is unwilling or unable to take action to remedy a situation becoming increasingly critical, then Congress must move to do so.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Oregon for his fine discussion of the complex problems facing the future of our forest resources. I want to point out an example of how we need to get back on top of the management of our timberlands.

Residents of my district in northeastern Oregon are facing a crisis brought about by one of the most serious bug infestations in the history of the forests in that area. The Douglas fir tussock moth has laid waste in the last year to an estimated half million acres of commercial forest land and some experts are predicting that the epidemic may spread over a million acres if it is not controlled.

The remedy is intensive forest management and vigilance to minimize such outbreaks when they occur.

Moreover, the insects respect no political boundaries or property lines. State, Federal and private lands are being steadily devastated. I fear that insufficient funds will be available to stop the epidemic. And I fear that insufficient funds will be available to salvage timber which must be gotten out in the coming logging season before it is rendered useless.

The Douglas fir tussock moth strikes mature timber and new growth with impartiality. And this means, of course, that we will face the staggering task of reforesting those ravaged acres and that decades will pass before they become productive once more.

The Forest Service is already making a plea to the Environmental Protection Agency to use chemical and biological agents in an emergency control effort. But we need something more than emergency measures. We need to provide Federal timber managing agencies with a stable and dependable source of funding for research, timber management and reforestation to minimize the effects of unpredictable depredations by forest enemies.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are taking this special order today to shed some light on, and bring to the attention of our colleagues, a matter of great concern to many people involved in the forest products industry in my congressional district, the western tree producing States, homebuilders, and potential homeowners.

The matter I refer to relates to the log supply and demand question at home and in Japan.

Unless a reasonable solution is found, the economic ripple effect of this complex problem in our most basic industry, could create a great loss of jobs and a movement toward economic instability throughout the housing and forest products industries and our entire economy.

In recent weeks, I have met with and discussed this matter with the Department of Commerce; with Forest Service officials from the Department of Agriculture; with the labor and management people directly and indirectly involved in the forest products industry in my area of northern California; with national experts on forestry and forest products; with interested Members of the House and Senate from Idaho, Montana, Washington, Oregon, California, and many other States, and their staffs; and with White House trade negotiators.

It is clear from these many meetings that it is difficult to overstate the complexities of this problem or to understand fully the variety of possible ramifications this crisis can have.

Because the lack of consensus as to an appropriate solution has raised the emotional pitch of those concerned, the discussion has at times clouded the issues involved. I have, therefore, asked for this time, Mr. Speaker, in order to comment in what I hope will be a constructive manner on some of the points of agreement; on some possible policy changes that could be beneficial; and on the need to apply the adjective "preventive" to economics as well as to medicine.

First, it is obvious that the so-called Morse amendment which restricts the export of logs from public lands, must be extended and its prohibition made complete.

At the time we enacted the amendment a limitation of 350 million board feet seemed reasonable. Subsequent events, including local timber requirements, increasing domestic housing production and administrative difficulties, have shown all too well that the Morse amendment must totally eliminate the export of logs from Federal timberlands.

Therefore, I shall urge the Department of Agriculture not to permit the export from public lands of logs amounting to the full 350 million board feet permitted by the Morse amendment.

A reading of the amendment makes clear that this provision conveys a discretionary authority upon the Secretary of Agriculture and that he is not mandated to make available the full amount.

He, therefore, could anticipate congressional action to reduce the Morse amendment to zero by accomplishing the same goal through simple administrative decree. I hope he will do so and it is my understanding that this issue is currently being considered in the Department.

The amendment is due to expire at the end of this year so that now would seem to be an appropriate time to consider this issue and enact legislation effective immediately rather than waiting until late in the session.

Second, in the many meetings I have had in recent weeks on this subject, the point has been stressed and restressed that the Forest Service must be provided with sufficient funding to permit it to expand its public sales to a more realistic level and to operate its timber management activities in a more fluid manner as opposed to the "stop and go" procedures of recent years.

This improvement is fundamental and stems from the most basic economic doctrine of supply and demand. Proper and wise management of our renewable forest resources can provide a sufficient supply of forest products to meet the demand at a reasonable cost.

Accomplishing this will allow us to achieve the dual goal of meeting national housing construction goals and doing so with the construction of homes nearly everyone can afford.

Third, trees are a renewable resource. As contrasted with gold, or silver, or oil, or other finite assets, trees are readily replaceable and can be available in perpetuity, with proper forest management techniques and programs on public and private lands.

I do not want to suggest, however, that this will automatically or accidentally be the case. Only an intensive dedication to the principle of reforestation coupled with a positive method of financing these activities can bring success.

Accelerated reforestation provides vast benefits both in the short term and over the long range. Had we recognized this opportunity a couple of decades ago, we would today be enjoying realistic levels of supply and lower prices.

Fourth, while I am deeply concerned about the difficulties log exports are causing us, we must not lose sight of the fact that international trade and economic competition is a two-way street in which unilateral action of a negative character can be counterproductive and harmful.

While it is impractical to expect the Japanese to rescind a trade policy it finds highly beneficial, it is equally impractical and unrealistic to impose an inflexible, complete ban on log exports from the United States.

We would be losing economically if we did so since many of the exported logs are not commercially processable in this country and would not be utilized here. We would also invite some sort of economic retaliation from the Japanese and a deterioration of our potentially beneficial mutual trade relationship and commercial competition.

Imposition of a complete ban on exports is, of course, the immediate reaction to the crisis but the opportunity for reflection suggests to me at least that this course of action would not be successful. With the State of Washington and their very powerful chairman, Senators Jackson and Magnuson, being against a total ban on log exports, it is unrealistic to conclude that exports will be banned.

Fifth, we can, and should, take appropriate action to attempt to convince the Japanese that it is in their best interests to cooperate with us in working out a realistic solution. The President has expressed this view through his trade negotiator's recent visit to Japan and I intend to make this suggestion to the Japanese Ambassador to the United States.

Sixth, with the expectation that the Japanese will not be amenable to this suggestion, we should begin to work out administrative and/or legislative means to cause a reduction of log exports to tolerable levels, taking into consideration our own domestic log inventory requirements as a priority to be satisfied.

Meetings with those in the forest products industry in my congressional district have shown clearly the great danger with which the wood fiber crisis threatens our economy. Hundreds of jobs are in jeopardy as foreign shipments dry up sources of supply and deprive domestic manufacturers of the raw materials they must have.

We must not permit these jobs to be lost—or even threatened. I am deeply concerned that a man's productive economic existence could be attacked by our Government's support of policies just to insure a supply of logs to Japan.

I am doubly concerned because I know this threat is not necessary. Where there

is a market for logs, does it not follow that there will be a market for lumber?

Did not this administration meet the wheat supply problem by increasing the acreage and production of that product? Is not the law of supply and demand the same for forest products as it is for wheat?

I think we can find the answers to these and other questions by summarizing some of the possible solutions to the log export crisis.

I would suggest for discussion purposes a level equal to two-thirds of the volume of log exports during calendar year 1972. This level would approximate the amount of our exports in 1971.

Log exports for January 1973 from the four Pacific coast States were 217.7 million board feet according to the respected Random Lengths market report. This represented a 42-percent increase over January of 1972 and a clear indication that the export crisis continues unabated.

Early, but responsible, action must be taken.

Seventh, we must encourage the Japanese to take manufactured wood from us in place of round logs. It is said that since standardized American lumber sizes are different from those in Japan that our mills cannot manufacture a product that could meet Japanese standards. I have been assured, however, by lumber industry experts that our mills could produce appropriate sizes for export.

In addition, we should be encouraging the Japanese to look into the possibility of changing their standard sizes and adopt American specifications and dimension standards.

California is first among the States as a consumer of wood products. It is second nationally in lumber production. The Nation and California need more wood to build more and better housing at reasonable cost. Timber and its products are of great importance to the citizens of our state and the Nation.

We can have more of this renewable resource right now if the funds, personnel, and moral support are given to the Forest Service to sell the allowable cut from the national forests. Nationally, the Forest Service has scheduled substantially less than the allowable cut for sale in the past 4 years. Actual sales have been 12 percent less than the programmed amount nationally, creating an artificial shortage at a time of great demand.

Some California mills must quit this month because of shortages of timber. Mills dependent on national forest timber in California could currently increase their production an average of 19 percent, if the timber were available.

Current allowable cut levels would have permitted the Forest Service to sell nationally at least 6 billion more board feet over the past 4 years. That is enough wood for the construction of nearly 600,000 more homes.

Allowable cut standards are based on 10-year periods. Volumes not sold in 1 year should be added to offerings in subsequent years. If this were done, much of today's shortage would be relieved.

My comments today are designed to be a responsible effort to present a platform

upon which a solution to this pressing question can be constructed. I am not wedded to the specifics of my proposals but I am committed to the proposition that domestic employment be protected and that we retain the capacity to meet our housing goals at realistic price levels.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by merely saying that I am sure all of us who have engaged in this colloquy today recognize the great importance of managing the national forests and Federal timberlands for the multiple purposes which are designated by statute for the management of these lands.

We recognize the many, many other purposes other than the production of commercial timber. We are concentrating on that aspect of it today largely because of the crisis that appears to be on hand, and really is on hand because of the extremely high price of lumber and plywood at the present time.

I would conclude, then, by pointing out that the price, both of lumber and plywood, really is established by supply and demand. We cannot repeal the laws of supply and demand. One thing we can do is to increase the supply, and I would hope, that this goal and this effort of focusing the discussion today upon the supply will unite forces who feel that we should have an increase in the supply.

I am talking about homebuilders. I think the environmentalists can and will join with us in this effort to reforest America.

I thank my colleagues who have engaged in this discussion today.

STATEMENT OF THE MAJORITY LEADER ON ANTI-IMPOUNDMENT LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of Congress are now considering their own versions of anti-impeachment legislation. The bills have the same end in mind: To restrain President Nixon's injudicious use of impoundment of funds and to reassert the congressional role in the funding and policymaking processes of this Nation.

The New York Times of Sunday, March 18, 1973, carried a thoughtful analysis of the bills and the approaches taken respectively by the House and the Senate. The Times concludes that the House bill, introduced by Chairman MAHON is probably the sounder vehicle.

But on one point the Times left no doubt: President Nixon seeks too much power—he moves too far toward one-man rule—with his grasping at the national pursestrings. The Times concludes that our case can best be argued not in ideological or narrow partisan terms but—and I quote:

In terms of the enduring place of Congress in a stable constitutional order.

Since this editorial is of interest to the entire membership of the House, I insert it in full into the RECORD:

THE CASE FOR CONGRESS

The power of Congress to appropriate money and ultimately to control how that money is spent is the foundation of all legislative power. In the evolution of self-government, fierce battles were fought in England between the House of Commons and the king to determine financial control. In this country, Congressional supremacy on fiscal matters is clearly set forth in the Constitution and in the Federalist papers.

Against this background, President Nixon's resolute attempt to suppress programs of which he disapproves by impounding the money which has been appropriated to finance them is a profound challenge to Congress. If Congress supinely acquiesces in this audacious bid for increased power, then the near-dictatorship which a President now exercises in war and diplomacy will have been extended to the domestic sphere.

In response to this challenge, Congress is now considering two bills, one sponsored by Senator Ervin of North Carolina and the other by Representative Mahon of Texas. Both measures would require the President to report to Congress if he impounds all or part of an appropriation. Under the Ervin bill, the President would have to spend the money unless both houses of Congress affirmed his action within sixty days.

Under the Mahon bill, which has the backing of the House Democratic leadership, any impoundment would stand unless the appropriations committees reported out and both houses approved a concurrent resolution disapproving the President's action. In practice, if there were support for the President's action among influential members of those committees, they could sustain him simply by refusing to report out any resolution. Ordinary members could not obtain a vote unless the appropriations committees led the way. Since the appropriations committees, particularly in the House, tend to be conservative and in favor of holding down the budget, an impoundment would probably prevail unless there was very strong sentiment in Congress on a particular issue.

The procedures of the Ervin bill would properly and forcefully assert Congress' prerogatives. But there are two reasons, one institutional and one political, for favoring the more cautious approach of the Mahon bill. Institutionally, it makes sense to refer Presidential impoundments to a Congressional committee for study, and Appropriations is the logical committee.

Politically, it is clear that President Nixon is almost certain to veto any anti-impeachment bill. His veto can be overridden by the necessary two-thirds vote only if the bill attracts the support of fiscal conservatives in both parties. In that situation, Mr. Mahon is ideally suited to argue the case for Congress—not in ideological or programmatic terms as a liberal might—but in terms of the enduring place of Congress in a stable constitutional order.

U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL: DANGER AT PANAMA AND THE REMEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the culmination of prolonged preparations on the part of the revolutionary Government of Panama, the U.N. Security Council held its first session on the isthmus on March 15, 1973, when the opening address was made by the Chief of Government and Commandant of the Panamanian National Guard, Omar Torrijos. In strongly worded remarks, this

"sawdust" dictator made the following significant points:

1. Accused the United States of "perpetrating a blatantly colonial situation by refusing to surrender its control" over the U.S. Canal Zone territory.

2. Denounced U.S. presence in the Canal Zone as "neocolonialism".

3. Asked for "world moral support" in the struggle for Panamanian sovereignty over the U.S. Canal Zone.

4. Said that his people are reaching the "limit of (their) patience" and that if peaceful change was not permitted, Latin Americans would be forced to "carry out violent changes".

5. Stated that Panama will never be "an associated state, a colony or a protectorate" of the United States.

6. Expressed, for the first time, "his government's solidarity with Cuba".

Long anticipated by informed observers, the tenor of the Torrijos address was no surprise but it did confirm the accuracy of some of the main points in my February 8, 1973, address in the Congress on the "Crisis at Panama: A Three-Pronged Assault on the Canal Zone," which is commended for rereading by those concerned with the canal question.

Prior to the Security Council's first session at Panama my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY) and more than 60 other Members of this body on March 13, addressed a letter to the President of the United States warning him of the dangers and urging him to use his "high office to stop the deterioration of U.S. control and authority over the—Canal Zone and the Canal."

The White House reply on March 14, signed by Richard K. Cook, Deputy Assistant to the President, deplored any "uncontrollable demonstrations" against the Canal Zone as "most unfortunate," but was evasive on the crucial challenge to the continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone. It stated that the United States is "seeking a new treaty which, while responsive to Panama's aspirations, will accord to the United States the necessary rights to operate and protect the canal."

Mr. Speaker, the last statement is not a forthright declaration, but a carefully worded expression that serves to obscure the real intention of our faceless State Department planners and others to supplant the present workable canal treaty with a status-of-forces type that would surrender U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, leaving the United States with responsibility for operating and defending the canal, but without requisite authority. Here it is pertinent to stress that the launching of the Panama Canal was the fulfillment of the age-long aspirations of the Panamanian people early in this century. It still is the primary reliance for the livelihood of an important sector of the Isthmian population. Truly informed Panamanians, who are friends of the United States in this matter, must not be betrayed in the manner that the people of Cuba were betrayed by the pretenses of a clique in our Government and its collaborators in the mass media that represented Fidel Castro as a bulwark of

freedom and as an assured friend of the United States. Prior to that, the ideological predecessors of this same clique in the U.S. State Department were responsible for turning over East Europe to the Soviets and in 1948 for turning over China to the Red regime that brought about American disasters in Korea and Southeast Asia.

Just as Castro, after attaining political power, publicly admitted that he was a Communist and had always been one, on March 15, Tomar Torrijos, as previously stated, revealed "his government's solidarity with Cuba." With Red agents already ensconced in the Panama Government could the significance of such confession by Torrijos be plainer? Certainly, we must not allow the successors of the State Department cliques and their associates, backed by the same elements in the mass media, to contrive the same type of betrayal at Panama as they did for Cuba.

In the light of the present news media emphasis in favor of surrender of the U.S. Canal Zone to Panama let us bear in mind that in the 1940's this same media proclaimed that Mao Tse-tung was simply an agrarian reformer and later broadcast that Castro was a dedicated champion of freedom. Are we to believe these same frauds now?

Let the following facts be heard around the Nation at this time:

First. The Canal Zone is the indispensable protective frame of the Panama Canal.

Second. The United States possesses the necessary sovereignty and jurisdiction over both and has title in perpetuity to all land and property in the zone territory.

Third. The Canal Zone was acquired under treaty negotiated pursuant to an act of Congress, but the Congress has not authorized any negotiations for its disposal.

Fourth. The taxpayers of the United States paid for the construction of the canal, which including defense, on June 30, 1971, represented an investment of \$5,695,745,000.

Fifth. The United States has full sovereign rights, power, and authority in the Canal Zone and thus has been able to avoid the conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extraterritorial rights.

Sixth. The U.S. Constitution vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress, which includes the House of Representatives as well as the Senate.

Seventh. The House has repeatedly shown that it will never approve the surrender of the Canal Zone.

For fuller information concerning the United Nations Security Council meeting now in session at Panama City, attention is invited to a notable address by Senator STROM THURMOND in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 15, 1973, on pages 8084-8087. As to the future control of the Panama Canal we cannot afford to make the grave error of surrendering sovereignty over the Canal Zone for if we do, we shall lose the canal. Then who will operate this vital waterway?

The denial at the Panama meeting by the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations of the right of the United Nations Security Council to intervene in Panama Canal affairs with an implied threat to use the veto clears away one obstacle in meeting the crisis on the Isthmus. To remove the others, I repeat what I have stated on other occasions as the principles that should govern our canal policies:

First. That the United States will not participate in meetings hostile to it on matters where the issue is a clearly defined historic right of U.S. sovereignty, which is not negotiable.

Second. That the current negotiations with Panama should be terminated immediately.

Third. That the United States should proceed, regardless of the Panama Government or the U.N., with the major modernization of the existing canal to provide for its needed increase of capacity and operational improvements under the maintenance provision of existing treaties, which authorizes "expansion and new construction" for the existing canal. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, part 9, page 9834.

Mr. Speaker, such policy declaration will carry forward the great work of Theodore Roosevelt who launched the Panama Canal, thrill the people of our country, appeal to important shipping interests that use the canal, and revitalize the Isthmus, with enormous benefits to the United States, other American countries, particularly Panama, and inter-oceanic commerce.

Because of their relevance to the current situation at Panama, I quote as parts of my remarks the previously cited letters and one by me to the President, with the reply thereto:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1973.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because the forthcoming sessions of the U.N. Security Council in Panama during 15-21 March 1973 may be the occasion of a contrived explosive situation comparable to that of January 9-12, 1964, and suitable for use in a world-wide campaign of hostile propaganda against the United States, the Congress was circularized on January 24, the House addressed on February 8, and again circularized on February 19. Copies of the indicated papers are attached.

The position taken by Panama over a long period of time has two main points:

(1) That Panama's advantageous geographical location is its "greatest natural resource" and should be exploited to the maximum degree.

(2) That the sovereign control by the United States of the Canal Zone and its military presence on the Isthmus must be liquidated.

As to the first, because of Panama's strategic position it has always been, and always will be, a target for predatory attack, which fact makes its geographic position its greatest weakness requiring the presence of a strong power. Thus, the claimed advantages of such location are canceled by the grim realities involved.

In regard to the second point, the Canal Zone is the indispensable protective frame of the Canal. Although Panama wishes the United States to surrender its sovereignty

over the territory, it also wishes our country to bear the burden of operating the Canal, which would place the United States in the untenable position of having grave responsibility without requisite authority. Removing U.S. Forces from the Isthmus would invite a takeover of the Canal as occurred at Suez soon after withdrawal of British Forces from the Suez Canal Zone.

Historically, U.S. Isthmian canal policy is based on two fundamental principles: the security of transit and the independence of Panama. The only way that Panama can remain independent is by continued U.S. presence on the Isthmus with retention of its full control over the Canal Zone and Canal with its Armed Forces defending it. Furthermore, the Congress has not authorized the disposal of any Canal Zone territory or other U.S. property in it.

When Secretary of State Hughes faced a situation on the Isthmus similar to that which you face, he called in the Panamanian Minister and warned him that it was "an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American Administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of (the) rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903." (*Foreign Relations*, 1923, Vol. III, p. 684.)

The feeling in the Congress on the Canal issue today is stronger than ever and the subject is covered with an extensive documentation. In view of all the facts, the only dignified course open for the United States at the forthcoming U.N. Security Council meeting in Panama, is for Ambassador Scali to take the floor immediately on the opening of the first session and announce that the United States does not recognize the jurisdiction of the U.N. Security Council over matters affecting the Panama Canal and therefore that it will not participate in these meetings. Any other course, including those outlined in Ambassador Scali's February 11 press interview on "Issues and Answers," is fraught with the gravest peril.

Respectfully yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., March 11, 1973.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter to the President concerning the forthcoming meeting of the United Nations Security Council in Panama.

I wanted you to know that your letter will be called to the attention of the President and his advisers on foreign affairs as soon as possible. You may be assured your views will be accorded full consideration.

With cordial regards,
Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1973.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Members of the House of Representatives concerned with the recent developments in Panama regarding the United States operation and control of the Panama Canal, we are writing this letter in the hope of alerting you to the feelings of many Members of Congress. Aside from the chronic problems attendant to the United States presence in the Canal Zone, we are currently concerned over the acute situation with which we are confronted as a result of the planned meeting of the United Nations Security Council in Panama from March 15-20, 1973. The Panamanians have gone on record to the effect that they will use this opportunity to influence world opin-

ion and solicit Latin American support for their demands against the United States. As you may know, elements in the Panamanian Government are now making exorbitant and unacceptable demands on the United States in the form of a new treaty and have threatened reprisals of a violent nature if they do not achieve their goals.

In order to short-circuit the announced plans of the Panamanian extremists, we recommend that vigorous and immediate steps be taken by the United States to nullify the efforts of these radical groups in Panama. It should be made clear to Panama and the other nations involved in the Security Council meeting that the United States will not be intimidated by their actions and that we will stand by our treaty position which upholds our rights to operate, defend, and control the Canal, and that we will stand by our treaty position which upholds protect United States property and the lives of Zone inhabitants by whatever means necessary.

Looking beyond the March 15 meeting, we must impress upon the Panamanian extremists—and reaffirm for the majority of Panamanians who agree with the United States position—that we intend to continue the mutually beneficial relationship that has existed between our two countries for the past 70 years and that the best guarantee of Panama retaining her own sovereignty, security, high rate of economic development and, indeed, the best guarantee of Panama's own survival as a nation rests on the profoundly unique relationship that historically has existed between the Panama Canal Zone, the Republic of Panama, and the United States.

We, the undersigned, implore you to take cognizance of our concerns and to use your high office to stop the deterioration of United States control and authority over the Panama Canal Zone and the Canal.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MURPHY,

Member of Congress.

(And some 60 other Members).

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1973.

DEAR JOHN: The President appreciated your bringing his attention to your concerns about the effect of the forthcoming United Nations Security Council meeting upon the American position in the Canal Zone, as contained in the March 18 letter from you and several of your colleagues.

Uncontrollable demonstrations directed against the Canal Zone would be most unfortunate. U.S. officials have been in close consultation with representatives of the Government of Panama regarding measures to avoid such a serious deterioration in our relations with that country. The Panamanian government appears to be taking appropriate measures to prevent disturbances and to provide a hospitable and secure environment for the meeting. Our representative, Ambassador Scali, will be prepared to make a constructive contribution.

As you know, treaty negotiations were renewed with Panama in 1971, following a careful review of all aspects of the Canal issue, particularly American interest in the continued availability of an efficiently operated and secure canal serving the needs of this nation and world maritime commerce. The United States is seeking a new treaty which, while responsive to Panama's aspirations, will accord to the United States the necessary rights to operate and protect the Canal. President Nixon shares your concerns about the importance of guaranteeing the future security of required installations in the Canal Zone.

The President welcomes your views and the opportunity to consult with you in the future on Canal policy.

Sincerely,

RICHARD K. COOK,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

CAN AGRICULTURE SAVE THE DOLLAR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROSE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the March 15 issue of Forbes magazine, because it gives a good description of how agriculture can save the U.S. dollar.

The article follows:

CAN AGRICULTURE SAVE THE DOLLAR?

You are furious about mounting food prices and perplexed about Nixon's new farm policy, but the answer is very simple—oil.

How do oil and food mix? Bear with us for a moment while we explain. The U.S. has lost, probably forever, its edge over Western Europe and Japan in manufacturing efficiency and technology. At the same time, it is burning imported oil at an ever-mounting rate. Question: How do you pay for the oil if you can't export enough manufactured goods?

That's where farming comes in. The U.S. is fast exhausting its once-plentiful natural resources. But there is one natural resource that, if cared for, never becomes exhausted: farmland. The U.S. has the acreage, the climate and the potential surplus over its own needs to become the granary of the world—a world where both population and ability to pay are rising fast.

Thus do the facts fall into place. The Nixon Administration is betting on agriculture to save the dollar. For if oil is essential for industrial civilization, food is necessary for life itself. Food is, potentially at least, the most priceless of all natural resources.

The U.S. last year ran a balance-of-trade deficit of \$6.8 billion. On top of the current woeful situation, the future seems impossibly bleak: By 1980, under not overly pessimistic projections, the U.S. could be laying out \$18 billion to pay for imported oil, compared with a \$4.2-billion payout in 1972. If things were to stay the same, this would imply a potential trade deficit of \$20 billion and international bankruptcy for the U.S.

Agricultural exports already are one of the few bright spots in the U.S. trade picture. In fiscal 1973 (the year that ends June 30), the U.S. will export \$11.1 billion worth of agricultural products. It will import, estimates the Department of Agriculture, \$6.8 billion. After subtracting \$1 billion of foreign-aid type foodstuffs from the export total, that still leaves a healthy \$3.3-billion cash trade surplus in agriculture—largely balancing the deficit in oil.

STEADY CLIMB

Of course, the current fiscal year is extraordinary because of the shipments of over \$1 billion worth of grain to the Soviet Union. But the fact remains that agricultural exports have been rising steadily in recent years: from \$5.7 billion in fiscal 1969 to \$6.7 billion in 1970, \$7.8 billion in 1971, \$8.1 billion in 1972. This gain was in cash sales; government program sales have remained at the \$1 billion level throughout.

Carroll G. Brunthaver, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs, says the trend will continue. "I won't predict 1980,

that's too far ahead," says Brunthaver, "but I think we can get to \$15 billion fairly quickly." To Forbes' central question: Can U.S. agriculture save the dollar? Brunthaver responds matter-of-factly: "Not all by itself, but it can go a long way."

The Japanese can manufacture as well as we can. They cannot farm as well as we can. The American farmer is not a lone man standing in the field. It would be more accurate to describe him as the human operative of a system of industry, technology, and capital that has taken the natural resource of the abundant land and made it yield a hundredfold. "Our advantages go back 100 years" says Brunthaver, a 40-year-old Ph. D. in agricultural economics from Ohio State. "They center in our educational system. Our farmers are educated. The infrastructure—the roads, railroads, irrigation systems—all are there. We have an organized market and an industrial complex that supports the farmer."

These investments may now be at the payoff stage. Growing income overseas means meat in the diet: That is the bright hope of the U.S. balance of payments.

Meat, that is, shipped as grain. Just as the U.S. raises more meat animals than anyone else, it also raises more of the feed grains that fatten these animals. Who can raise corn like the U.S.? For the protein supplement soybeans, the U.S. soil and climate are ideally suited, and the U.S. grows 70% of the world's supply. What, which we think of as a food grain, is also a feed grain around the world, and the U.S. stands ready even now to export up to 1 billion bushels a year of it. In short, it is foodstuffs for meat animals that is the U.S.' long suit in international trade. Remember, it takes eight pounds of feed to produce one pound of beef, seven to produce one pound of pork.

All this places in perspective several major recent actions of the Nixon Administration. Among them: parlaying with Russia or China; preparing for negotiations with Japan and the European Economic Community; fending off irate consumers about high food prices; devaluing the dollar. Agriculture is at the heart of every Administration major move of late.

Last year Presidential Assistant for International Economic Policy Peter M. Flanigan commissioned a report from the Department of Agriculture. That confidential report, entitled *Agricultural Trade and the Proposed Round of Multilateral Negotiations*, is now circulating in Washington and among agricultural businesses in the Midwest. The report examines the potential benefits to the U.S. from a general liberalization of agricultural trade and concludes at its most optimistic that the U.S. could achieve agricultural exports of \$18 billion in 1980—with grains and soybeans comprising almost \$12 billion of that—if all favorable factors came into play. In this scenario imports, led by dairy products, grow to \$9 billion. But the nation would still be earning \$9 billion net on agriculture.

Last month the President committed the Administration to ending direct crop subsidy payments for U.S. agriculture over the next four- or five-year period. Ended also will be the allotment program under which acreage was set aside to prevent price-ruinous surpluses. The U.S., which has some 340 million acres growing crops, has 60 million more acres in the set-aside program. This spring 40 million of those set-aside acres come into productive use—half will be producing more soybeans, corn, wheat, grain sorghums and other crops. The other half of the acreage will be used for grazing animals, thus effectively freeing more grain to the market.

Isn't this risky? Won't disastrous surpluses result? The Nixon Administration displays a blithe confidence that they will not. As Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz put it last month: "We are gambling on the side of too much, rather than not enough."

The gamble is interesting, as it solves two problems at once for Nixon. By announcing the phasing-out of crop subsidies, and allowing expanding crop production, he can say at home that he is moving gradually to bring down food prices. By knocking out the U.S. subsidies to farmers, the Nixon Administration can approach the negotiations this fall with the Europeans with clean hands, as it were, and demand that they loosen their own protective subsidies to farmers. Those subsidies are now effective barriers to U.S. grain exports.

Furthermore, expanded production of U.S. grain will bring today's high market prices down to more reasonable levels. This will make all the more ridiculous the spectacle of the Europeans holding out low-priced U.S. grain while feeding their meat animals on home-grown, subsidized, high-priced feed—and feed comprises 75% or more of the cost of raising an animal. It will also keep American grain and soybeans attractive to the Japanese, with whom price has been a problem recently. The expanded production holds little danger of a ruinous U.S. surplus in the crop year beginning this spring.

Extraordinary export demand last year depleted U.S. grain reserves, and those stocks must be replenished. So Nixon has until the summer of 1974 to persuade the foreigners to buy more of the U.S. agricultural abundance.

Significantly perhaps, the U.S. was most reasonable in February's devaluation of the dollar. The whole thing was carried off relatively painlessly for Europe. No European country had to change its currency value, and thus Europe's internal balance of exchange rates was preserved. The feeling in the Administration is that Europe owes the U.S. something, preferably in agriculture.

The barriers are formidable. The only significant achievement of the European Economic Community to date has been the Common Agricultural Policy, which sets a high price level for crops grown inside the EEC and, through the use of a variable agricultural levy, holds out selected foreign crops—most particularly U.S. feed grains such as corn. Since this came fully into effect around 1966, the U.S. has lost \$200 million to \$300 million a year in feed grain exports to Western Europe—a market in which consumption of meat has expanded over 20%. On top of that, Britain, Ireland and Denmark, customers for \$550 million worth of U.S. agricultural exports a year, have just entered the EEC, imperiling that steady export demand. The Administration feels that in the forthcoming negotiations, the U.S. had better recover that lost business and get a clear shot at future growth markets. The alternative? Fewer Volkswagens and French wines coming into the U.S.

Japan, on the other hand, is a good customer. U.S. agricultural exports to Japan this year will total \$1.7 billion. And Japan is fast becoming a meat-eating nation, producing now 2.5 billion pounds of meat, compared with half a billion ten years ago. Most consumption is expected to double again in this decade. The U.S. problem here is economic: It must keep the price of its grains competitive to hold the market and to lessen the attraction for Japanese investment in growing soybeans and feed grains on Australian and Brazilian soil.

With the newly opened giant markets for U.S. grains in the Communist countries, the problem is going to be how to arrange hard

currency purchases over the long term. The signs that the Russians, though, are serious about building up their livestock herds are growing. Russia has a five-year-plan objective of a 25% increase in meat production; in spite of a terrible crop year in 1972, it did not slaughter the livestock herds as it has done previously in crop-disaster years. The potential market for U.S. feed grains and soybeans in Russia and Eastern Europe is estimated by the Department of Agriculture, and independently by Minneapolis' giant grain dealer, Cargill, Inc., at 35 million to 40 million tons annually—easily a \$2.5-billion annual market. The People's Republic of China import annually 4 million to 5 million tons of grain, mostly wheat. Initially a market for 1 million to 2 million tons annually, reckons Agriculture's Brunthaver.

India, even with the Green Revolution, is figured for frequent if not chronic shortfalls in wheat production. This year the shortfall is in the nature of 10 million tons, and the hard-pressed Indians are buying U.S. grain at current inflated market prices.

Of course, there are pitfalls to watch out for in these admittedly rosy projections of world demand for foodstuffs. Good weather conditions around the world would diminish U.S. wheat exports for a start. The Common-Market nations are not going to cower meekly under U.S. table-pounding in negotiations; Japan, with its Brazilian plans, could become a competitor in agriculture. Russia normally grows more wheat than even the U.S., and is a grain exporter itself. It also grows barley and can fatten its calves and hogs on that. So while demand for grains will grow, it will remain highly cyclical. But for all that, the U.S. does hold the trump cards, and chief among them is the soybean.

There are no trade barriers to soybeans in any country in the world; the problem is supply, not demand. The reason is simple. The soybean has a protein content of 40% compared with 8% for corn, 10% to 12% for wheat and about the same for oats and barley. The U.S. this year will export some \$2.7 billion worth of soybeans and soybean meal and oil; it will export 475 million bushels out of a crop of 1.3 billion bushels. And, says the Department of Agriculture, to no one's disagreement: If we had 200 million bushels more, we could sell every one of them. That alone would make a \$1-billion dent in our payment's deficit.

The rest of the world has a hard time growing soybeans. The soil and climate of Iowa and Illinois are particularly favorable to the bean. But that's corn country. Why doesn't the farmer simply switch from corn to soybeans? Because there is a wealth of technology behind corn; the yields get to 150 bushels an acre and above. Soybeans are now up to 28 bushels an acre in good times, and soybeans are not yet free of natural hazards that no longer bedevil corn, like proliferating weeds and difficulty in harvesting.

But the situation is changing. Soybeans, because of their higher price, are now the U.S.' No. One cash crop—totaling \$4 billion in calendar 1972 compared with \$3.3 billion for corn. The Administration is paying farmers out in the corn belt 15 cents a bushel—straight payout—just to plant beans on land that might be used for corn.

And the acreage is opening up for everything. Soybeans will be planted on from 7 million to 10 million previously idle acres this spring, bringing total soybean acreage up to 54 million-57 million acres. Corn will be expanded to 74 million acres, wheat to over 60 million. The production potential of this could be astounding. Hence the universal optimism of businessmen involved in agriculture.

Thomas Roberts Jr. is president of DeKalb AgResearch Co. in DeKalb, Ill. DeKalb is a corn seed supplier, developer of those hybrid seeds that make possible the incredible yields the U.S. gets in corn. Roberts expresses some fear that maybe things are going too far, too fast with the corn crop, but concludes: "This world demand thing is real. We are the lowest-cost suppliers. There are positive implications for American farmers in this. The productive potential of this country is just enormous." And Robert Perritt, vice president of Central Soya, the soybean processor and seller of feedstuffs, adds: "There is no part of the world that can begin to compete with us in this area. We are very effective." Chairman Dwayne Andreas of Archer-Daniels-Midland, the largest soybean processing firm, goes all out. "The soybean will be the savior of the dollar" he says. "The opening of trade with China and Russia is the greatest thing of the century; it has taken the farm economy out of jail."

DEFENSE TO OFFENSE

What do the Administration's new farm policies, hopes and expectations really mean for the rest of the business world? Who's helped? Who's hurt? For the answer, one must step back a bit and consider the profound changes in American agriculture contemplated by the new policies.

First of all, they are the reversal of approaches to farm policy dating at least to the 1930s and the Roosevelt Administration. Acreage was allotted then to prevent surpluses. Later during World War II, and again somewhat during the Korean War, it was opened up to get maximum production. But in the 1950s the open policies of Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, produced huge surpluses and ruinously low prices. The Democrats in the 1960s tried first to hold down the explosive productive potential of the U.S., then in 1966-67 to release it to prevent world hunger. But that release came just at the wrong time—at the onset of Asia's Green Revolution—and it was based on the prospects of the U.S. charitably feeding the world's developing nations.

The new policy is more realistic: It is based on selling for cash to those who have the money. Russia and China are in. India is out.

But an even more basic change is involved. This time we would not be so much selling grain as meat—in the sense that the grain would be converted into meat—for countries with a rising standard of living. For those who can't yet afford meat but need protein, there are soybeans.

The food business will, of course, always be cyclical. What this means is that if the U.S. wants to encourage agricultural expansion as a means of earning foreign exchange, it will have to protect the farmers against undue price fluctuation. As granary to the world, too, the U.S. will have to protect its customers against shortages and wild price escalations. One way to do this would be by government stockpiling in off years. Another way might be to try working out long-term supply contracts by which major customers might agree to take regular amounts—in return for being assured of a regular supply. Either way, the Government is in the business of holding reserves of the major commodities. As Senator Hubert H. Humphrey from the farming state of Minnesota put it: "The Government must share with the farmer the risks associated with these market uncertainties."

WHO IS HELPED?

The prospects arising from all this for fertilizer, herbicide, pesticide and farm machinery are glittering. Dean McKee, econom-

ist at Deere & Co., points out that farm machinery now takes 40% of the farmer's gross dollar *vs.* 30% formerly; with the farmer's dollar growing fast, the leverage can be considerable. Hence the recent full market in farm machinery stocks.

Another profound change will be in the shipping of the grain. With expanded crop production, and expanded export shipments, the movement of grain from the Midwest out to the ports will tend more to be a year-round affair than the peak-and-valley business it is now. The grain dealers are shouting at the railroads now to buy more grain-holding hopper cars, and the railroads are beginning to respond. Reports Edwin T. Ahnquist, president of Pullman-Standard: "For us, the covered hopper market looks good. We expect not only that greater amounts of grain will be shipped, but that an increasing percentage of it will travel in covered hopper cars."

Ralph Avery, head of grain marketing for the Burlington Northern, which is laying out \$18 million above its previously planned capital budget for 1,000 covered hoppers, explains some of the economics. "The return on investment on jumbo covered hoppers can be over 30% annually. If we could run them anything close to 12 months a year, that's Utopia." As it is, grain cars work only about six months a year, which is hard on profits; in the grain shipment rush, owing to the Russian purchases, the port tie-ups have hurt the railroads, too.

What about the American consumer? With food prices up some 30% in five years and meat prices up 15% in the last two, he really is hurting. And he's mad. At everybody. The Government. The supermarket. The food processor. But the fact is this: Food prices can't respond to demand the ways cars and clothing do. This is especially true of meat prices, the cause of most consumer wrath. The meat bought at the supermarket today started its production cycle 19 months or more ago—when corn was sky-high because of the 1970 corn blight. The farmer kept his herds down and paid for those animals he did feed; the meat-eater pays now. In grain, reserve bins must be filled and export demand met before prices fall enough to yield lower retail prices. In fruits and vegetables, the better conditions for farm workers that many city folk support also mean higher prices.

But then, does the city-dweller really want a migrant worker's poverty subsidizing his breakfast grapefruit? So it looks like wait 'till next year, if ever, for lower food prices. On major items like meat and grains, the Administration is gambling that prices will start down as the new acreage comes in, attracted by high prices.

Perhaps the rise in prices will level off, but if the Nixon gamble works, the American people will never again know food as cheap as they have had in recent decades. Again, because the Government will have to see to it that prices stay reasonably steady. Consumers may be angry at high food prices, until they get used to them. But farmers would never forgive a party that encouraged them to expand and then let their market collapse.

INTO THE ACT

In fact, the farmer is not going to be a passive element in all this: "There's nervousness on their part," concedes Carroll Brunthaver of Agriculture. Senator Humphrey says: "The Department is essentially right in asking for more production, but the Department is wrong in being unwilling to insure that farmer against risks. Now we insure practically everybody else—companies investing in Latin America, cost-plus contracts here at home. Then they come to the poor old farmer and they say, 'You play the marketplace.' He isn't big enough."

But what Forbes found among farmers in Bloomington, Ill. (see p. 82) was less ner-

vousness than combativeness. Listen to Richard Rayburn, farmer: "Agriculture is the nation's largest business. And it is the largest single user of steel. Any business as large as that deserves more consideration than the tinkering being done to it. A management decision to change core or livestock population by 5% is a major management decision. This new farm program isn't making minor changes. We have the world's lowest cost of food. I don't think anyone would consider such a strong turnaround in any other industry. It would be like taking all the tariffs off automobiles, or all the restraints off longshoremen." He's saying: Sure, we're itching to expand, but don't try pushing us around.

PLANT CLOSINGS AND INDUSTRIAL MIGRATION FROM CITIES REQUIRES NEW FEDERAL LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems facing those of us who represent urban areas are the plant closings and industrial migration of recent years. In addition to the misery it causes to the families of men and women who had worked in these establishments, this migration raises a serious question as to the economic viability of large cities. What is at issue is whether in the coming years the city will be able to provide a broad range of job opportunities to those who inhabit it, and whether through a healthy local economy, the city will have access to the tax revenues necessary for it to perform the broad range of services its citizens need and deserve. Traditionally, the Federal Government has for the most part shied away from any effort to encourage industry to locate in one area or another. But I believe that only through the commitment of Federal resources can this dangerous trend be halted, and so I am today proposing the Urban Employment Act of 1973, a piece of legislation which addresses itself to what I perceive to be the most important causes of industrial migration from the cities.

PLANT CLOSINGS: IMMEDIATE AND LONG RUN DIFFICULTIES

Almost without exception, the large cities of this country have over the past several decades seen a variety of their oldest and most established industries close their doors and move to new quarters in suburban or rural areas. Other industries, finding that they have suddenly fallen far behind their competitors, have either gone out of business or combined with a national company that has no use for the outmoded facility.

For Cleveland, our Regional Planning Commission has found that since 1963, 69 major manufacturing firms, defined as those employing 100 or more persons, have either closed or moved from the city, these firms having employed over 21,000 persons. More than one-third of this loss in firms and in employment has taken place in the past 2 years. Only 17 of the 69 businesses, employing 4,000 persons, moved to another location within the county, and so for the most part, these were a complete loss to the metro-

politan area. The Greater Cleveland Growth Association has stated that, in the past decade, Cleveland lost 655 companies of all sizes, with a total job loss of over 80,000. Projecting into the future, an official of the Regional Planning Association has estimated that by 1976, another 5,000 jobs may be lost.

The results of this hardening of the industrial arteries are always the same, and each case has its share of horror stories. A man in his late fifties has not quite worked long enough to qualify for his pension, and so he receives zero from the fund. A young family is faced with the choice of uprooting themselves and following the company—at a loss in pay and seniority—or else going on the job market again to see if new employment can be found. For middle-aged workers especially, the task of finding a new job is very difficult.

While these immediate dislocations are very painful and difficult, they are not the full extent of the story. Each place of business is a vital part of the local economy, and from each is generated many streams of economic activity. A thriving factory calls upon other businesses for marketing, transportation, supplies, and other services, and its workers, with their paychecks, create a further demand for goods and services. Each factory lost is a body blow to the local economy, and nowhere is this loss more deeply felt than in our efforts to reduce unemployment. In all the large cities today, there is a vast number of people who seek work, but cannot find it. My own city of Cleveland in 1971 had an average unemployment rate of 11.8 percent—the highest among the 20 largest cities. How can we ever begin to reduce unemployment in the cities if the providers of employment—the factories and other places of business—are moving away?

We have in Cleveland and other large cities many fine vocational education and manpower development programs. They achieve their immediate purpose of imparting skills in the machine trades and other fields to young people, but these programs will in the long run fail if the jobs are not there. Again and again the Congress has expressed its commitment to the goal of providing a decent job for all Americans. To achieve this goal, we must now follow through on our original commitment and act to see that the jobs will be where the people are: in the large cities.

While unemployment in the cities is especially serious, industrial migration has contributed to other urban problems. Tax resources have been eroded to such an extent that we last year had no alternative but to pass legislation giving cities the resources to finance services that they traditionally paid for out of their own revenues. School districts in many of the large cities have in recent months suffered strikes which dramatize the financial plight they now face. Although tax losses are difficult to estimate, one official of the city of Cleveland has estimated that the tax loss due to industrial migration has reached an annual rate of \$4 million a year for the city and the school district of Cleveland.

URBAN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1973

Obviously, this problem is not merely of local concern, but of national concern as well. Urban areas in all parts of the Nation have common disadvantages from the viewpoint of those who choose sites for industrial location, and so these cities face common difficulties in retaining industry. Most have initiated vigorous programs to retain and expand their industrial base. In reviewing these local programs, I find that they are lacking not in energy or imagination, but, as in other areas, in money. Unlike other financial needs however, a Federal investment here will bring immediate results both in creating more jobs and in making the city self-sustaining to a larger degree.

As the vehicle for this investment, I am today introducing the Urban Employment Act of 1973. This legislation, which was drafted with the assistance of economic development officials in Cleveland and elsewhere, envisions the establishment within the Economic Development Administration of a two-pronged attack on the causes of industrial migration. Large cities would be eligible for grants and loans for the purpose of establishing land banks, and businesses would be offered long term, low-cost loans for the development of facilities within the cities.

First among the needs of industry is land. A growing business in particular looks for land on which to expand, and the cost of land in the city is astronomical. Land is in short supply, and that which is available usually has some type of structure on it which must be demolished, adding further to the cost. While in the city, the per-square-foot cost may be \$1.75, \$2, or more, the comparable cost in suburban and rural areas often is only one-half, or one-quarter of this amount.

Cities have attempted to meet this problem by establishing land banks, through which the city purchases land—usually in the form of large industrial parks—and then offers the land to industry at a competitive rate. But most cities in their present financial state cannot possibly afford the large initial investment required, and neither can they afford the loss involved in purchasing the land, preparing it, and then selling it at a rate comparable to the prices outside the city.

Thus the Urban Employment Act will offer, for the first time, Federal grants and loans for the establishment of land banks. All central cities of 100,000 or above in population are eligible for this assistance, and the loans can cover up to 90 percent of the costs—including those incurred in purchasing the land and in making it suitable for industrial development—while the grants may cover up to 25 percent of such costs. These loans will provide a ready source of capital, and the grants will be used mainly to make up any financial loss which the city may suffer in reselling the land. Before making any grant or loan, the Secretary must make a determination that the land being purchased is suitable for industrial development, that the costs incurred by the city are reasonable, and that the proposed project will assist in

maintaining or creating employment opportunities. An authorization of \$250 million a year for the next 5 years is provided.

The other major program established under the bill would provide long-term, low cost loans to private enterprise for purpose of developing industrial facilities within the city. A broad range of activities, including modernization of equipment, purchase of land, the building of new structures, or the improvement of existing ones, would be eligible for such assistance. These loans would be for up to 90 percent of the project cost. Any project for which assistance is sought must be located within the central city, must assist in alleviating unemployment, and must have the approval of the local economic development agency—\$250 million per year for the next 5 fiscal years is authorized for this part of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, insuring that job opportunities exist for all who seek employment is one of the most important efforts in which the Congress can be involved. As Daniel Moynihan has said:

In America, what you do is what you are. To do little is to be little, and to do nothing is to be nothing.

In a very real sense, we can act to see that all those in the city will have an opportunity to become "something." This is the significance of the legislation I propose today, and so I urge that Congress consider it, and act upon it.

SOCIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued proposed regulations for the federally assisted social services program. If implemented, these new regulations will all but decimate nationwide efforts to combat welfare dependency and a wide range of other social ills.

HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger indicated recently that some changes will be made in the February 15 regulations but, as yet, we have received no indication that any extensive revisions are being contemplated by Secretary Weinberger's department.

Because of the urgent need for action on this matter, 74 House Members have asked that the following resolution be considered at the Wednesday, March 21, meeting of the Democratic caucus:

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON SOCIAL SERVICES
FUNDING FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS, MARCH 21, 1973

Whereas, pursuant to the authority contained in Titles I, X, XIV, XVI and IVa of the Social Security Act, programs of social services have been initiated by state and local governments which have provided substantial assistance to the disadvantaged and have enabled large numbers of citizens to successfully remain off the public assistance roles and,

Whereas, in the 92nd Congress a ceiling of \$2.5 billion was imposed upon federal reimbursement to the states and territories for such social service programs and,

Whereas, at the same time a formula for apportionment of said sum among the states and territories was established which fixes the sums to which each state is entitled, and

Whereas, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has now proposed new, restrictive regulations which would destroy many useful programs of social services and would sharply reduce the effectiveness of others, and would shift substantial financial burdens to state and local governments, and

Whereas, the President has urged that Congress provide greater decision-making to state and local governments in the expenditure of federal funds.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives that the Committee on Ways and Means is respectfully requested to promptly report to the floor legislation necessary to enable state and local governments to continue existing programs of social services subject only to the limitations expressly enacted in the 92nd Congress.

LIST OF SUPPORTING MEMBERS

Bella Abzug, Joseph Addabbo, Glenn Anderson, Herman Badillo, Lee Hamilton, Yvonne Burke, Philip Burton, Shirley Chisholm, William Clay, John Conyers,

James C. Corman, John Culver, Ronald Dellums, Ron de Lugo, Charles C. Diggs, Robert F. Drinan, Don Edward, Joshua Ellberg, Dante B. Fascell, William Ford.

Walter Fauntroy, Donald Fraser, Julia Hansen, Michael Harrington, Augustus Hawkins, Ken Hechler, Henry Hełstoski, James Howard, Robert Kastenmeyer, Edward Koch.

Robert Leggett, Torbert Macdonald, Lloyd Meeds, Ralph Metcalfe, Jonathan Bingham, John Brademas, George Brown, Parren Mitchell, John Moakley, William Moorhead.

Morgan Murphy, Lucien Nedzi, Claude Pepper, Bertram Podell, Melvin Price, Charles Rangel, Thomas Rees, Ogden Reid, Donald Riegle, Peter Rodino.

Fred Rooney, Edward Roybal, Patricia Schroeder, John Seiberling, Fortney Stark, Louis Stokes, W. S. Stuckey, James Symington, Frank Thompson, Robert Tiernan.

Lionel Van Deerlin, Lester Wolff, Andrew Young, Jerry Waldie, John Moss, Thomas Ashley, Henry Gonzalez, John Dent, Antonio Won Pat, Spark Matsunaga, Brock Adams, B. F. Sisk, Don Rostenkowski.

The American Public Welfare Association has estimated that 3.8 million people currently receiving federally aided social services will be deprived of these services if the regulations are adopted. At the same time, States will lose more than \$1 million in Federal aid annually or 40 percent of the aid they are entitled to under the social services provisions of the 1972 Revenue Sharing Act, Public Law 92-512.

A more detailed analysis of the impact of the regulations is provided in the following staff memorandum prepared by the APWA:

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION—
MEMORANDUM

MARCH 9, 1973.

To: Guy R. Justis.
From: Jack Hilard, Jr.

Subject: Analysis and Observations—Questions—Questionnaire on Impact of Proposed HEW Social Services Regulations.

We have received as of this date partially or fully completed Questionnaires from 33 states. Although this only represents approximately 65% of the states, these 33 reporting states utilize approximately 73% of the federal money for Social Services and likewise represent approximately 73% of the population served by these programs.

On the basis of the data available and the

projections for the other states not reporting, we are making the following observations about the overall fiscal and people impact:

1. FY 1973—FOURTH QUARTER (APRIL-JUNE)

33 States

1,092,250 people: \$197,934,630.

All States (projected)

1,496,232 people: \$271,141,959.

2. FY 1974—ANNUAL

33 States

2,798,038 people: \$774,119,705.

All States (projected)

3,832,929 people: \$1,060,437,951.

3. Both of the Fiscal impacts for FY 1973 (4th Quarter) and FY 1974 seem to indicate slightly more than 1 billion dollars will not be available to states for social service programs. (1974 FY projected for all states=

\$1,060,437,951; and 1973 FY (4th Quarter) projected for all states of \$271,141,959 $\times 4 =$ \$1,084,467,836.

4. Assuming the ceiling of \$2.5 billion as the maximum federal expenditure, and using the projected fiscal impact amounts, the annual federal matching money would not be greater than \$1.4-1.5 billion.

5. The 1973 FY expenditures would probably exceed this expenditure level, due to the hold-harmless provision for the 1st quarter of the fiscal year.

6. If the regulations are implemented as proposed, the FY 1974 expenditure will probably not exceed the \$1.4-1.5 billion level. (This would represent less expenditure of federal dollars than the Total Used in FY 1972 of \$1.71 billion.)

7. The pattern of reducing federal matching funds to the FY 1972 level is illustrated further by some specific state impact examples:

	Actual fiscal year 1972	Estimate for fiscal year 1973	Estimate impact, fiscal year 1974	Revised estimate
(a) Arkansas	3,273,092	10,500,000	7,000,000	3,500,000
(b) Colorado	18,908,219	24,097,000	8,040,703	16,056,297
(c) Georgia	32,415,041	57,524,260	19,000,000	38,524,260
(d) Iowa	9,536,046	13,500,000	3,106,324	10,393,676

8. The total impact by dollars and people are probably the most accurate estimates that can be derived. If anything, they represent a slightly conservative amount. This is due to the inability of several states to provide unduplicated totals. When this occurred, the figures were used from the highest single impact Provision (usually the Definition of Potential Recipient) on the assumption that the same people and dollars would be reported under the other Provisions.

9. The categorical data is incomplete. Some states did not report by category for people and dollars, and others did not provide an unduplicated count. Therefore, the total figures for the categories are only for the states that reported them separately. If used, it should be prefaced with a qualifying statement, i.e., "At least 1,068,025 people in families will be deprived of social services in 1974 as a direct result of the HEW proposed regulations," or more than 150,000 blind and disabled individuals will not receive social services in 1974 as a result of the HEW proposed regulations.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has received formal comments on the proposed regulations from a vast number of individuals and organizations—10,000 at last count.

One of the national organizations expressing concern about the regulations was the AFL-CIO. The following news release from the AFL-CIO contains the text of president George Meany's letter to HEW Secretary Weinberger.

NEWS FROM THE AFL-CIO

AFL-CIO President George Meany has registered sharp objections to proposed federal social service regulations published in the February 16 Federal Register.

Meany detailed his objections in a letter to HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger dated March 7 that was released today. Meany said the regulations "would effectively reverse the Congressional intent of over a decade to alleviate the social and physical ills which lead people into poverty."

He urged Weinberger to withdraw the proposed regulations and recommended future proposals be "designed to assure adequate financing for day care and other needed services permitting private, state and local, and Federal cooperation on a practical basis."

We are equally opposed to the proposed regulations which would:

(1) Eliminate day care as a mandated service.

(2) Impose stringent restrictions on a state's ability to purchase service from another public or private agency.

(4) Threaten the existence of currently operating community-controlled day care programs by providing Federal funds only for state and local agencies which are not required to have any parent participation.

We urge you to withdraw these regulations, and strongly recommend that any future regulations in this area be designed to assure adequate financing for day care and other needed services permitting private, state and local, and Federal cooperation on a practical basis.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, Chicago recently played host to a regional meeting of Time, Inc.'s 50th Anniversary Editorial Project, "The Role of Congress." Charles O. Jones, of the University of Pittsburgh, calls upon the press to play a larger role in focusing attention on the Congress, rather than excluding it from coverage in favor of the President and his entourage. Jones emphasizes that Congress is not a side show and that it should be center stage in national politics. He suggests increasing the visibility of party leaders, and giving them more control of the legislative process. The professor also offers good suggestions to the press on how to assist in the "revitalization" of Congress. Henry A. Grunwald, managing editor of Time, Inc., was the moderator. I include the address and panel discussion in the RECORD.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

Mr. GRUNWALD. Ladies and gentlemen, and distinguished guests: My name is Henry Grunwald. I am Managing Editor of Time, and I am your host today.

Before I go any further, I have the great pleasure of being able to present to you a gentleman who has very graciously agreed to say a few words of welcome, the Governor-Elect of Illinois, Dan Walker. I am sure that I do not have to provide any details in introducing Mr. Walker to this audience. You are very familiar with him.

I would like to say one word about his biography; a fact, frankly, that I had not been familiar with, one that startled me. Dan Walker, once upon a time, went to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and I could not help wonder what would have happened if he had decided to make the Navy his career. It appears to me that if, in the months ahead, the office of Governor of Illinois should prove troublesome to you, sir, you might take comfort from the fact that Admiral Zumwalt's job will be even tougher. Ladies and gentlemen, the Governor-Elect.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you very kindly, Mr. Grunwald.

It is a real pleasure to have the opportunity to welcome you here today. We in Chicago and in Illinois are very grateful to Time Inc. for choosing us as a place to help mark the 50th anniversary of TIME magazine. That organization and that magazine, as everybody here knows, has distinguished itself not only by its news coverage, but also for sponsoring and participating in educational events like this one.

I, for one, believe that more enterprises, including corporate enterprises, ought to

The text of Meany's letter follows:

The AFL-CIO strongly objects to the Social Service Regulations appearing in the Federal Register on February 16, 1973. They would deny to large numbers of disadvantaged people needed services such as day care; prohibit private contributions as matching funds for Federally financed programs; significantly cut back on the scope of available services; hamstring the states by burdensome and unnecessary documentation and record-keeping procedures and, perhaps worst of all, eliminate the responsibility of states to meet Federal standards for the care of children.

The AFL-CIO has long supported the use of Federal funds to encourage states to provide the rehabilitation and preventive services necessary to reduce dependency. Implementation of the proposed regulations would effectively reverse the Congressional intent of over a decade to alleviate the social and physical ills which lead people into poverty.

The most shocking regulation is the one which removes any Federal responsibility over day care standards. Both in 1971 and 1972 we voiced our objections to the DHEW's attempts to weaken the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. Instead of strengthening the requirements, the proposed regulations would completely eliminate them just as the Department is completing a two-year study of how best to improve them. We urge the issuance of adequate day care standards, based on the Department's study, as soon as possible.

We are completely opposed to the proposed regulations which would deny all services to the working poor. The proposed regulations will severely limit the availability of day care and other services by sharply narrowing the eligibility requirements. The new level of income at which people will no longer be eligible for these services is, in most states, far lower than the poverty level. This will mean that large numbers of low income families will be completely shut out from Federally assisted day care and other programs.

We particularly object to the proposed regulation which eliminates private donations as a source of state matching funds for Federally financed programs. This change would seriously undermine the excellent private-public partnership approach to the solution of human problems and is certainly in conflict with the Administration's professed reliance on the voluntary sector.

consider even further than they are doing now what they can contribute to the communities in which they operate. One of the pressing needs in this country is for people in business to think about what they can contribute, not just what they can earn. More and more, when I view the very difficult tasks that I have lying ahead of me, I recall John Kennedy's Inaugural Address, when he said those famous words: "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

If that was an appropriate remark, and I believe it was, in 1961, then it is even more appropriate today. There are a lot of people who feel very disenchanted with our Government. There is a very deep feeling, and the word has been used repeatedly, of alienation on the part of the public toward our institutions of government. I think this is something that obviously has to disturb and concern all of us, whether we are involved in the Executive Branch, the Legislative Branch of Government, or whether we are just viewing it as interested citizens.

As the panelists discuss today the proper balance between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch of Government, I would hope that you would find a way to consider this sweeping alienation, to see if that kind of balance can have some impact on that problem. And I would hope that all of you would agree with me that the kind of alienation we are observing across the nation is a very ominous factor in a democracy.

But I hasten to say that the topic and the discussion are yours for today. I just want to venture this comment: please, panelists, leave some powers to the Executive Branch of the Government.

I am here to welcome you, and I do that warmly. Ours is the heartland state of the nation. Illinois contains, right within its borders, much of the diversity that, as TIME magazine has frequently pointed out over the years, is the very essence of our nation of America. Illinois salutes Time on its 50th anniversary, and I thank each and every one of you for participating here today.

Mr. GRUNWALD. Thank you for your very generous and warm introduction.

I would like to take a moment to explain just why we are here. As Mr. Walker has mentioned, of course, this is in a sense a birthday party, and it is one of a series of functions that we are holding to mark the 50th anniversary of TIME magazine and our parent company, Time Inc. Some of you may feel that this is a somewhat odd way to have a birthday party, to meet relatively early in the morning and talk about a serious subject like Congress. More conventionally, a birthday celebration should consist of champagne toasts, song, dance, and above all, congratulations.

We are not against any of this in its proper place, because my colleagues and I are admittedly proud and happy that what our founder, Henry Luce, used to call "this little magazine with the red border" has reached the half-century mark, and I must say that as I contemplate the national bicentenary approaching, it is rather awesome to contemplate that we have, as a magazine, been on this scene for fully one-quarter of our country's history.

I am also somewhat overcome when I contemplate this extraordinary century that we have lived through, and how much of it our magazine was fortunate enough to be able to witness and to report, and perhaps in a small way influence. We are proud that we have been able to help inform the American public and sometimes, I assume, to amuse it and occasionally even to annoy or provoke it. And we are pleased that we have been able to contribute at least a few new forms to American journalism.

However, having said all that, we still do not really feel in the mood for self-congratulation. We would rather celebrate by

doing something useful and by performing a public service.

It was with this in mind that Hedley Donovan, the Editor-in-Chief of all of our publications, gave us a rather large assignment, which was to try to bring back to public view the vital importance the role Congress must play in the proper functioning of our Government. And if you agree with me that the hopes not only of our own people but also a great part of the world still hang on the right and proper function of that Government, then surely our assignment is well worth the effort, and your cooperation is particularly welcome and necessary.

There are many other problems besides Congress on the national agenda. But it seems to me that none of them stand a decent chance of solution unless Congress can play its proper part.

What has happened in the last few years is really a profound shift in the balance of American Government. Throughout the 19th century we had what Woodrow Wilson called congressional Government. Congress initiated legislation, formulated policy, and the President either approved or vetoed it. Today we have almost an exactly reverse situation, where the President initiates legislation and formulates national policy, and Congress usually just modifies, approves or rejects it.

I would like to add hastily that this did not happen because of a series of power-mad men in the White House. It happened because of some really very complex and staggering historic forces. Not did it happen because of any one individual. We are not taking aim at any particular President. In fact, we hope that President Nixon who, after all, is a lawyer, a strict constructionist and a former member of both houses of Congress, may take an interest in these proceedings at some point.

Most of you are familiar with the excellent working paper prepared for this session by Professor Charles Jones, from whom we shall hear in just a few moments. In that paper Professor Jones calls on the press to play a much larger part in drawing attention to Congress and perhaps to pay a little less attention to what he calls the "President and his court." You may have noted in that paper that Professor Jones chides us journalists because we apparently were unable to come up with a better sex symbol in national politics than Henry Kissinger. Professor Jones observes that no matter how unglamorous members of Congress may be, some surely have more sex appeal than Dr. Kissinger.

You see, the point is that as Kissinger has himself observed on many occasions, "power is a great aphrodisiac." He has also ruefully predicted that all those luscious young things he is always seen with around the world will stay interested in him only as long as he holds power.

This observation may seem frivolous to you and not quite pertinent, although I submit that it is, because even on a far more serious level, power is the issue, the tremendous appeal that presidential power exerts on the country and even the power held by those in the President's orbit. To see congressional power and presidential power in perspective and perhaps to help redress the balance between them, Professor Jones calls on the press and the public together to take the initiative, and that is precisely what we hope to do here today. With your help, we hope to do our share in rescuing Congress from anything like becoming the forgotten branch, to make its remarkable and unique responsibilities better understood, and to perhaps sketch out, if we can, a few possible solutions to its problems.

Now, may I introduce our first speaker, Professor Jones. In any list of congressional scholars, he surely stands at the very top. You have before you a small booklet that gives the credentials of our speakers, and you will see from it that Professor Jones has at-

tended an extraordinarily interesting group of schools and that he has written widely on Congress. He happens to be at work at the moment on a book about air pollution, which seems to be somewhat out of his field, but then maybe it is not. Professor Jones certainly is one intellectual who does understand Congress. Gentlemen and ladies, Professor Jones.

Dr. JONES. While I am pleased to be at this distinguished gathering, I confess I have found my assignment somewhat frustrating. First, I was charged to discuss congressional leadership and proposed reforms. Well, I have a confession to make to you. I was born and raised in South Dakota, and there is a lot of evidence to suggest that this is not the year for anyone from South Dakota to be recommending change—even those of us who stayed in teaching.

A second frustration, is the Congress is just a damn difficult thing to describe and analyze. As the most democratic, representative, and powerful legislative body in the world, it is basically an untidy set of institutions. And when we go about changing Congress we are faced with the difficult challenge of trying to improve its capabilities without destroying its functions.

Let me say a bit more about the second frustration because it is central to what I state in my written paper. I once paraphrased Pogo for a title of an essay on Congress: "We have met the Congress and they are us." I like that because it emphasizes the representational aspects of Congress, suggesting that whatever is wrong with Congress may also reflect ills in the society. It also provides a standard for evaluating Congress and what it does. Congress should be "us" does not mean that it can resolve all the issues, any more than you and I can resolve all the issues that might divide us. We must be super-careful, then, not to base change simply on what one group in society may want at any one particular time.

So let's emphasize right off that Congress is not some side show. It is and should be center stage in national politics. Continuing the theatrical analogy at this point requires the imagery of a fantastic number of cues coming from the wings. It is almost as though a hundred dress rehearsals for the same play were occurring at once, with curtain time imminent.

All this describes Congress pretty much as a mess, and I can understand why some people do not want to become involved. It is easy to throw up your hands and/or make fun of the U.S. Congress. Lots of people do just that. But let me say this—those who do are really making light of themselves, the nation, and its problems. For Congress is an editorial on us; it is social commentary; it is a mirror with considerably less distortion than most of those we stare into.

I accept representation as an important function of Congress and I don't want it destroyed in the name of efficiency. But I do want Congress to be more effective. And I want that because I believe in a strong legislature. For example, when a presidential landslide occurs, I don't want to be forced to depend upon the humility of the President as a check on Executive power—whether that President be Richard M. Nixon or Lyndon B. Johnson. I am non-partisan in my support of legislative power vis-a-vis the Executive.

How can Congress become more effective? Surely much depends on leadership. Presently Congressional leadership is diffused among committee and sub-committee chairmen, and party leaders.

Strengthening party leaders—increasing their visibility and providing them with more control of the legislative process—is one way to improve the effectiveness of Congress, in my view. I draw from Woodrow Wilson's classic treatise, *Congressional Government*, for the title of my paper. "Somebody must be trusted," Wilson said, "in order that when

things go wrong it may be quite plain who should be punished." Party leaders in Congress presently don't have enough authority for us to hold them accountable for what goes on there. It is not simply a matter of the current stable of party leaders—though I count them all quite weak, and I think history will sustain that assessment. It is also a matter of what they can do in the present mode of accountability.

Now, in my paper I suggest some changes in Congress itself that may strengthen party leaders. But I caution that all reform proposals must be evaluated by a test of political feasibility since one of the stark realities is that "Congress may change, but it reforms itself."

I also suggest a number of changes outside Congress, particularly in coverage by the media. As Morris Udall has said in his most recent book, *Education of a Congressman*, "Congress will never reform itself through internal pressures alone."

Party leaders need attention and support among the public as a source of power with their colleagues. Some leaders have been able to attain this by sheer power of personality and skill—for example, Everett M. Dirksen, Lyndon B. Johnson and Sam Rayburn. The current group has not been so fortunate.

I hope the media can be persuaded to expand positive coverage of Congress. President Nixon has already indicated that he plans no dramatic new programs. Thus, it seems to be a good time for the media to focus on Congress. A period of consolidation is the perfect time to analyze the role of Congress as a prelude to increasing its effectiveness.

In reflecting on the qualities of the model congressional party leaders, I finally settled on what I might call the "intelligent partisan." By that I mean a person who combines conviction, common sense and ability. In my judgment such men as Robert A. Taft, Lyndon B. Johnson, Oscar W. Underwood, Thomas B. Reed, among others, fit the model of the "intelligent partisan." And in preparing for this meeting I reread sections of William A. Robinson's biography of Speaker Reed—certainly one of the most intelligent of partisans to lead the House of Representatives. Reed assumed the speakership in 1889 at a time when the House of Representatives had very nearly ceased to function due to procedural tie-ups. He took charge of the chamber and calmly enforced procedures designed to move it off dead center.

Later he modestly reflected: "Great events do turn upon one man. The House of Representatives was ready and ripe for change, and the people stood ready to approve. What all the world wanted was easy to do."

I believe a similar opportunity may be upon us. But those in Congress who want change need support from those outside who have studied history enough to know that if the legislature fails, democracy fails.

Thank you.

CONGRESS HAS THE POWER, DO WE HAVE THE WILL TO CONTROL FEDERAL SPENDING?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I have requested a special order today and have asked several of my colleagues to join me in special orders to dramatize the importance of the primary issue before this Congress: That is control of the Federal budget. No issue affects more Americans than the manner in which the Federal Government spends tax dollars. The onus of responsibility for facing fiscal reality is upon each of us. I am grateful

that my colleagues are willing to participate in this effort to serve notice to other Members of Congress and to the American people, that the dual plagues of higher taxes and inflation are not inevitable.

During recent weeks the furor has mounted over the administration's proposed budget, with its proponents describing it as a responsible and necessary effort to combat higher taxes and inflation and its critics citing it as an abject and callous disregard of Federal responsibility. In Congress the debate has often involved concern over supposed "usurpation" of congressional prerogatives by the executive branch. The fact that the administration has proposed the elimination or substantial modification of a vast number of categorical programs is taken as further evidence of this "usurpation."

The simple truth is that over the years—and especially within the past decade—Congress has failed to exercise the kind of restraint which is necessary if the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government is to be upheld. We have opposed higher taxes, and we have deplored inflation. At the same time we have proceeded to create and enlarge an array of programs which has hugely increased Federal spending. And we have done so knowing full well—although we have seldom admitted it—that all of this increased spending had to result eventually in higher taxes or more inflation.

Despite that reality, the Democratic leadership insists on bringing up legislation precipitously and with great rapidity for no other reason than to frustrate the attempts by those of us on both sides of the aisle and in the administration who believe that Congress should not be considering these bills without first giving consideration to an overall spending ceiling and reform of the congressional budget process. The first 15 bills on which this Congress will be acting, if passed, would result in an estimated 5 percent tax increase to pay for them. And we see no legislation introduced that might provide the needed revenue. The reason is clear. Who here in this Congress, running for election in his home State last year, campaigned on a platform of higher taxes or more inflation? And yet now that the election is over and we are back in Washington, some Members seem determined to push ahead with the same kind of Federal spending which we know will mean higher taxes or more inflation or both.

Fundamental national issues, such as maintaining a growing economy, halting inflation, keeping the budget under control, establishing national priorities, cannot be effectively dealt with under the present congressional structure. Congress still has the power but has abdicated its authority simply because it lacks the machinery to use its authority wisely. The top priority of this Congress is to develop a process which will allow us to get a handle on the budget, view it in totality, and establish a ceiling on the budget, before the usual rituals of log-rolling and pork-barreling begin to make their bid for what is available.

While the notion of impoundment does not sit well with me, I cannot in good

conscience condemn an executive action which aims to achieve a result in the general interest which cannot in any other way be met. And clearly, budget responsibility cannot be achieved under current congressional processes.

I have cointroduced legislation which will help meet that challenge to Congress to reform its own fragmented approach to budgetmaking. The bill, originating in the Senate by Senator BROCK of Tennessee, would establish the machinery to enable Congress to arrive at its own spending priorities. Our bill would require not only Congress as a body, but each individual Member, to face up to the duty to curb spending and stop the steady erosion of budgetary power to the executive branch.

The bill covers five major points:

First. Designate a joint congressional committee to formulate a legislative budget and evaluate the Federal budget in terms of priorities.

Second. Require the projection of all major expenditures over a 5-year period.

Third. Require all major spending programs to be evaluated at least once every 3 years.

Fourth. Require consideration of pilot testing of proposed major Federal programs.

Fifth. Require all Federal expenditure programs to be appropriated annually by Congress.

Is it too much for the public to expect us to abandon our old ways—our assorted allegiances to pet programs and projects? A number of Members—on both sides of the aisle—have shown that we can and must face fiscal reality, that we can and must kick the habit and sacrifice self-interest in behalf of the Nation's good. The freshman Members of this Congress performed a valuable service by speaking, in a special order last week, of their and Congress responsibilities to act with fiscal responsibility. In the weeks and months ahead, in the votes on programs which we will be considering and, should it come to pass, on votes to override Presidential vetoes, let us hope that those advocating fiscal responsibilities will prevail. If we do not prevail, I fear we will witness more erosion of congressional influence. If we do prevail, however, it will be a significant step in returning the Congress to its proper role in the affairs of the Nation and assuring the people of this country that inflation and higher taxes can be avoided.

INTIMIDATION AND BLACKMAIL BY SELF-STYLED PROTEST GROUPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was startled and dismayed to have read in last Tuesday's edition of the Washington Evening Star and Daily News an account of a meeting which took place in the Old Senate Office Building the preceding day. That meeting suggests the extent to which public officials now engaged in the fight to hold down Federal spending may, as a result, be subjected to the intimidation and blackmail—the threats of disorder and violence—which

have become the chief instruments of so many self-styled protest groups during the past decade.

This meeting was said to be one in a series designed to draw together a variety of such groups in a common front of opposition to the Nixon administration's declared desire to cut back on the vast array of wasteful Federal programs which have been enacted in recent years. The strategy outlined at the meeting is familiar. There will be a so-called spring offensive featuring the same kind of mass marches and demonstrations which these groups have used in the past to attract the attention of the media to themselves.

Mr. Speaker, while no one more ardently supports the constitutionally protected rights of free speech and assembly than I, it is only realistic to recognize what lies at the very heart of this spring offensive. These people know, just as every member knows, indeed as every reasonably well informed American knows, that violence is an almost inevitable corollary to, if not the conscious goal of, the kind of irresponsible protests which these groups state. Despite all the grave assurances of their leaders, their activities invariably result in violations of the law not infrequently accompanied by destruction of property and bloodshed.

That the plans for these demonstrations carry an implicit threat of disorder and violence is clear from the reported remarks of one leader at the meeting. He told his audience that the spring "is going to get hot" and that they "must use that heat." Mr. Speaker, that spokesman's imagery calls all too readily to mind the riots, chaos, and anarchy which have been visited upon American cities in recent years. It calls all too readily to mind another singularly "hot spring" when looters and arsonists ran rampant through the Nation's Capital and entire neighborhoods of this city were engulfed in flame.

I do not wish to impugn the intentions or the sincerity of those members of responsible organizations who seek only to demonstrate in peace their concerns on issues of the day. But the history of recent years teaches us what we must now expect when masses of protesters take their dissent into the streets in an atmosphere made ripe for violence by predictions of "hot springs" and exhortation to "use that heat."

It is not surprising that many professional protesters would engage in such coercive tactics to influence the outcome of the present debate on fiscal responsibility. Indeed, it would be surprising if they did not band together to save those extravagant Federal programs in which they have so large a vested interest.

Mr. Speaker, the hard economic decisions which Members of Congress are going to be making in the weeks and months ahead are far too important for us to allow ourselves to be intimidated by irresponsible pressure groups. Let us keep the air clear and hope that, after almost a decade, the violent furies and passions which we have witnessed so often in recent years have now spent themselves and that the spring of 1973 will be more temperate than the practi-

tioners of intimidation and coercion might wish.

FACTS BELIE CHARGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, despite the great gains which have been made by the present administration in effecting a constructive balance between the resources which we devote to military purposes and those which we devote to human needs, its critics continue to charge that unnecessary and undue emphasis is being placed on the former at the expense of the latter. They ignore the fact that this administration has brought an end to the excessively costly war in Vietnam. They ignore the fact that it has made massive reductions in uniformed personnel. They ignore the fact that it has negotiated historic agreements which will enable the major world powers, including the United States, to curtail the arms race. They ignore these and other military economies, just as they ignore the fact that expenditures for human needs have been dramatically increased.

Although these realities are clearly reflected by the administration's proposed budget, the critics are making the same old charge—about that very budget—to much for the military, too little for the people. But the facts belie the charge, and, when this debate is ended, the people are going to know the facts.

Since this administration took office the number of men and women in uniform has been reduced by one-third—from 3.5 million to 2.2 million—and we now have the smallest armed force since 1950. Defense spending today actually takes less out of the American economy than it has at any time in nearly a quarter of a century. Furthermore, more than half of the present defense budget is devoted to personnel costs—the price of instituting the all-volunteer force for which the American people have indicated they are willing to pay.

In short, the defense budget has been pared down to the absolute minimum. The fat is gone; only the muscle is left. To cut any farther would result in an unacceptable degree of military vulnerability.

Furthermore, additional reduction of the defense budget would seriously jeopardize future negotiations with the Soviet Union and China—negotiations which should result in even greater military savings through a continued lessening of world tension and additional limitations on the arms race, and in even greater non-military benefits through increased trade and cooperation in health, science and other fields. Just as the historic diplomatic triumphs of last year depended upon negotiation from strength, so the success of future diplomatic efforts will depend upon our maintaining a credible defense capability. That is precisely what President Nixon's defense budget does.

Now, let us compare defense spending with human resource spending 10 years ago and today. The 1964 defense budget provided for approximately \$53.5 billion,

compared to an allotment of less than \$34.5 billion for human needs. Defense spending claimed 45.2 percent of the total budget, compared to 28.9 percent for human needs.

This administration's 1974 budget reversed this ratio, with just over \$81 billion or 30.2 percent for defense and approximately \$125.5 billion for 46.7 percent for human needs.

Whereas in the 1964 budget some 8.8 percent of our gross national product was allocated for defense purposes with only 5.6 percent for human needs, in President Nixon's 1974 budget 6.2 percent of the GNP is designated for defense spending with 9.5 percent for human needs.

And there can be absolutely no argument that there have not been tremendous increases in specific areas of social program spending during the past 4 years. Here are the facts:

Federal outlays which benefit the elderly will total \$63.5 billion in 1974, an increase of 71 percent since 1970.

Federal food aid increased nearly 3½ times from \$1.2 billion in 1969 to \$4.1 billion in 1974.

Total Federal funds benefitting the sick have grown from \$18.1 billion to \$30.3 billion, or 67 percent, in the last 4 years.

Federal outlays for direct benefits to low-income persons increased 88 percent from \$16.1 billion to \$30.3 billion since the Nixon administration took office.

In 1969, outlays for income security programs were \$37.7 billion; by 1974, they will have more than doubled, to \$87.6 billion.

Outlays for special benefits for disabled coal miners—black lung—have increased from \$10.4 million in 1970, the first year of the program, to an estimated \$965 million in 1974.

Research on cancer and heart disease, the two greatest causes of death in the United States, has increased 117 percent since 1969 to a new total of \$765 million.

Federal funds for drug abuse prevention and drug law enforcement programs have increased from \$82 million to \$785 million since 1969, a 10-fold increase.

Since 1969, funds for student grants and work-study have increased nearly four-fold by \$700 million, with the numbers of awards increasing by more than 1.5 million.

Federal support for minority businesses, either in direct Federal funds or in Federal loan guarantees, will increase to \$1,100 million in 1974, up from \$700 million in 1972 and \$200 million in 1969.

Outlays for all air, water, and other pollution control and abatement have increased from \$7.7 billion in fiscal year 1969 to \$3.1 billion in fiscal year 1974. Outlays for waste treatment grants have increased from \$135 million to \$1.6 billion in these same years.

Federal funding for Indian programs in the Department of the Interior has more than doubled between fiscal years 1969 and 1974, going from \$270 million to \$618 million.

Loan and grant obligations under the USDA community development programs increased from \$1.3 billion in 1969 to \$2.9 billion in 1974.

To suggest, then, that the administra-

tion of the Republican President is against social programs, callous toward human needs or stingy with spending to meet people's personal problems has to be inspired by motives other than accuracy. With the end of the war in Vietnam and tight restrictions on military spending—except in the human areas of more pay and allowances for manpower—priorities for Federal spending have truly been reversed by President Nixon.

Now, a way must be found to keep all Federal spending under control, to end deficits and to stop inflation. That may be a lot more difficult than perpetually increasing the outlays in the name of social concern.

These are the facts, and they accurately reflect the most basic goals of the present administration—to reorder our national priorities in accord with the realities of the 1970's and to make our Government a more responsive and effective servant of the people.

CURTAIL SPENDING TO CONTROL INFLATION

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note briefly one feature of the present debate over curtailment of Federal spending which seems to have eluded some of our colleagues and yet which may be of considerable significance to them when the time comes to return to the hustings and account for their votes. As representatives of that branch of the Federal Government which is supposed to be most responsive to the people, some Members of Congress are showing surprising ignorance of the public mood on this question.

Consider, for example, a poll taken by Lou Harris just 1 month ago which showed that the American people agreed—by a 59- to 28-percent margin—that "President Nixon is right in saying that inflation cannot be controlled unless Federal spending is cut to the bone." Evidently, the general public has a better grasp of the basic economic issue involved in the present debate than do many Members of Congress. Evidently, the people can recognize, if some of their representatives cannot, that continued escalation of massive Federal spending must lead to higher taxes, greater inflation, or both.

And the people reject these two alternatives. Specifically, they overwhelmingly endorse President Nixon's alternative—to put a realistic limit on Federal spending.

A Gallup poll of last December showed that by 54 to 39 percent the public backs the President on holding down spending and taxes as opposed to congressional efforts to devote even more money to social programs. And a Harris poll taken in mid-February revealed that—51 to 37 percent—the people agree that "Congress is wrong in opposing the President's spending program and should cooperate more with him."

Those in Congress who are ignoring this sentiment, those who are insisting

on pursuing policies which will sustain inflation and require more taxes, are only contributing further to Congress' unfortunate reputation for fiscal irresponsibility. Ironically, some of these same Members are among those who speak out most loudly about the prerogatives of the legislative branch as opposed to the executive branch. And yet it has been their votes, inflating the Federal bureaucracy and requiring the ineffective expenditure of billions more of the taxpayers' dollars, which have so greatly detracted from the Congress' effectiveness—as has been documented by yet another Harris poll of last month which found the public giving Congress negative marks for its performance by a 45- to 38-percent margin, while giving President Nixon high marks by a margin of 59 to 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, if these Members of Congress choose to ignore the will of the public—of, it might be added, a public all too well-informed on the issue of Federal spending—then I say they do it at their peril. If they choose to continue to vote in behalf of the special interests which are served by the myriad programs so haphazardly created in recent years, then I say again they do it at their peril.

It is too late in the game for them to hope that the public will forget who served the special interests at its expense. The people know the score, and they will settle accounts at the polls with those of their representatives who ignore it.

IMPOUNDMENT OF FUNDS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VEYSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the present, ongoing consideration of the administration's proposed budget and many of the various programs which it seeks to modify or eliminate, the proponents of continued irresponsible Federal spending have raised a number of false issues. Among them, in my opinion, is what they choose to identify as a constitutional crisis over the so-called impoundment of funds appropriated by Congress.

If, indeed, we are experiencing such a constitutional crisis, then it is one which the Nation has survived for a century and a half. In fact, it is a constitutional crisis extending all the way back to Thomas Jefferson, who was accused of the same thing with which President Nixon is now charged. I do not doubt that virtually every President has "impounded" funds. Certainly, every President who has held office in the past 25 years has done so.

President Truman withheld funds which Congress specifically provided for Air Force expansion and for construction of the aircraft carrier *United States*; President Eisenhower withheld funds specifically provided for an anti-ballistic-missile system; President Kennedy withheld funds specifically provided for the B-70 bomber; and President Johnson withheld funds specifically provided for a nuclear-powered frigate and for highway construction.

And yet the Nation has survived.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to reconcile the logic of those who criticize President Nixon for reserving Federal funds with the past habits of Congress itself. We will vote to limit the budget, to put a ceiling on the national debt, and then we will proceed to appropriate funds in excess of our own announced constraints. We cannot direct the President to hold overall spending to a certain level and simultaneously require that he make individual outlays which, in total, go beyond that level.

Clearly there must be a degree of Presidential discretion, and clearly there always has been.

Then, why are we hearing all of the talk about a constitutional crisis? Fundamentally, I believe it reflects a misplaced, if justified, concern on our part about congressional prerogatives—a concern which happens to coincide with the efforts of a strong President to effect basic and long-overdue governmental reform.

If the boldness of the President's proposals is a challenge to Congress, our best response would be to address ourselves constructively to the problems which have created the need for that reform. And, certainly, major among these is the problem of excessive, inflationary Government spending. Our best response, in fact, would be to exercise fiscal restraint right here in this House—at the very beginning of the Federal spending process.

Rather than spending our days in the tangle of an irrelevant "constitutional crisis," let us take the initiative in eliminating waste and in restoring to the Federal Government sound economic practices.

WILSON SPEAKS OUT ON TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNMENT AT WOUNDED KNEE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, negotiations at Wounded Knee are still going on without much success. I am pleased to note that my colleague in the other body, Senator McGOVERN, has finally come out with a law-and-order stance at Wounded Knee that parallels the sentiments of my special order on Wounded Knee of last week.

As quoted in the Argus Leader on March 15, Senator McGOVERN was quoted as saying that "every reasonable effort at negotiation has failed. Every concession made by the Government has been matched with yet another American Indian Movement demand. We are at the point where we are either going to enforce the law, or we are not," he said.

As the Members of the House know, I concur with these sentiments and share the feelings of Mr. McGOVERN when he says that "the law must be enforced, and those who have broken the law must be arrested and pay the penalties under the law."

Dick Wilson, president of the Oglala Sioux tribal government, has been much maligned by AIM. In a letter to the Minneapolis Star he has spoken out on

the history leading up to the establishment of a tribal government by legal and democratic means. I would like to take this opportunity to share this letter with my colleagues as a point of interest in reference to the present confrontation at Wounded Knee:

A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE OGLALA SIOUX

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Following is a letter to The Star from Dick Wilson, president of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, with headquarters at Pine Ridge, S.D. Wilson has been sharply criticized by leaders of the American Indian Movement, who have occupied Wounded Knee, which is on the Oglala reservation. The letter presents Wilson's version of events leading up to the Wounded Knee occupation.)

To the Editor: During the last few days I have been reading what the white man's newspapers have been saying about the goings-on on our reservations. It has made me really wonder. Why don't the reporters try to find out what's going on before they start writing?

If you want to know what is going on at Wounded Knee now, you have to understand what has been happening to our people for the last hundred years. After the United States army invaded our country and our warriors finally had to surrender in 1877, the United States set up an occupation government for us.

We were run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and on our reservation the superintendent was the mayor, the city council and the chief judge, all rolled in one. He really was a tin god. Yes, there were also some Indian spokesmen, but they were nothing but puppets.

Our occupation government lasted for a long time. More than 50 years passed before the first change came. Under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 we were finally given a chance to set up our own government. we did that by vote of the people in 1935. A majority of the people voted to set up our self-government but there was strong minority against it. A lot of people had been used to being run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and wanted to keep it that way.

Our self-government was set up by a vote of 1,348 for and 1,041 against. The opponents of self-government, the people who preferred paternalism, have been agitating against our tribal government for a long, long time.

But our tribal self-government has existed since 1935. The people elected a president and a tribal council in accordance with our tribal constitution. The council passes ordinances and the president and his staff have to carry them out.

The present council and I, as president, were elected by the voters of the Oglala Sioux Tribe in the tribal election of December 1971. I received 1,554 votes and my opponent received 1,130 votes. We were the top two candidates in the primary, where there were six candidates. The councilmen were elected in the same election, each of them running from his district. We have no political parties in our tribe. Each candidate runs on his own.

Since we took office in 1972, the council and I have tried to run the affairs of the tribe to the best of our ability. It is a hard job. Our people have lots of problems and we need more help than we have been getting. But we have tried hard and we have tried to do our best. Everybody knows now who is in charge on this reservation.

Those who haven't liked the tribal government since it was set up are not just agitating against me personally but against a tribal government that takes charge. They really don't want their own people to run the affairs of the reservation. They believe in paternalism.

I believe in tribal self-government and Indian people speaking up for themselves. But I don't believe in taking hostages, in

threatening lives. And I don't believe in disrupting government operations. I think that is plain stupid: it doesn't help a single Indian.

That's why I have been opposed to the AIM. Because I spoke my mind, the AIM people have been against me and have made threats against me and my family.

Some of the paternalists on our reservation who want to abolish the tribal government and go back to being run by the superintendent have linked up with the same people who tore up the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington. That is what has happened at Wounded Knee. Both sides have only one interest, to embarrass the tribal government of the Oglala Sioux Tribe.

But we are going to stick to our jobs. We are going to see to it that we have law and order on our reservation and we are going to do our very best to give our people a better life. What we are asking the newspapers to do is to be fair to us. Is that too much?

DICK WILSON.

LEGISLATION TO REPEAL THE 3-CENT-A-POUND MEAT TARIFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (ST GERMAIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, all of us here, along with housewives throughout the country, are well aware of skyrocketing food costs.

But, the point is driven home with tremendous force by the most recent Labor Department wholesale price index which shows that food prices rose in February at the alarming adjusted annual rate of 19.2 percent.

By any standard, that kind of advance in food prices, the highest for any single month since 1951—the days of the Korean war—cannot be tolerated. The burden simply is too great, especially for those of low or fixed incomes.

On March 15 I introduced a bill that is not offered as a palliative, but as a real contribution to attempt to lower some of the pressure on the cost of food.

My bill would eliminate: First, the 3-cent-a-pound duty now being charged against every pound of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef imported into this country; and second, the 2½-cent-per-pound duty now being levied on mutton.

Certainly, in the midst of a crisis in the cost of food, there can be no reason for this Nation to impose a tariff on meat at a time when meat is in such short supply that prices are out of reach of many families. And, the end is not in sight.

My interest in the Nation's meat supply goes back some years. I was among the first to urge the Nixon administration to broaden the meat import quotas so as to allow more meat to enter the country. I am happy to be able to compliment President Nixon on his earlier decision to lift meat import quotas completely for all of 1973.

Wise as that decision was, it is not enough.

This Nation must go further by wiping out the tariff which simply adds 3 cents a pound to the price of meat bought by consumers.

At this juncture, there can be no justification for continuation of that import duty. We badly need the meat being imported; we certainly need to do every-

thing possible to curb the increase in prices.

In dealing with this question of the 3-cent-a-pound tariff on foreign meat, we must be aware that most of that meat is used for manufacturing meat. A study completed only last year by the U.S. Tariff Commission showed that 92 percent of imported meat is used for manufacturing purpose—hamburger, sausage, cold cuts. Only a very small portion, about 8 percent, is sold as table meat.

Those official figures demonstrate clearly that imported meat does no harm at all to American cattle producers, but that imported meat does help restrain the price of those great American staples—the hamburger, the hotdog, and sandwich meats.

I would hope this House would find it imperative that we act quickly to repeal the tariff on imported meat. It is high time to give some help to consumers. This is the time to translate our sentiments into very real action—by dropping a tariff which is helping no one and hurting everyone.

MASS TRANSIT AND THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (MS. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

MS. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, of which I am privileged to be a member, began hearings on the 1973 highway bill.

While there are many issues and questions facing us in the consideration of this legislation, none is more critical than that of providing funds for mass transit, including the question of whether some portion of the highway trust fund should be made available for such purposes.

I include the text of my opening statement and of my bill, H.R. 5573, in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG

We are this morning beginning hearings in preparation for the writing of legislation which I expect will mark a turning point in the history of Federal government involvement with transportation in America. We are on the threshold of realizing and acknowledging that that one aspect of transportation—roads and highways—cannot be considered or dealt with in a vacuum, but that we must consider all of our basic forms of public transportation on a coordinated basis.

The 1970 census showed that 73.5 percent of the American people—about 150 million of us—lived in urban areas; in addition, a substantial portion of the remaining 26.5 percent commute to and from urban areas to earn their living. As our nation has become more and more crowded, the use of the private automobile as a basic form of transportation in our urban areas has become increasingly inefficient and damaging to our environment. It is now clear that the future of transportation in our urban areas must be in the form of such modes as bus and rail transportation.

We simply do not have room for all the cars.

Also, we cannot breathe the air. In Southern California, a serious attempt is now being made to cut back substantially on the availability of gasoline for private cars. The absence of mass transportation in and around

our urban areas has led to such a glut of private cars on the road that even the commercial traffic for which the Interstate System was in large part built is unable to move expeditiously from place to place.

Thus, I believe that making a portion of the money in the Highway Trust Fund available for mass transit purposes will not only afford our urban areas the kind of transportation systems they need and want, but will also ease the congestion on highways in and around our cities.

Last year, the Senate passed a highway bill which would have opened up a portion of the Highway Trust Fund for urban mass transit purposes. The House did not see fit to concur in that judgment and the final bill, which would have permitted the expenditure of funds out of general revenue for mass transit capital expenditures, failed to pass on the last night of the 92nd Congress. Last week, the Senate acted on its version of the 1973 highway bill, once again deciding to permit the use of funds from the urban systems portion of the highway program, \$850 million annually, for mass transit expenditures. It also voted to authorize the expenditure out of the general fund of nearly \$4 billion for both capital and operating expenses for mass transit systems.

Now, it is our turn to work our will. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 5573, which would permit all Highway Trust Fund money other than that designated for the Interstate System to be used for mass transit purposes. This would make available some \$3 billion annually out of the Highway Trust Fund for mass transit, as opposed to the \$850 million which is provided for in the Senate bill. I repeat that this will not affect the \$3.25 billion annually which is authorized for completion of the Interstate Highway System. But it will bring about a long overdue consolidation of the existing myriad of non-Interstate highway programs (such as primary, secondary, urban extension and urban systems), and will provide States and localities with the flexibility to plan rational, balanced transportation programs including mass transit.

In addition, H.R. 5573 contains an "urban pass-through" provision similar to that which I offered in committee and on the floor of the House last year. Under this provision, which appears as part of Section 10 of my bill, that portion of a State's non-Interstate funds which are attributable (on a straight population basis) to urbanized areas within the State shall be earmarked for expenditure in those urbanized areas. In any case where the local governments within the urbanized areas combined together under State law to create a metropolitan transportation agency, the funds earmarked for that urbanized area shall be made available directly to that metropolitan transportation agency. The creation of such agencies may be a difficult and time-consuming process, however, and will often involve the cooperation of two or more States. Therefore, I have also included a provision which assures all cities over 250,000 in population their fair share of the urbanized area's funds on a direct pass-through basis until the metropolitan agencies are created.

I note in connection with this provision that the bill which passed the Senate makes funds available, in the absence of a combination of the localities in the urbanized areas, only to cities with populations of 400,000 or more; thus, my bill would assure direct pass-through to substantially more localities than would the Senate bill, even in the absence of an agreement among municipalities for the creation of a metropolitan transportation agency.

I am pleased to note that the Administration, this year in the person of Secretary Claude Brinegar, is once again supporting the concept of making Highway Trust Funds money available for mass transit purposes. I do hope that this year they will really put some muscle behind their position.

I am also extremely pleased to note that our able and distinguished chairman, Congressman John Kluczynski of Chicago, has shown his capacity for statesmanship by coming around to my way of thinking about the use of Highway Trust Fund money for mass transit.

As I stated at the outset of my remarks, I believe that we stand at a turning point in the history of American transportation. I look forward to the coming week of hearings and the mark-up which will follow with great interest and anticipation.

H.R. 5573

A bill to allow States and localities more flexibility in utilizing highway funds, improve the efficiency of the Nation's highway system, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Highways and Related Transportation Systems Improvement Act of 1973".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that highway congestion, air pollution, and related safety problems are increasingly impairing the efficiency of the Nation's highway system; that the efficiency of the Nation's highway system can be improved by developing highway or related transportation systems which are tributaries to and supportive of highways; and that highways and related systems can be improved best by according to the States and local communities greater flexibility in the use of Federal assistance for highways.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) After the definition of the term "forest highway", add the following new paragraphs:

"The term 'Governor' means the chief executive officer of the State.

"The term 'highway or related transportation service' means (1) the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, operation, or maintenance of highway, bicycle paths, pedestrians walkway, equestrian trail, traffic control, or public transportation systems, facilities, or equipment (including safety facilities and equipment); (2) planning, training, research, development, and demonstration activities for such activities, and highway safety program activities; and (3) beautification, relocation, and environmental protection activities associated with any activity set forth in clause (1) or (2) of this paragraph."

(2) After the definition of the term "maintenance", add the following new paragraphs:

"The term 'population' means the total resident population based on the most recent data compiled by the Bureau of the Census and referable to the same point or period of time.

"The term 'unit of general local government' means any city, municipality, county, town, township, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State."

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 4. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended by striking out "the additional sum of \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the additional sum of \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and the additional sum of \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976", and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the additional sum of \$3,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, additional sum of \$3,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, the additional sum of \$3,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the additional

sum of \$3,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, the additional sum of \$3,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1978, and the additional sum of \$3,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1979."

INTERSTATE SYSTEM APPORTIONMENTS

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to make the apportionment for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditure on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5, House Committee Print Numbered 92-29.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 6. (a) The second paragraph of section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "twenty years" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three years" and by striking out "June 30, 1976" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1979".

(b) (1) The introductory phrase and the second and third sentences of section 104(b) (5) of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking out "1976" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such place "1979".

(2) Such section 104(b)(5) is further amended by striking out the sentence immediately preceding the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the approval by Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimate in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1976, and June 30, 1977. The Secretary shall make a revised estimate of the cost of completing the then designated Interstate System after taking into account all previous apportionments made under this section in the same manner as stated above, and transmit the same to the Senate and the House of Representatives within ten days subsequent to January 2, 1976. Upon the approval by Congress, the Secretary shall use the Federal share of such approved estimates in making apportionments for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1978, and June 30, 1979."

INTERSTATE SYSTEM ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) The fourth sentence of subsection (e)(2) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read: "The provisions of this title applicable to the Interstate System shall apply to all mileage designated under the third sentence of this paragraph, except that the cost to the United States of the aggregate of all mileage designated in any State under the third sentence of this paragraph shall not exceed the cost to the United States of the mileage approval for which is withdrawn under the second sentence of this paragraph; such costs shall be that as of the date of the withdrawal."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The authority granted by this paragraph shall expire on the date of enactment of the Highways and Related Transportation Systems Improvement Act of 1973."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding the following:

"(4) In addition to the mileage authorized by the first sentence of paragraph (1) of this subsection, there is hereby authorized additional mileage for the Interstate System to be used in making modifications or revisions in the Interstate System as provided in this paragraph. Upon the joint request of a State Governor and the local governments concerned, the Secretary may withdraw his approval of any route or portion thereof of the Interstate System within that State selected and approved in accordance with this title prior to the enactment of this paragraph, if he determines that such route or portion thereof is not essential to completion of a unified and connected Interstate System (in-

cluding urban routes necessary for metropolitan transportation) or will no longer be essential by reason of the application of this paragraph and will not be constructed as a part of the Interstate System, and if he receives assurances that the State does not intend to construct a toll road in the traffic corridor which would be served by such route or portion thereof. After the Secretary has withdrawn his approval of any such route or portion thereof the mileage of such route or portion thereof and the additional mileage authorized by the first sentence of this paragraph shall be available for the designation of such Interstate route or portions thereof within that State as provided in this subsection necessary to provide the essential connection of the Interstate System in such State in lieu of the route or portions thereof which were withdrawn. The provisions of this title applicable to the Interstate System shall apply to all mileage designated under the third sentence of this paragraph, except that the cost to the United States of the aggregate of all mileage designated in any State under the third sentence of this paragraph shall not exceed the cost to the United States of the mileage approval for which is withdrawn under the second sentence of this paragraph. Such costs shall be that as of the date of the withdrawal. Whenever the Secretary determines that such routes or portions thereof are not essential or whenever the amounts necessary for the completion of the substitute essential routes or portions thereof are less than the cost of the withdrawn route or portions thereof, the amounts remaining or the difference shall be transferred to and added to the amounts apportioned to such State and urbanized area, in which the segment was to have been constructed, for expenditure pursuant to chapter 6 of this title, except that the Federal share of project costs shall be the same as for the Interstate System."

REMOVAL OF DESIGNATED SEGMENTS OF THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Sec. 8. Section 103(g) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Secretary, on July 1, 1974, shall remove from designation as a part of the Interstate System each segment of such system for which a State has not notified the Secretary that such State intends to construct such segment, and which the Secretary finds is not necessary for continuity of traffic flows between cities. Nothing shall prohibit the consideration for substitution prior to July 1, 1975, of alternative segments of the Interstate System which will meet the requirements of this title. Any segment of the Interstate System, with respect to which a State has not submitted by July 1, 1975, a schedule for the expenditure of funds for completion of construction of such segment or alternative segment within the period of availability of funds authorized to be appropriated for completion of the Interstate System, and with respect to which the State has not provided the Secretary with assurances satisfactory to him that such schedule will be met, shall be removed from designation as a part of the Interstate System. No segment of the Interstate System removed under the authority of the preceding sentence shall thereafter be designated as a part of the Interstate System except as the Secretary finds necessary in the interest of national defense or for other reasons of national interest."

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Sec. 9. (a) Section 131(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately preceding the penultimate sentence thereof the following: "Federal-aid highway funds appropriate to a State after the first expiration occurring after January 1, 1974, of a regular session of the State legislature shall be reduced by amounts equal to 10 per centum of the amounts which would otherwise be apportioned to the State under

section 104 of this title, until such time as the State shall provide for effective control, if the Secretary determines that the State has not made provision for effective control, of the erection and maintenance along the Interstate System and the primary system of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices, the advertising or informative content of which can be seen from the main traveled way of the system."

(b) Section 131(d) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "within six hundred and sixty feet to the nearest edge of the right-of-way" by inserting in lieu thereof "at any location".

(c) Section 131(m) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(m) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, not to exceed \$27,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971, not to exceed \$20,500,000 for the fiscal year 1972, and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975. The provisions of this chapter relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section after June 3, 1967."

(d) Section 136(m) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(m) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$20,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, not to exceed \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, not to exceed \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1973, and not to exceed \$7,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975. The provisions of this chapter relating to the obligation, period of availability, and expenditure of Federal-aid primary highway funds shall apply to the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section after June 30, 1967."

NEW PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 10. Title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

Chapter 6.—HIGHWAYS AND RELATED TRANSPORTATION SERVICES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Sec.

- “601. Creation of program.
- “602. Authorization.
- “603. Allocation formula.
- “604. Comprehensive State and local transportation plans.
- “605. Records, audit, and reports.
- “606. Recovery of funds.
- “607. Rules and regulations.
- “608. Annual report.
- “609. Relocation assistance.
- “610. Highway safety programs.
- “611. Labor standards.

“CREATION OF PROGRAM

“Sec. 601. There is hereby created a highways and related transportation services improvement program under which the Secretary of Transportation shall be authorized to apportion Highway Trust Funds to States and local governments to aid them in operating, maintaining, and making improvements to highways and related transportation facilities including public transportation services. Recipients are authorized to use funds received in accordance with this section for the construction of facilities and the acquisition of public transportation equipment for highways and related transportation services within the responsibilities of governmental and quasi-governmental agencies in urbanized areas if such activities are performed in accordance with a State or local transportation plan authorized by section 604.

“AUTHORIZATION

“Sec. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated for the highways and related transportation services improvement program, out of the Highway Trust Fund, \$2,750,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and the additional sum of \$3,250,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979.

“ALLOCATION FORMULA

“Sec. 603. (a) For each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1973, and ending prior to July 1, 1980, the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall apportion 90 per centum of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 602 among the States as follows:

“(1) 50 per centum in the ratio which the population in urbanized areas in each State bears to the total population in urbanized areas in all States;

“(2) 25 per centum in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all States; and

“(3) 25 per centum in the ratio which the square root of the area of each State bears to the sum of the square roots of the areas of all States. No State shall receive less than one-half of 1 per centum of each year's total allocation to the States under this subsection.

“(b) The remaining 10 per centum shall be available for grants by the Secretary at his discretion for any highway or related transportation service he deems appropriate, but priority shall be given to assisting State, local, and regional government entities in developing and implementing comprehensive transportation plans, developing emergency systems to meet the ambient air quality standards of the Clean Air Act, constructing and improving bridges, financing research, development, and demonstration projects, and emergency relief repairs and reconstruction of serious damage resulting from natural disasters and catastrophic failures from any cause.

“(c) (1) Funds apportioned to a State pursuant to section 603(a)(1) shall be reapportioned by the State directly to urbanized areas within the State in the ratio which the population within the State of each urbanized area bears to the total population of all urbanized areas within the State.

“(2) Funds allocated to any urbanized area under section 603(c)(1) shall be available for expenditure in another urbanized area within such State only where the responsible public officials in both such urbanized areas agree to such availability.

“(3) Where the units of general purpose local government in any urbanized area shall combine together under State law to create a metropolitan transportation agency, with sufficient authority to develop and implement a plan for expenditure of funds allocated to such urbanized area pursuant to this section, funds allocated to such urbanized area under section 603(c)(1) shall be available to such metropolitan transportation agency for projects authorized by this chapter in accordance with a State or local transportation plan approved under section 604.

“(4) A transportation agency shall be considered to exist when an agency for the purposes of transportation planning has been created by the unit or units of general local government within the urbanized area which represent at least 75 per centum of the total population of the urbanized area and include the largest city. In addition each transportation agency shall have (A) representation in its executive management of the highest appropriate elected official of each participating unit of general purpose local government or, in the case of the District of Columbia, representation of the Commissioner; (B) a citizen advisory board composed of representatives of citizen groups; (C) planning authority for all urban surface modes of

transportation; (D) proportional voting based on population; and (E) authority to develop the program of projects required under section 604, except that implementation of such projects may be carried out by units of local government.

(5) Where the units of general local government in any urbanized area have not combined under State law to create a metropolitan transportation agency as defined in section 604(c)(4), a portion of the funds allocated to any such urbanized area under section 603(c)(1) shall be reallocated and available to any legally constituted municipality having a population of two hundred and fifty thousand or more within such urbanized area, in an amount which reflects the ratio which the population of each such municipality bears to the total population within the State of the urbanized area of which it is a part.

(6) Where a State reduces its allocations to support highways or related transportation services of any local government below the level of assistance which the services within the jurisdiction of that local government received in the fiscal year ending immediately preceding the date of enactment of this section, that State shall have its allocations under sections 603(a)(2) and 603(a)(3) reduced by a like amount, unless the State can demonstrate to the Secretary special circumstances which warrant such reduction in assistance.

(7) In the event that cooperation between the States is necessary in order to realize the full benefit of the provisions of this section, the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States to enter into appropriate agreements.

“COMPREHENSIVE STATE AND LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLANS

“SEC. 604. (a) A State shall be eligible to receive its allocation pursuant to section 603(a)(2) and (3) for any fiscal year if it has a comprehensive State and local transportation plan approved by the Secretary under this section. Such plan shall:

(1) provide for the development, maintenance, and operation of highways and related transportation services responsive to the needs of such State and its communities;

(2) be coordinated with local community development plans and take into consideration the social, economic, and environmental impact of the available transportation alternatives and assure adequate citizen involvement in the planning process through public hearings and related activities;

(3) include a program of projects to be undertaken with funds appropriated under 603(a)(2) and (3) such program to be submitted annually to the Department of Transportation;

(4) (A) be approved by the Governor of each State and (B) be approved with any recommended revision by a similar procedure within a period of not more than two years from the previous approval or reapproval; and

(5) be administered by a single State agency with authority for preparation and execution of such State's comprehensive transportation plan and for transportation policy and programs generally in such State.

(b) State and metropolitan transportation plans shall show how they comply with the Clean Air Act.

(c) The Secretary shall not finally disapprove any State or metropolitan plan submitted under this chapter, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State or metropolitan administering agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(d) Not to exceed 3 per centum of the allocation of each State or urbanized area under this chapter may be expended for planning and administration of the planning program.

“RECORDS, AUDIT, AND REPORTS

“SEC. 605. (a) All funds allocated under this chapter shall be properly accounted for as Federal funds in the accounts of the recipients.

(b) In order to assure that funds allocated under this chapter are used in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, each recipient shall—

(1) use such fiscal and accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure (A) proper accounting for obligations incurred and payments received by it, and (B) proper disbursement of such amounts;

(2) provide to the Secretary, on reasonable notice, access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records as he may reasonably require; and

(3) make such reports to the Secretary as he may reasonably require.

“RECOVERY OF FUNDS

“SEC. 606. (a) If the Secretary determines after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing that a recipient has failed to comply substantially with the provisions of this chapter he shall—

(1) refer the matter to the Attorney General of the United States with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action will be instituted, or

(2) notify the recipient that if corrective action is not taken within sixty days from the date of notification, funds allocated to it will be reduced in the same or succeeding fiscal year by an amount equal to the amounts which were not expended in accordance with the provisions of this chapter; or

(3) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(b) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (a)(1) of this section, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

(c) (1) Any recipient which received notice of reduction of funds allocated under subsection (a)(2) of this section may, within sixty days after receiving notice of such reduction, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such recipient is located or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a petition for review of the Secretary's action. The petitioner shall forthwith transmit copies of the petition to the Secretary and the Attorney General of the United States, who shall represent the Secretary in litigation.

(2) The Secretary shall file in the court the record of the proceeding on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. No objection to the action of the Secretary shall be considered by the court unless the objection has been urged before the Secretary.

(d) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or modify the action of the Secretary or to set it aside in whole or in part. The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. The court may order additional evidence to be taken by the Secretary, and to be made part of the record. The Secretary may modify his findings of fact, or make new findings, by reason of the new evidence so taken and filed with the court, and he shall also file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, and shall also file his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original action.

(e) Upon the filing of the record with it, the jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review

by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

“RULES AND REGULATIONS

“SEC. 607. The Secretary shall prescribe such rules, regulations, and standards as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and conditions of this chapter.

“ANNUAL REPORT

“SEC. 608. The Secretary shall make an annual transportation report to the President and the Congress pertaining to transportation requirements and to the effectiveness of programs authorized under this chapter.

“RELOCATION ASSISTANCE

“SEC. 609. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 211 of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1894), no Federal contribution in addition to funds allocated under this chapter shall be provided for relocation payments and assistance for those displaced by transportation activities assisted under this chapter.

“HIGHWAY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

“SEC. 610. Nothing in this chapter shall be interpreted as repealing the requirements in section 402(a) of this title respecting the establishment by States of highway safety programs approved by the Secretary. For the purposes of the sixth sentence of section 402(c) of this title the phrase 'Federal-aid highway funds apportioned' shall mean funds apportioned pursuant to section 104(b)(5) of this title.

“LABOR STANDARDS

“SEC. 611. (a) The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of loans or grants under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Secretary shall not approve any such loan or grant without first obtaining adequate assurance that required labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1287; 5 U.S.C. 133-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) It shall be a condition of any assistance to mass transit systems under section 601 of this chapter that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective-bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective-bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) assurances of employment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. Such arrangements shall include provisions protecting individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to sections 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 5(2)(f)). The contract for the granting of any such assist-

ance shall specify the terms and conditions of the protective arrangements."

Sec. 11. (a) Chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 323. Application of Civil Rights Act of 1964; prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex

"(a) Funds made available under this title shall be considered as Federal financial assistance within the meaning of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

"(b) No person shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal assistance under this title or carried on under this title. This provision will be enforced through agency provisions and rules similar to those already established, with respect to racial and other discrimination, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, this remedy is not exclusive and will not prejudice or cut off any other legal remedies available to a discriminate."

(b) The analysis of chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"323. Application of Civil Rights Act of 1964; prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent from the sessions of the House of Representatives last week on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 44, "nay."
On rollcall No. 45, "yea."
On rollcall No. 48, "yea."
On rollcall No. 50, "yea."

THE ST. JOE RIVER

(Mr. SYMMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years there has been pressure to preserve certain portions of our Nation by setting them aside, as wilderness or wild rivers, so that future generations would be able to visit them and see how America looked in its original, unspoiled beauty. Sizable amounts have already been set aside, and more is being considered. At the present time there are already 3.2 acres of wilderness in Idaho for every citizen in the State.

I do not believe that it was ever the intent of the Congress to destroy people's jobs and to buy up their farms and ranches in order to return areas already developed to a wilderness condition. The St. Joe River in Idaho is an area which has already been substantially developed with roads, ranches, and farming operations. If this river were to be included in the wild river system, it would impose severe hardship on many people and industries who already have investments along the river in excess of \$10 million. The restrictions imposed by a wild river classification would seriously endanger the economy of the entire area. The St. Joe river is a beautiful stream, and the

ranchers and farmers who live along it have no intention of damaging or destroying this natural beauty. The people of Idaho believe that the land can be used without abuse, and that there is nothing wrong in having available access to some of this beautiful scenery.

Since the St. Joe is not now in a primitive condition, and reclassification to wild river status would not only be expensive to the American taxpayer but destructive to the people living in the St. Joe river drainage, I sincerely hope that it can be removed from this wild river study, so the people of that area can return to a normal, productive way of life. For this reason, I am today introducing the following bill. I also include in my remarks at this time the report I received when I was in St. Maries, Idaho, in February of the Ad Hoc Committee.

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to remove the St. Joe River in the State of Idaho from consideration for designation as a wild and scenic river

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by striking out "(22) Saint Joe, Idaho: The entire main stream." and by renumbering the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

To CONGRESSMAN STEVE SYMMS—FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, STATE OF IDAHO—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR THE WILD RIVERS STUDY FOR THE ST. JOE RIVER DRAINAGE

The Ad Hoc Committee was appointed by Kenneth Norman, Forest Supervisor of the St. Joe National Forest with headquarters in St. Maries, Benewah County, Idaho to work with the Forest Service on the current Study. The Committee was composed of ten members representative of Lumbering, Mining, Railroads, Business and Environmental Interest Groups. On February 12, seven of the ten members were present at the meeting which made the following recommendations. Six of the seven members voted in favor of the recommendation with one negative vote being cast. The following is a copy of the recommendation:

We, the undersigned members of the Ad Hoc Committee, that were appointed to serve in a study of the St. Joe River in Northern Idaho to determine how much, if any, of that river should be included in the National Wild Scenic or Recreation Act do hereby request that the following statements be entered into the records of this study:

No. 1—Inclusion of the river, if approved, would impose severe Government regulations and restrictions on the use of privately owned land and greatly impair the operation of the many industries along the river which represent investments exceeding ten million dollars. The restrictions imposed on these industries could greatly endanger the economy of the area.

We oppose the constantly increasing encroachment by the Government at all levels upon the rights and privileges of private and corporate citizens.

No. 2—The undersigned feel that if controls are necessary that such controls can be administered by local government through County Comprehensive Planning Commissions which are now functioning in both Benewah and Shoshone Counties through which this river flows.

With many state laws now in effect we feel that any further laws on the Federal level is a duplication and very costly to the taxpayer. We much prefer local controls administered at the local level.

No. 3—We oppose the inclusion of the St. Joe because of the very high cost to the taxpayer in the procuring of easements and the placing of covenants over the land owned by some four hundred and fifty landowners along the river.

These easements would prove inflexible and would stop the development of many thousands of acres of land and would restrict or prohibit access by roads to areas for the economic benefit of all citizens.

No. 4—We oppose the classification of this river even through Federal owned land because it would jeopardize the movement of traffic, including logging through this corridor: Stopping the flow of natural resources to their point of manufacture and allowing them to die and become a loss to this nation is certainly not in the best effort of conservation.

No. 5—We oppose this proposal because it prevents the development of private lands by the owners for their highest and best use under the traditional system of free enterprise. Private development will eventually and surely increase the tax base of the local area whereas restricted development caused by rigid, inflexible regulations would decrease or severely limit the growth of the tax base.

No. 6—We oppose inclusion because as members of this study group, we know that it would freeze all controls for an indefinite period and could be changed only by Congressional Action, which is too rigid to allow for changes in economic needs of the area. Resources, such as timber and minerals would enjoy limited, if any, development since the logical way to reach these resources is by roads built along stream channels, a practice which would be prohibited or difficult under the Act. Development of resources would be more beneficial to all citizens of the Area and the U.S. than closing the Area for the use of a limited number of vacationers.

No. 7—Many public meetings have been held in this area in the last two years in an effort to bring this to a Concerned people. As a whole we find our populace stunned over the possibility of what might happen to them if the river becomes part of the Wild and Scenic River system.

Because of this, we feel even more a deep responsibility to see that this does not happen.

We too believe in Conservation—the preservation of the rights granted by the Constitution—that is the right of proprietorship of our land without Federal intervention.

We as members of this Committee submit the above facts, in all honesty and with conviction, as a result of extensive study of the Wild Rivers Act, as it concerns the St. Joe River in the State of Idaho.

THE INTEREST RATE CONSPIRACY AND THE INACTION OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the latest prime rate increase illustrates the total ineffectiveness of the Committee on Interest and Dividends. It makes even more ludicrous Dr. Arthur Burns' much-publicized exchange of letters and telegrams with the banks last month.

No longer do we hear from Dr. Burns as the interest rates steadily climb upward. The prime rate now stands a full three-quarters of a point above that existing before the wage-price program went into effect in August of 1971 and, more importantly, all interest rates are pushing upward and are well above the

precontrol figures. The prime rate has increased 12½ percent since the wage-price program went into effect and the administration continues to coddle its banker friends.

And once again, we will see the big banks move together on this increase and the Justice Department will sit idly by and make no attempt to prevent the financial institutions from manipulating the rates in concert.

Mr. Speaker, anyone capable of tracking an elephant in the snow ought to be able to spot the conspiracy to violate antitrust laws in the setting of the prime rate.

These latest interest rate increases will be a prime topic for the Banking and Currency Committee as it takes up the President's request for an extension of the Economic Stabilization Act. The administration has failed miserably to live up to the requirements of this act in controlling the cost of money and the Banking and Currency Committee is going to demand to know why the law has been flouted.

CONGRESSIONAL FUNDING OF PRESIDENTIAL ADVISERS

(Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, included in the proposed 1974 budget of the U.S. Government is the sum of \$121 million to fund the Executive Office of the President. Additionally, the budget proposes direct appropriations to the President of \$1 million as an emergency fund for the use of the President and \$350,000 for special expenses of management improvements. Essentially, it is proposed that this tax money be spent for the following expenses of the Government:

President's Salary and Expense Allowance	\$250,000
Care, Maintenance, and Operation of the White House	1,370,000
Domestic Advisers	1,168,000
Economic Advisers	1,376,000
Environmental Advisers	2,466,000
International Economic Councilors	1,400,000
Leaders and Coordinators for Federal Drug Abuse Prevention Activities (Including Grants)	65,199,000
National Security Advisers	2,802,000
Policy Advisers and Coordinators for Nonmilitary Emergency Preparedness Activities	9,620,000
Supervisors and Coordinators for U.S. Foreign Trade Policies	1,550,000
Telecommunication Advisers (Including Contractual Research and Development)	3,270,000
Staff Assistance and Administrative Services—White House Staff	9,110,000
Staff Assistance for Budgetary, Management, and Other Executive Responsibilities	19,600,000
Development and Implementation of Improvements in the Management, Organization, and Operation of the Executive Branch	350,000
Special Assistance to the President	675,000

Staff Assistance on Special Problems	\$1,500,000
Emergency Fund for Presidential Use	1,000,000

Mr. Speaker, this vast sum of tax money will pay the salaries of more than 2,000 employees who will assist and advise the President in one way or another. Are we in this Congress to authorize the use of tax moneys for these purposes and yet—at the whim of the President—to be precluded from asking these employees what is going on downtown?

The claim and belief that there is such a thing as executive privilege is simply a delusion dreamed up by Presidents and permitted by Congress.

As the elected President of the United States, President Nixon has a clear mandate. He is to be the leader of Government. In his wisdom, he is to propose those programs which he believes to be in the best interest of the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, the people—through their duly elected representatives—are to have the final say as to what programs are to be funded and how they are to be carried out. Once the people—through their representatives—make these decisions, the President's duty is clearly to carry out the will of the people.

Equally clear is the people's privilege to review the operations of their government—through use of their elected representatives—at any level and in any way they wish. For the President to prohibit this is to usurp the clear constitutional rights of the people.

The people—through their duly elected representatives—clearly have the power to protect their constitutional rights. Should the gentleman downtown become too arrogant in his illusions of executive privilege, then—come July 1st—the people's representatives will be fully justified in exercising the power of the purse. Money, and the lack of money, may be the only thing the gentleman clearly understands.

Funding for the Office of the President should be limited to the President's salary and expense allowance, and custodial care, maintenance, and operation of the White House. To the extent that Congress agrees that advisors for the President are necessary, we can provide the funding through the appropriate department and agency budgets.

Mr. Speaker, we can also legislate an end to the dream and illusion of executive privilege—if that is truly the wish of the people—by inclusion of a general provision in the appropriation acts to the end that—should an agency fail to provide a document requested by a duly constituted committee or subcommittee of Congress or should any of its officials or employees fail to appear and testify when requested by a duly constituted committee or subcommittee of Congress, then all appropriations to that department or agency would immediately cease to exist and all disbursing officers of Government would be legally precluded from further disbursement of funds on behalf of the department or agency involved.

Mr. Speaker, the people—through their duly elected representatives—have the

means of enforcing their will. The question remains, however, do we have the determination?

RETAIL DRUG PRICE COMPETITION

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have released a comprehensive study of the prescription drug industry which shows that American consumers are forced to pay over a billion dollars annually in unnecessary prescription drug costs because of prohibitions on retail advertising, overproductive patent laws, exorbitant promotional expenditures by industry, and unreasonable markups.

In connection with release of the report, I introduced four pieces of legislation:

H.R. 5734 requires the open dating of all perishable prescription drugs, showing clearly on the dispensed product's label the date beyond which the potency is diminished or the chemical composition altered by age;

H.R. 5735 requires the labeling and advertising of prescription drugs by their established—generic—name and an end to all laws prohibiting generic substitution by pharmacists;

H.R. 5736 would end all State prohibitions on retail prescription drug price advertising and require the posting of prices for the 100 most commonly prescribed drugs;

H.R. 5737 would make compulsory the licensing of new prescription drugs during the 17-year patent period.

Because of the wide interest expressed in this report and the accompanying legislation by Members of the House as well as consumers across the country, I include this report in the RECORD so that copies may be available to everyone:

Rx: RETAIL DRUG PRICE COMPETITION—A CONSUMER STUDY BY CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL

(Note.—Charts and ads referred to not reproduced in the RECORD.)

FOREWORD

The economic concept that competition in the marketplace weeds out poor products and disreputable businessmen is largely a myth. Competition itself is stifled by economic concentration in many industries and the power of corporations to manipulate decision-making in the marketplace is enormous: advertising and mass media selling often rely on subtle deceptions and on imagery instead of substance, and many of today's products are too complex to be easily understood and evaluated by even the most sophisticated consumer.

Each of these forces is at work at all levels of the drug industry—one of the most powerful, influential and richest segments of the American economy. In fact, at a time of high unemployment and increasing health care costs for the American people, the drug industry is reaping astronomical profits. It is a unique industry whose products are in constant demand. It also may be the most closely controlled industry in the country. It is certainly over-protected, a situation that contributes strongly to its enormous profits.

The evidence is strong that the drug industry is more concerned with its own corporate economic health than with the Ameri-

can public's medical health. This is apparent in the priorities it sets for itself, spending hundreds of millions of dollars on advertising and promotion but only a fraction of that on research and quality control. Much of the research it does conduct is not aimed at finding new cures and treatments but at adapting existing drugs for competitive purposes.

Two major segments of the drug industry—the manufacturers and the retailers—may at times be on different sides of consumer issues, but neither is willing to subordinate its profit making in behalf of lower drug prices to consumers. As a general matter, they have opposed:

Permitting open price competition on retail prescription drugs;

Filling prescriptions with identical drugs that cost less than the heavily-advertised trademarked products;

Revealing to patients to shelf life of the drugs they are using; and

Halting monopolistic practices that keep prices high.

These are some of the topics covered in this report. It is the work of a summer task force of college students led by Joel Butnick and Georganne Daher. Assisting were Robert Arbeit, Barbara Joseph and Richard Slovak, summer interns working in my Queens, New York, congressional office, and Alan Cronheim, Susan Hands, Lynda Heer, Matthew Pinkus, Peter Rosenberg and Nick TeBordo, interns assigned to the Washington, D.C. office.

Their basic assignment was to examine prescription drug prices and study the question of drug price advertising (a practice largely prohibited throughout the country) and its potential importance to and effect on consumers. Since prescription drug price advertising is considered taboo by those who dominate the pharmacy profession, it is difficult to tell exactly what its impact on consumers would be, although there is evidence that in cities such as Miami and Philadelphia, where drug advertising is permitted, prices tend to be lower than in places where it is prohibited. Researchers surveyed more than 120 drug stores in Queens, New York, and in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area during 1971 and 1972 to compare retail prescription prices under a variety of conditions. These findings also were compared with advertised prices, where the practice is permitted. Since no discussion of prescription drug price advertising can ignore other marketing and promotional practices, this study takes a close look at other aspects of the drug industry as well.

One comes away convinced that the consumer is the victim of singleminded concern for profit involving the entire drug consortium—and with the conviction that prompt action is needed to protect the consumer's economic well-being in the drug market-place.

CHAPTER I—THE PROBLEM

The American consumer spends up to \$7 billion on prescription drugs every year—an annual bill of over \$33 for each man, woman and child.

There are several reasons for the high cost of drugs—the lack of open retail price competition, over-protective patent laws, needless and exorbitant promotional expenditures, arbitrary pricing practices and unreasonable markups—but they all fall under one heading: Economic Profiteering.

It has become increasingly clear in the past few years that pharmaceutical manufacturers, whose profit rate is nearly double that of other U.S. manufacturers,¹ have

victimized the consumer. Fiercely competitive, the drug manufacturers spend \$1 billion or more annually touting their products to those who prescribe and dispense them. Joining in the battle to maintain high profits are the pharmaceutical organizations which expend enormous amounts of time, money and effort to prevent consumers from comparing the retail prices of prescription drugs. State pharmacy boards and supportive organizations, which formulate and vigorously enforce anti-advertising and anti-substitution laws, play the most significant role in keeping price information from the consumer.

Although they wrap themselves in the same cloak of piety which surrounds the medical profession, drug manufacturers and pharmacists more closely resemble business firms whose exclusive interest is profit. Excessive prices and monopolistic practices go hand in hand with the desire of most pharmacists to avoid retail price competition. Ultimately, this combination works a hardship on the sick and afflicted—all of us at one time or another.

There are signs that the drug industry itself is becoming aware of this situation. Major pharmaceutical firms have begun to stress their "low, generic prices," and a group of New York pharmacists recently expressed public alarm over the high price of drugs. Efforts at stabilization during the period of wage and price controls did nothing more than freeze prescription drug prices at unconscionable levels. During Phase III, prices are destined to go higher.

Retail price advertising—where it exists—reveals the immense disparity between prices for the identical drug and shows conclusively that where there is open price competition, the consumer pays less for the same product. Ironically, those drug products prescribed by the doctor and dispensed by the pharmacist are sold to them through the vigorous use of price advertising by drug manufacturers—a method relied on at the wholesale level but steadfastly opposed at the retail level.

The opposition to price advertising rests on self-serving, and, at best, fallacious reasoning. The widely publicized argument that pharmacists are professionals who, like doctors and lawyers, should not be compelled to advertise their prices, is specious. Unlike pharmacists, physicians and lawyers do not deal in a product. Only if the pharmacist performed an exclusive professional service as complex and individualized as that of a doctor or lawyer, might the analogy then be valid.

At one time pharmacists were viewed as physicians' associates, compounding drugs and advising patients. Today's pharmacist is a modern merchandiser, who dispenses everything from cosmetics to cigars. A physician who characterized the relationship between the doctor and the pharmacists as "remote and getting more so" recently stated: "In urban areas of the United States and Britain, few pharmacists know personally the physicians practicing in the area. In most cases the only contact is over the telephone and that is often through receptionists in the physician's office."²

Despite the claims and dreams of pharmaceutical organizations, the pharmacist

compared to 9.7% for all U.S. manufacturing. *Prescription Drug Data Summary 1972*, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, p. 24. "Despite the economic recession [of 1970] manufacturers of prescription and other professional [drug] products increased their profits by 12.1% over 1969. At the same time, taxes on this earning dropped 9.5%." Reported in *Drug Trade News*, September 20, 1971, pp. 1, 16.

¹ "Physician's Viewpoint" by Karl Neumann, M.D., *American Druggist*, July 12, 1971, p. 8.

does not perform a service requiring medical skill so much as he sells a mass-produced, fully compounded and often pre-packaged product. The pharmacist has no real control over the drugs which the doctor prescribes, but he is responsible for following the physician's directions as to drug type, brand (if prescribed), strength and dosage. Under law, he must also be certain that the drug is fresh (the date of potency loss is on the pharmacist's own package but he is not obligated to give that information to the consumer, nor does he usually volunteer it). Finally, he must accurately label the customer's prescription.

The responsibility for patient care is the obligation of the physician. In the words of a pharmacist, "It is the physician, not the pharmacist who writes the prescription. Instructing and counselling the patient is the obligation, duty, and responsibility of the physician, not the pharmacist."³ Philadelphia pharmacist Edward Pastor states: "Drug interactions can be controlled only by the physician. A patient filling one prescription at Store A, a second at Store B and a third in another store or through daily interstate mail-orders can only be monitored by his physician." Pastor, who was largely responsible for overturning Pennsylvania's prohibition on prescription price advertising, also states: "By law, the pharmacist must fill the prescription as written. The penalty for not doing so in most states is loss of license." In view of these facts, he concluded that there is overwhelming evidence that no decrease in health care occurs with free price competition in the drug marketplace.

The effort to undermine the free enterprise system through prohibitions on retail price information has failed in a few places, most notably Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Florida and Oregon, where it is presently legal to advertise retail prescription drug prices. It is the aim of this report to review the wide disparity in drug prices, to examine the role of the drug industry—at all levels—in certain aspects of advertising and competition and to report the results of surveys and questionnaires in this area.

CHAPTER II—QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to determine the attitudes of consumers toward their prescription drug buying habits, questionnaires were sent to 24,000 Queens, N.Y., households: approximately 2,000 persons responded. The questionnaire sought to examine the degree to which consumers are aware of drug price variations, the differences in price between brand name and generic prescription drugs; and to ascertain their opinions on the advertising of prescription drugs and the factors involved in their selection of a pharmacy. (See Appendix I.)

This sampling revealed that the average person fills ten or more prescriptions annually, seven of which are for the same drug. Some 75% have found price variation for the same prescriptions at different pharmacies. The degree of price variation was as follows: 39% of those responding found price variation to be in the 10% to 20% range; 50% found variation to be from 25% to 50%; and 11% found prices often vary from 50% to over 100%.

By a large majority, most consumers were found to fill prescriptions at the same pharmacy. The most important factors in choosing a pharmacy were ranked as follows: 44% based their choice on convenience, 38% on price, and the remainder looked for services offered by the pharmacy such as delivery, credit, record keeping and 24-hour service.

Most prescriptions prescribe brand name drugs, according to the response to the question "Do you know whether your doctor prescribes brand name drugs or drugs by their generic (chemical) name?" However, 30%

¹ Letter from Edward Pastor, Philadelphia pharmacist.

² Drug manufacturers' average net profits after taxes are double the figure for all U.S. manufacturing corporations: in 1971 the return was 19.3% of net stockholders' equity

stated that their physicians prescribe generally, and close to 35% responded that they did not know. A staggering 87% of those answering stated that they do not ask their physicians to prescribe generically. This figure suggests that most of the public is not even aware of the availability of lower cost generic drugs.

Half said they do not ask the price of a prescription before it is filled. Nine out of every ten respondents felt that prescription prices are prohibitively high; not one respondent said they are too low, although 10% expressed the view that they are about right.

95% of those respondent felt that prescription drug prices should be advertised in order to facilitate comparison shopping, equalize prices and provide the freedom of choice which is afforded in the purchase of nearly every other consumer product.

Many of the voluntary comments accompanying the questionnaire responses told of particularly unfortunate cases in which elderly persons on fixed incomes found that their savings were virtually wiped out by the high cost of long term maintenance drugs. Minority group members reported discriminatory practices in the quotation of prescription prices and the filling of prescriptions. Those in the medical and paramedical professions volunteered such information as the following, written by a New York City nurse:

"It is a fact that pharmaceutical companies realize at least 50%-100% profit on their products, and the local pharmacist realizes his cut of at least another 40%. Advertising of prescription drug prices is long overdue."

The following are some comments by persons answering the questionnaire:

Generic prescribing: "When you inquire as to what a drug is supposed to do you're stared in disdain—like you are a leper from outer space—intruding on the sanctity of their sacred domain."

Convenience: "I use my present pharmacy because it is close to home and open until 11:00 p.m. and with two small children I need access to a drug store."

"Usually prescriptions are required in a hurry which leaves little time to shop for price."

"I purchase at the store because it is easily accessible and they deliver."

Confidence: "The price is very important but the assurance of quality should be militantly regulated."

General: "Drugs are a big item for senior citizens and as necessary as food."

Price: "After walking out of a drug store having paid for a prescription you really feel sick."

"Prices for goods and services should be advertised so that one could compare costs more easily."

"About two months ago, I conducted a survey on my own. I picked two drug stores in Manhattan near where I work and four which were convenient to home: all were equally convenient. For one package of Norlistrin 21, I found the following prices: \$1.69, \$1.79, \$1.95, \$2.50, \$2.90, \$3.50. My memory may not be exact, but the high and low prices stuck in my mind."

"I am of the opinion that all drugs are grossly over-priced."

"Cost should be lowered drastically—as soon as possible. The consumer gets taken every time."

"We are senior citizens and between the terribly high prices doctors charge and the prescriptions, our funds are rapidly being depleted."

"I believe that prices are too high and druggists charge different prices to people from different nationalities, especially if these people don't speak the language well."

"There is nothing non-professional about advertising or posting prices rather it is in

keeping with the ethical standards of providing high value source of medicine."

"The widow living alone doesn't have a chance. The doctor and the druggist have her at their mercy. One prescription was \$75 in a local pharmacy and \$47.50 in a discount store."

"Lower middle income people definitely cannot afford prescription costs today. Prices of drugs are prohibitive."

"So few prescriptions are compounded today that I believe that it should be quite simple to advertise so that the average person could compare and know what he is buying. Also it is sometimes 1/4 the price when obtained generically."

"On 9/7/71 I had a prescription for mycostatin vaginal tablets (15) filled in an independently owned pharmacy for \$7.95 . . . the same disorder recurred on 2/9/72 and I had the prescription for mycostatin filled at a discount chain at \$2.69."

"Prescription drugs are entirely too high and many a time needed but not bought because of cost."

"I am semi-retired and the very high costs of prescriptions are a tremendous burden."

"High costs tend to make people skimp on the prescribed dosage to economize."

"Since druggists mostly refuse to give the price in advance competition is all but gone."

"By advertising drug prices, the cost to the consumer of drugs prescribed would drop because of competition in the marketplace."

"As a diabetic I am taking D.B.I. pills which I paid \$5.50 for 25 pills until I found out that the same pills were available at chain drugstores for \$3.19 and five more pills."

"I have been charged different prices for the same prescription at the same store within a two-month period."

"Whatever you can do to reduce the price of drugs will be most appreciated. I am on social security and my income is very limited and the price of drugs is a very big drain on the budget."

"I have noticed that when I buy a prescription one week the price is lower, while another week the price rises. The pharmacist does not even have a definite price."

"I strongly feel that advertising costs of drugs would produce a competitive healthy market which gives the consumer knowledge of what drugs and what prices he should be buying."

"Yes, there should be some kind of control on drug costs and if the competitive atmosphere brought about by advertising could bring prices into line then I am for it."

CHAPTER III—DRUG PRICE SURVEY

Two separate surveys, 13 months apart, were conducted in Queens, New York, and in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan areas. Researchers visited 122 drug stores in an effort to determine retail pricing practices on three widely prescribed medicines.

All prescriptions used in the August 1972 survey were generically written. In other words, they identified the drug by its official or chemical name and not by any trade or brand name. This means the pharmacist could fill the prescription with any manufacturer's product.

The July 1971 prescriptions were evenly divided between those generically-written and those specifying a particular brand. In the latter category, the pharmacist has no choice of products; he must fill it with the specified manufacturer's drug.

Researchers did not have the prescriptions filled but asked the pharmacist for the price and the manufacturer of the product he intended to dispense. In the 1971 survey, prices for brand name products were frequently quoted in response to the generically-written prescriptions, a practice which tended to raise the average price for generic drugs.

Institution of the price freeze and subsequent Phase II economic controls in no way

diminished the price disparities found in the previous survey. It was generally revealed, however, that few pharmacies complied with price posting requirements, and the prices of prescription drugs were as high and higher than the previous year's figures.

It is important to note (see Chapter VIII) that in most jurisdictions throughout the country the pharmacist is prohibited from filling a prescription with anything other than the drug specifically stated by the prescribing physician. Thus, if the doctor wrote on the prescription a specific brand name (such as Tetrax, the pharmacist has no choice but to dispense Tetrax by Bristol Labs. If, on the other hand, the physician simply designated the generic equivalent of Tetrax, tetracycline, the pharmacist has a broad choice of products, including brand-name ones and many at lower prices, from which to fill the prescription. One significant finding of this report is that when the pharmacist chose to fill a generic prescription with a generic (non-brand) drug, the purchaser was able to save substantially on the cost of medication. However, there were instances in which the pharmacist's freedom of choice resulted in the substitution of a higher priced brand product.

In 1971, researchers visited 36 pharmacies in the Washington, D.C., area (including Maryland and Virginia suburbs) and 23 pharmacies in Queens, New York. Researchers in 1972 went to 30 Washington area pharmacies and 33 in Queens.¹

The three drugs² used in these surveys were:

Ampicillin trihydrate, a type of penicillin, and a trademarked equivalent, Polycillin by Bristol Labs.

Tetracycline, a widely used antibiotic, and a trademarked equivalent, Tetracycline by Roerig.

Chlopheniramine maleate, an antihistamine, and a trademarked equivalent, Chlor-Trimeton by Schering. (These were not used in the 1971 Queens survey.)

Ampicillin trihydrate

Washington: In 1971, prices for a prescription calling for 30 capsules (250 mg) ranged from \$5.65 to \$15.00 at 12 pharmacies. Although the highest and lowest quotations were both in response to the generically-written prescription, the average price for the brand name product was \$9.03, compared to \$8.80 for the generic. (Researchers found that when presenting a generically-written prescription, the pharmacist frequently quoted a price for a higher cost brand-name drug. This resulted in generic prices appearing higher than if all price quotations were for generics.)

In 1972, researchers surveyed 10 pharmacies and found that the highest price for 56 capsules of Ampicillin was \$17.95 in an independent pharmacy, where the pharmacist quoted a brand name product for the generic prescription. The lowest price quoted was \$8.40 at a discount store.

Wholesale prices according to the *Blue Book* of 1971³ for 30 capsules of this drug are \$3.90 for the generic equivalent and \$5.15 for the trademarked product. For 56 capsules, the wholesale price is \$7.28 for the generic product.

New York: In 1971, researchers surveyed 11 pharmacies in Queens with prescriptions for generic ampicillin and were quoted 12 prices (two visits to one store) ranging from \$4.95 to \$9.00, an average of \$6.55 for all stores. The distribution of these figures averages \$6.02 in the white, middle income district of Queens (Flushing) and \$7.30 in the racially mixed, low-to-middle income neighborhood of Corona. In the second visit to the same stores with prescriptions for Bristol's Polycillin, prices this time ranged from \$6.95 to \$9.90, averaging \$8.78. This time the price spread between the two neighborhoods was closer—\$8.61 in Flushing and \$8.95 in Corona.

Footnotes at end of chapter.

In 1972, a total of 16 pharmacies were surveyed. The highest price quoted was \$16.75 and the lowest was \$6.50, quoted at three pharmacies. The average for this generic prescription of ampicillin was \$9.20 for 56 capsules.

Tetracycline

Washington: Tetracycline wholesales generically at \$.25 for the 30 capsules called for on the 1971 prescription (56 capsules were called for on the 1972 prescription). Retail prices quoted in 1971 ranged from \$2.75 to \$9.90. As was the case in the prescription of Ampicillin, the extremes in prices were both in response to the generically written prescription; however, the two highest prices quoted for the generic equivalent were, in reality, for brand name equivalents. As a result, the average generic price was \$4.31, seven cents higher than the average brand price. The trademarked product, Tetracycline, wholesales for approximately \$1.28 for 30 capsules. Either way, there is a considerable gap between wholesale and retail prices.

In 1972, ten stores revealed a wide assortment of brands and prices. The highest figure, \$5.50, was quoted by two independent pharmacies in suburban areas, while the lowest price, \$1.50, was given by a chain pharmacy in a suburban area. It is significant that prices were generally found to be much higher at pharmacies located in medical arts buildings. The average price for the generically written prescription of tetracycline was found to be \$3.38.

New York: Prices quoted in the Queens area in 1971 for the generic drug (30 capsules, 250 mg) ranged from \$1.95 to \$5.95, averaging \$3.44. The average price in Flushing was \$2.81, compared to \$5.13 in Corona.⁴ The same stores were later presented prescriptions for the trademarked equivalent, Tetracycline. One pharmacy did not stock the drug. Seven prices were quoted varying from \$2.00 to \$4.29, averaging \$2.91. Two pharmacies, both in Corona, quoted prices on another brand although it is illegal in New York for a druggist to substitute another brand for the one specified by the physician writing the prescription. One pharmacist would not reveal the product he would dispense to fill the tetracycline prescription.

The 1972 survey of Queens area stores revealed an average price of \$3.81. The prescription called for 56 capsules of tetracycline, and at nine pharmacies, the highest price was found to be \$4.95, while the lowest was \$2.49.

It is interesting to note that on the same page of the *Blue Book* catalogue which lists generic tetracycline prices, Lederle had a large advertisement for its trademarked version of that drug.⁵ The ad read: "Achromycin V tetracycline capsules. Now prices at 'generic' levels." A check of Achromycin V showed that it wholesales at \$4.50 per 100 capsules, a decrease from the \$11.22 of a few years ago, but still far above "generic" levels and even higher than Roerig's Tetracycline at \$4.25 per 100.

Chlorpheniramine maleate

Washington: Prices for 25 tablets (4mg) of the antihistamine ranged from \$1.20 to \$2.43. The wholesale price for 25 tablets is 4¢ from Kasar Inc. Average prices in the survey were \$1.78 for the generic drug and \$1.56 for the brand name drug. This situation, in which the brand drug was less expensive than the generic product was atypical. The wholesale price for the brand name product was \$0.61.

The Washington survey in 1972 revealed that both the highest and lowest prices for generically prescribed Chlorpheniramine were quoted at chain pharmacies. However, without exception, the pharmacists stated that they would fill the prescription with Chlor-Trimeton. The highest figure for this prescription of 60 tablets was \$5.13, quoted

at two pharmacies in the same chain, and the lowest price was \$3.50, averaging \$4.22 at the ten stores visited.

Although the Queens survey did not include this drug in 1971, it was used in 1972. The highest price, \$4.95, was quoted for a generic equivalent of the drug by an independent pharmacy. The lowest fee, \$1.95, was found at a discount pharmacy. The average of the prices at the seven stores surveyed was \$3.85, \$0.37 lower than the average Washington price.

These surveys show the wide variety of retail prices charged for otherwise identical drugs—in one case a markup in excess of 6,000%, but usually a matter of a few hundred percent. (See Appendices 2, 3, and 4.) It does not depict the true difference between generic and brand pricing—although it is accurate enough to lead to valid conclusions regarding the arbitrary price differences among prescription drugs—because several pharmacists quote prices for the more costly trademarked products when presented with generically written prescriptions.

Researchers found that when visiting more than one store of the same chain they were not always quoted the same price for the same prescription. They also found that a generically written prescription taken to a chain or discount store in a middle income neighborhood tended to yield the lowest price.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Two other recent surveys in New York City have shown similar results:

(a) A survey of 68 pharmacies in Queens conducted by a group of St. John's University students for Queens District Attorney Thomas J. Mackell found prescription prices "arbitrary and inconsistent." The researchers discovered that the poor pay more than the affluent to have identical prescriptions filled.

The report recommends that the government set price ranges for all prescription drugs and that the majority of these drugs be pre-packaged by the manufacturer in commonly prescribed quantities and accompanied by detailed instructions, a practice that has reportedly proved successful abroad.

(b) A survey of 504 Manhattan drug stores by medical and dental students in pharmacology courses at Columbia University revealed similar findings of wide variations in prices, arbitrary charges and inconsistent charges from customer to customer. Instances of quotations of prices well below the pharmacist's cost led study director Dr. Norman Kahn to observe that the druggist was inept or planning to illegally dispense manufacturer's product different from one specified on the prescription. Students also noted about 30 offers from pharmacists to partially fill a prescription in order to get the price down and attract business. Dr. Kahn said this amounts to tempting patients to discontinue therapy before the time determined by the physician. Details of the Columbia study are expected to be published in a professional medical journal. (Interview, Oct. 26, 1972).

² *Tetracycline* is the drug product most frequently prescribed generically; *Ampicillin* is second, according to industry surveys.

³ American Druggist *Blue Book* 1971, published by the Hearst Corp., New York City, is one of several industry price guides and its quotations are considered approximations. Because of the many factors influencing wholesale prices—promotional deals, quantity orders, extent of manufacturer's line carried, method of purchase (from jobber vs. manufacturer), the purchaser's relationship with the supplier, competitive practices, etc.—the prices quoted here should be considered generally higher than those actually paid by the druggist. Nonetheless, they provide a point of reference for comparing wholesale and retail prices. The HEW prescription drug study found substantial dif-

ferences in the prices at which drug products are offered to community pharmacies and to hospitals and government agencies as well as in the prices at which they are sold to American and foreign purchasers.

⁴ This figure is not totally reliable because only three stores were surveyed in Corona, compared to eight (8) in Flushing. It is worth noting, however, that the lowest price in Corona equaled the highest in Flushing. *Blue Book* 1971, p. 37.

CHAPTER IV—FACTORS INFLUENCING DRUG PRICING

Shopping for prescription drugs is unlike shopping for any other consumer product. The customer has been conditioned to avoid comparing prices and never to ask the prices of the drugs he orders. There is usually a sense of urgency involved in having a prescription filled. Patients concerned about their health rarely make the purchase of a prescription contingent on its cost, nor do they usually have the time or transportation to shop comparatively.

That prices do differ—dramatically—from store to store is undeniable, and this study examines the underlying factors of that price variation. It is one of the contentions of this report that the consumer should not bear the burden of price investigation completely on his own. As a spokesman for the National Association of Chain Drug Stores stated: "The problem is to incorporate the pharmacy industry into an operation wherein the consumer is not a second class citizen who feels that he must ask the prices of prescriptions, sometimes with little or no hope of further illumination from the pharmacist."¹

It has become increasingly apparent that pharmacists, as well as consumers, are concerned about astronomical drug prices. Early in the summer of 1971, a group of New York City pharmacists called on President Nixon to impose price controls on prescription and over-the-counter drugs. This was prior to the President's announcement of the Wage and Price Freeze which took effect in mid-August of 1971. The vague outlines of that program stipulated that stores with more than 60 employees or which grossed \$200,000 or more annually had to post the prices of their 40 most purchased products in each department. Prescription drugs were included in the category, despite vigorous industry efforts to have them exempted. The effect of price posting, however, was of dubious benefit to the consumer. Most pharmacies are independently owned and operated (by a ratio of 7 to 1) and consequently do not employ 60 people. Not only did these stores not have to post their prices, but they were saved from explaining their pricing practices to the public.

There is a sign that the industry's attitude toward posting may be changing, however. A study conducted for APhA by the Institute for Motivational Research recommended the association endorse prescription price posting in pharmacies because consumers want it. More than half of the 501 persons interviewed in 40 cities for the study said they would welcome price posting. In selecting a pharmacy, they said "lower price" was second only to "professional service" and by only a slim margin of 17.6% to 18.4%. The head of the study group said consumers rarely make prescription price comparisons and they tend to put a portion of the responsibility for prescription prices on the physician who selected the drug and the manufacturer who set the cost of the druggist.²

Many pharmacists vigorously protest any criticism of high drug prices. Invariably they point to the higher price of medical care and bring up Bureau of Labor Statistics figures which show prescription prices going down during the Sixties while other prices went up. The validity of the BLS figures

Footnotes at end of chapter.

has been questioned on the following grounds:

1. An inadequate number of products in the sample;
2. An over-emphasis in the sample on products that have fallen sharply in price, and
3. Failure to include the new and costly products which replace older, less expensive drugs.

The average prescription price has been going up at the rate of about 2% per year during the past decade, according to the HEW drug study.³ The average retail prescription price charged in 1971 was between \$3.78 and \$4.21, according to industry surveys. Ten years earlier the price range was \$2.97 to \$3.27.⁴

The following resolution, adopted by the Long Island City Pharmaceutical Society, illustrates the widely substantiated opinion that prescription drug prices are too high and can be controlled, if not by executive action, then by allowing prices to be advertised: "Whereas wholesale costs of prescription drugs, patent and proprietary medicines have continually spiraled upward at an alarming rate during the past two years, we, the members of the Long Island City Pharmaceutical Society, request that price controls be established on these commodities and a letter directed to the President of the United States be sent recommending the prompt enactment or decree establishing these controls."

Lawrence H. Carter, president of the 75-member association stated that he believed his was the first pharmaceutical group to request such action. Perhaps it is the fault of our pharmacy leaders not to have made this request sooner, but any additional delay will be catastrophic for the general public." Carter's letter to Mr. Nixon which accompanied the resolution said: "... Wholesale prices continue to spiral upward at an alarming rate. Many manufacturers are now on their fourth round of price increases in the past two years. . . . While some increases may be necessary, many manufacturers have raised prices astronomically and we . . . feel this is totally unwarranted. Drug manufacturers, as we of the pharmacy profession, have a responsibility to the public. Mr. President, we implore you to enact wholesale price controls on prescription and related items before continued inflationary pressures price these commodities beyond the means of the average public. . . ."

Retailers generally tend to disclaim any responsibility for drug prices, contending that their prices represent only a reasonable markup over their wholesale cost. The reasonableness of the markup is debatable, especially in light of the fact that retail prices for identical drugs vary dramatically among like stores in the same neighborhood. The essential elements of these differences relate to the costs to retailers of trademarked drugs versus their generic equivalents, and the fact that some pharmacies, due to differences in overhead, services and efficiency of operation, are able to charge less for the same drug product.

The pharmacists and drug store operators who fight so vigorously against retail prescription drug price advertising frequently are the victims themselves of over-pricing by the large pharmaceutical manufacturers. Small independent druggists fear competing with mass merchandisers, a competition which they feel would develop if price information were readily available to consumers. However, the small proprietor usually has two strong advantages over his larger counterparts—convenience and more personalized service. He is more likely to be located near the doctor's office or in a residential neighborhood.⁵ Many alert consumers recognize this and are willing to pay for the convenience and personalized service of the neighborhood pharmacy, but they do so knowing that prices are probably higher.

There are numerous channels through which the influence of pharmaceutical manufacturers is exercised and results in higher prices to the public. One widely used method is advertising in pharmacy journals, periodicals and other literature. These publications, whose backers rigidly oppose retail drug price advertising, rely heavily on wholesale drug price advertising from manufacturers as a major source of their revenue. They apparently see no conflict because their publications are not distributed to the general public, from whom they want to conceal price information. Advertisements in medical journals represent a significant method of influencing the doctor's prescribing habits. According to Dr. Richard Burack, author of *The Handbook of Prescription Drugs*, "Probably the shrewdest and most effective means by which the big pharmaceutical corporations perpetuate their hold over doctors and patients is through the *Physicians' Desk Reference* (PDR). Although some doctors may not think of it in terms because its format and veneer give it a clearly authoritative appearance, PDR is in fact composed of advertising."⁶

The PDR is a catalogue of prescription drugs which illustrates them and explains their usage. It is distributed without charge to most doctors and is found in every hospital. The PDR states that its contents have been obtained through the "cooperation" of drug manufacturers, through whose "patronage" its publication is made possible. Dr. Burack states: "This is a euphemism. Drug houses buy space in the PDR and publish what they wish to publish."⁷ Contrary to its supposed purpose, the Handbook is incomplete because it mentions only a few generic names for widely consumed basic drugs. Furthermore, the widespread use of this volume serves to conceal from practicing doctors the existence of numerous other manufacturers who very often can supply the same drugs at lower cost. The higher price of these drugs is, therefore, passed on to the patient, who is caught unaware in this web of economic profit.

The pricing factors discussed above are not necessarily all-inclusive. However, there is ample evidence to show that the lack of a free flow of information from manufacturers to doctors and pharmacists results in arbitrary and unjustifiable markups in the prices of prescriptions purchased by the consumer.

Prices vary not only from store to store, but can even vary from customer to customer at the same store. Simply because prices are not posted or advertised, the clerk or pharmacist can arbitrarily change the price on the basis of the customer's age, sex, race or appearance.⁸ There are very few, if any, checks on this practice. It is also common knowledge (substantiated by reporters) that prescription prices at some stores are negotiable. A customer who tells the pharmacist that the competition offered a lower price than the one just quoted is more likely to have his bill reduced than the person who says nothing.

Retail prescription drug pricing is based on a number of fixed costs, as well as variable and arbitrary factors. The primary influence on a pharmacist in determining cost is the wholesale price of the drug. (The larger retailers purchase directly from the manufacturers; smaller stores must go through the more expensive middlemen.) Added to this fixed cost are the overhead costs of operation of the pharmacy, the cost of services offered and the desired profit.

Survey such as this one and others have revealed a tendency for prices to be higher in low income neighborhoods. Pharmacists confirm this finding but claim that there are valid reasons for this situation: business costs are frequently greater, insurance is more difficult to get, and it is often a problem to hire people for these areas. Large losses due to shoplifting, robberies and

burglaries have forced some pharmacists to stop selling prescriptions in high crime areas because they fear that their supply of narcotics is too tempting an invitation to addicts.

The poor often pay more for another reason. Most poor people do not enjoy the mobility of the more affluent consumer who has a car and can shop around for the best price. Consequently, the poor have become a captive audience for the dwindling number of merchants in their neighborhoods. The lack of competition in these areas sends prices upward for all commodities, not only medicine. This situation is further hampered by the scarcity of chain and discount drugstores in these areas.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Robert J. Bolger, Executive Vice President, telephone conversation, 6/30/72, NACDS.

² *American Druggist*, November 27, 1972, p. 13ff.

³ *The Drug Users*, Task Force on Prescription Drugs, HEW Feb. 7, 1969, p. 15-16. One reason for this is, reportedly, the increasing size of the prescription itself.

⁴ *Prescription Drug Data Summary*, 1972, p. 33.

⁵ Of the 51,476 community pharmacies in the United States in 1969, independents outnumbered chains by better than seven to one (45,093 independents; 6,383 chain pharmacies). *Prescription Drug Summary*, HEW, p. 29.

⁶ Pantheon Books, New York, New York, 1967, p. 17. Dr. Richard Burack, *The Handbook of Prescription Drugs*.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ In response to the Rosenthal questionnaire, one person wrote: "I am a law student, but I have worked in a small, independently-owned drugstore. The prescription prices are made on the spot, according to the appearance of the customer, how often they frequent the store, how knowledgeable they are of prices and drugs and how business has gone that day."

CHAPTER V—THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG ADVERTISING CONTROVERSY

The opportunity to make an informed choice in the purchase of products which are as necessary to the health of the individual as prescription drugs is a basic right. However, monopolistic drug patent laws, captive pharmacy boards, pressure from pharmaceutical manufacturers and the groundless fears of pharmacists over prescription drug price competition have effectively thwarted the consumer's freedom of choice. The culmination of this closed economic system is the statutes and regulations in 37 states which presently prohibit price advertising. There appears to be no similar hesitancy toward saturating the media with millions of dollars worth of advertising touting the doubtful virtues of over-the-counter (OTC) drugs.

An example of this double standard can be found in two separate ads placed by Drug Fair¹ in the March 26, 1972, issue of the *Washington Post*. (See Appendix 5.) A full-page ad (page A-30) asked in bold type "Should prescription drugs be advertised?" and answered itself: "Our society needs to have drugs be promoted like a glassblower needs hiccups. . . . Drugs need de-emphasis, not publicity." This "noble" thought was exploded by a 16-page advertising supplement Drug Fair put in the same issue, touting a variety of over-the-counter drugs such as cough mixtures, eye drops, mouthwash, saccharin and a line of vitamins. Such action exposes the hypocrisy of Drug Fair's professed concern for protecting society.

This "interest" in the public welfare is little more than a facade for concealing the real motive—a desire to avoid price com-

petition in the sale of highly lucrative and often over-priced prescription drugs.

Resistance to advertising prices has another purpose as well. It also conceals the fact that prices are not consistent at all stores in the chain throughout the area. The practice is sometimes called "zone pricing." The companies give two basic reasons: (1) higher cost of doing business in some areas (because of crime, insurance, etc.) drives prices up there, and (2) tough competition from a nearby store (usually a discounter) tends to keep some prices down at selected stores.

The latter factor is especially prevalent in the case of birth control pills. Representatives of two Washington, D.C., area chains said the pill is the most highly competitive prescription product today and most of their stores sell it at cost or below, especially in college neighborhoods.

John McHugh, director of professional services of People's Drug Stores in the Washington area, said his chain does not have "zone pricing" but does make "some local competitive exceptions" to chain-wide basic prices on a store-by-store, item-by-item basis.

Every facet of the drug industry, from the largest pharmaceutical manufacturer to the owner of a small pharmacy, makes use of the media to merchandise its products. The situation has reached the point where every emotional problem and ache and pain, real or imaginary, is subject to some pill or medicine. It has become increasingly difficult for parents to warn their children of the evils of drug abuse when the young see, on television and in their own homes, adults popping pills into their mouths almost like candy.

One recurring argument offered by pharmacists who oppose the advertising of prescription prices is that such action would contribute to the already dangerous saturation of the media with irresponsible advertising. FDA Commissioner Charles C. Edwards recently observed, "We are a drug culture society," adding, "psychiatrists, sociologists, psychologists—all share with us a deep concern that this trend, this attitude may be one of the causative factors in our drug abuse problem." He further stated: "The tremendous wave of advertising over the media, especially TV, [has] created an environment in which the consumer feels that reaching for a pill, tablet or capsule is a panacea for all of his ills."²

In view of this argument, it is fallacious to assume that prescription drug price advertising is a link in the drug abuse chain. Not only are prescription drugs products whose access, content and use are tightly controlled, but it taxes the boundaries of rationality to imply that informing consumers of prices, as opposed to therapeutic efficacy, could lead them irreversibly down the path of drug abuse.

According to officials in the Justice Department,³ which supports the advertising of prescription drugs, "One of the main problems in regard to prescription drugs is that the other side (pharmaceutical manufacturers) relies on euphemism, that is, using the term drug as an illicit substance. They latch on to the need to control 'dangerous and addicting drugs' (those requiring a prescription) and on this basis, they are not inclined to favor informing the consumer as to the prices he must pay." In this situation, it was stated, the Justice Department does not wish to thwart the efforts of organized pharmacy, or to ease in any way the passage of laws which would facilitate illicit drug traffic, only those which would serve the purpose of informing the consumer. The first objective, therefore, is to try to prevent drug manufacturers from preventing concern for illicit drug traffic into a restrictive economic profits game.

It is a recommendation of this report that

restraint is urgently needed in the presently irresponsible advertising of claims for non-prescription drugs in the mass media as well as in trade and professional publications. If self-restraint is not forthcoming, it may best serve the public interest for the Congress and appropriate federal agencies, such as the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration to act to control the often deceptive advertising tactics of pharmaceutical firms and allow the free dissemination of price information to the public.

FOOTNOTES

¹ A large Washington, D.C., area drug chain.

² Testimony before the Monopoly Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Small Business Committee, July 21, 1971.

³ Telephone conversation with Mr. Richard Bernstein, Antitrust Division, Justice Department, July 6, 1972.

CHAPTER VI—THE DRUG INDUSTRY

The drug industry in the United States occupies a uniquely secure position. Demand for pharmaceutical products continues to grow as new scientific discoveries are made, and as the cures for more diseases are unearthed. Concomitant with the drug industry's rapid rate of growth over the past 25 years has been the astronomical increase in the profit margins of these firms.

The central issue over which controversy continues to be generated is drug pricing practices. The industry has sought to wrap itself in a cloak of righteousness, preying on consumers' fears about their health. A common but widely disproven claim of some major drug manufacturers used to justify their higher prices is that manufacturer's size is equal to product quality—but there exists a wide price gap among large firms as well. (See Appendix 6.)

A chief economist of the Federal Trade Commission has expressed the belief that where price competition exists in drug firms it is ineffective:

"And even where there are relatively many sellers, as well as potential sellers—for example, in the case of unpatented drugs sold under generic names—effective price competition often is muted by vast advertising, promotion, and other selling efforts which differentiate in the minds of consumers the products of the largest manufacturers selling under their own brand or trade names from those of other manufacturers. Hence, manufacturers selling chemically identical drugs under generic names frequently have difficulty in selling them at any price."¹

Americans spent approximately \$7 billion on prescription drugs in 1971. This includes \$4.4 billion at retail pharmacies, the remainder being purchased from hospitals, nursing homes, government, physicians, and others outside the retail marketplace. Data for per capita consumer expenditures used in this report are based on the \$4.4 billion retail sales figure found in the HEW task force study.²

The drug manufacturers reported sales in 1970 of \$4,321,900,000 for prescription drugs in the United States. Added to this is approximately \$3 billion more in veterinary products, exports and over-the-counter drugs. For the purposes of this report, the \$4.3 billion figure will be used for manufacturers' sales.³

Out of that \$4.3 billion, the drug makers spent more than \$1 billion (about 25%) on promotion, \$132 million (3%) on quality control, about \$280 million (6.5%) on research and development, including only 1% for basic research.⁴

The billion-dollar-plus promotion budget figure is based on studies by the Social Security Administration, Food and Drug Administration, Congressional investigators, and others. (See Appendix 7.) The industry pro-

tests that the figure is only about half that amount, but veteran observers express little faith in these sources.

The drug industry "spent more than \$1 billion on all forms of promotion," according to T. Donald Rucker, then head of the Social Security Administration's drug study unit. He gave the following breakdown in a March 8, 1972, speech to a drug wholesalers convention in Las Vegas: "\$700 million for all costs associated with detailing, including sampling; \$167 million for professional journal and direct mail advertising; \$150 million for other direct and indirect forms of promotion (educational films, pamphlets, seminars, plant tours, hospitality and displays at conventions, etc.); \$3 million for institution and institutional promotion." He added that "more than 85% must be classified as an economic waste."

The result, he said, is "product prices are inflated unnecessarily by some 25%."

These high promotional expenditures have paid off for the large manufacturers by developing a high degree of product loyalty. Rucker said this loyalty "often has been a dominant factor enabling pharmaceutical manufacturers to exercise control over drug prices."

The director of FDA's Division of Drug Advertising, H. W. Chadduck, has estimated "total promotional expenditures in this area" at 25% of sales.⁵

Former FDA Commissioner James L. Goddard estimated that drug manufacturers were spending about \$4,500 in 1968 on advertising and promotion for each of the approximately 200,000 prescribing physicians in the United States.⁶

The PMA represents 115 companies which account for approximately 95% of the prescription drugs sold in this country. These companies conduct nearly all of the industry's research and development, according to the HEW study:

"Just as they account for the overwhelming proportion of sales, they conduct essentially all of the industry's research, they control the overwhelming proportion of drug patents, they conduct the most vigorous promotion of their products, they compete vigorously—usually on the basis of innovation and quality and rarely on the basis of price—for the favor of the medical profession, and they achieve the industry's highest rates of profit."⁷

The remaining 5% of the nation's prescription drugs are produced by an estimated 700 small companies which control few drug patents, do little or no research, compete on price as well as quality, engage in minimal promotion and realize relatively low rates of profit.⁸

When an industry spends one-and-a-half times as much money on advertising and promotion as it does on research and quality control combined, it is easy to get the impression that its principal concern is not for the health of the American people, but for corporate success. This money—approximately \$1 billion—is being spent not to aid the consumer or to make him healthier, but to beguile him and his doctor and to fight his attempts to get a better buy for his money.

Expenditures for drug promotion are excessive and add needlessly to the price consumers must pay, declared the HEW Task Force. Intense competition among companies promises "a greater share of a relatively limited market and richer profits for the successful competitor"—but it has "little to do with normal price competition in the retail marketplace, with the promise of eventual price savings to the consumer," concluded the report.⁹ Congressional studies have uncovered a long history of misleading and deceptive prescription drug advertising.

The question of drug prices was a principal concern of the late Senator Estes Kefauver, beginning in 1959. Over the years, Ke-

Keauver held comprehensive hearings on the drug industry which were widely publicized and increased public concern. His probing of the complex price issue virtually opened the tight little world of U.S. medicine. As he so aptly stated: "The problem for the drug companies is that their involvement can be expressed in dollars and cents and is thus relatively easy to understand."

One indirect result of the wide publicity given the drug industry in the Kefauver hearings was an increase in the skeptical public attitude toward an industry once thought to be sacrosanct. According to the most recent findings of the Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, N.Y., the drug industry has "continued its downward trend in terms of public favorability." In 1969, the research firm found that 51% of the public had basically favorable attitudes toward the prescription drug industry. In the latest study, it was revealed that only 37% of the public had attitudes favorable to the drug industry.¹⁰

Findings like these plus efforts by consumers to remove restrictions on drug price advertising are apparently beginning to worry the pharmacy establishment.

Kenneth E. Tiemann, an APhA trustee, rhetorically posed the following question at the association's house of delegates meeting in late 1972:

"Realizing that the giving of prescription price information is essential to the building of an image and getting consumer groups off our backs, should we possibly advocate the repeal of laws that prohibit price advertising, since they are being used as a sword against us?"

The authoritative magazine *American Druggist* noted that although Tiemann worded his statement as a question, "this was apparently advanced as a proposal." He predicted that in nearly every state where drug price advertising is prohibited now, legislation will be introduced to remove those barriers.

"Because of a small percentage of pharmacists in this country who refuse to give prescription price information and who refuse to use proper discretion in the pricing of prescriptions," Tiemann stated, "we as a profession are being subjected to ever more image-destroying publicity in the public mind."¹¹

The final outcome of the Kefauver hearings in terms of legislation was the Kefauver-Harris Amendments of 1962 to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Among other things, this legislation authorized FDA to establish simple useful names for drugs, to be proposed by the United States Adopted Names (USAN) Council.

In the course of that Congressional investigation it was pointed out that the market structure, which uniquely allows for great disparities in price, is the basic determinant of the behavior of the drug industry. Manufacturers, as has been noted, spend at least \$1 billion a year on advertising. Their purpose is twofold: to instill confidence in physicians and pharmacists for their products and to insure the specific market they have carved out for themselves. (See Appendices 8 and 9.) *The market is also unique in that the people who pay for and consume pharmaceutical products are not the ones who must be persuaded.* Senator Kefauver once remarked, "He who orders does not buy, and he who buys does not order." This is an important asset to the manufacturer, who is well aware of the nature of medical science and seeks to create physician confidence in the company's product through the use of brand names which are short and recognizable. Since he does not pay, cost usually is of little or no importance to the physician.

Larger drug manufacturers contend that their prices are a result of better quality control, higher marketing costs and expenses

for continuing research and development. These contentions are valid in part, although the federal government does contribute to the costs of research. One result of this research is the improved treatment of diseases and other ailments with drugs.

On the other hand, the HEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs concluded, "Much of the drug industry's research and development activities would appear to provide only minor contributions to medical progress."¹² The other reality, in terms of economics, is the extremely comfortable state of the industry and its consistently high profit margins. (See Appendix 10.)

Drug industry profits continued to gain in 1971 despite the continuing recession nationally. The annual financial survey by Product Management Magazine (formerly Drug Trade News) showed a 10.8% increase in sales for prescription and other professional products and after-tax earnings of 10.1%. Diversified drug companies fared nearly as well. Sales were up 9.6% and profits up 9.2% over the year before. Top earnings gainers in the former category were Deseret with 108.8%; Barry-Martin Pharmaceuticals, 102.9%; and Cutter Labs, 43.1%.¹³

A survey of corporate performance for the third quarter of 1972 by Standard & Poors shows drug industry profits up 16% from the year before for a profit margin of 9.8%. Return on equity was 19.2%. The price-earnings ratio for stock of the 29 companies listed was an impressive 32-to-1; the only industry doing better was Photo & Optical with 37-to-1.¹⁴

The Federal Trade Commission reports drugs and medicines are the most profitable manufacturing industries. In a report on rates of return in selected manufacturing industries, drugs and medicines showed an after-taxes rate of return on stockholders' investment of 19.6% for 1970, the latest date available. In its survey of the dozen largest firms in each industry category, the FTC found none of the top 12 drug and medicine manufacturers showed any losses; in fact, none had a rate of return under 14.5% and seven of the 12 were over 20%.

The companies and their 1970 rates of return were: Abbott Laboratories 16.3%; American Home Products Corporation 27.6%; Lilly & Company 22.2%; Merck & Company, Inc. 25.2%; Pfizer, Inc. 15.4%; Richardson-Merrell, Inc. 14.5%; Schering Corporation 22.8%; Searle & Company 29.2%; Smith Kline & French Laboratories 23.7%; Sterling Drug, Inc. 20.3%; Upjohn Company 14.6%; and Warner-Lambert Pharmaceutical Company 15.0%.

The HEW Task Force Study reported the industry's average net profits after taxes (as a percentage of net stockholders' equity) was 19.3%, nearly double the rate (9.7%) for all U.S. manufacturing corporations.¹⁵

The HEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs in its 1968 report, *The Drug Makers and Drug Distributors*, enumerated a list of significant factors which are expected to influence the future growth of the drug industry.¹⁶ It concluded:

1. A steady increase in the number of people in the United States and their anticipated growing affluence will maintain the growing demand for prescription drugs.

2. The proportion of Americans over the age of 65, whose drug purchases are higher than average, is expected to increase more rapidly than the population as a whole, contributing to an increased demand for maintenance and other prescription drugs.

3. Higher health standards and living conditions in other parts of the world, especially in the developing nations, are expected to create important new markets for the prescription drug industry, including the American companies which are already developing foreign markets.

4. Drug research may be expected to yield new products which will make possible the control of conditions or diseases which are

currently uncontrollable. Although such breakthrough developments will probably be infrequent, they, too, will contribute to increasing demands for pharmaceutical products.

5. Through broader health insurance coverage and increasing outlays for medical care by governmental agencies, more people will be able to pay for the drugs they need.

6. Unlike other industries, the drug industry will presumably continue to be protected from the economic changes of the business cycle, as the need for drugs is relatively unaffected by swings in the nation's economy and drug consumption is rarely postponed.

Setting drug standards: USP and NF

Not only does the consumer exercise no control over the manufacturing, patenting or prescribing of the drugs he buys, but the official compendia which indicate the standards of purity, quality and strength of drugs are published by two private, professional organizations. The United States Pharmacopeia (USP), published by the U.S. Pharmacopeial Convention, and the National Formulary (NF), published by the American Pharmaceutical Association, are the compendia used by most physicians. They specify the chemical identity and purity of selected, therapeutically-important drugs and methods for assuring that the finished product is of the highest quality. The drug standards set by USP and NF are legally enforced by FDA.

The unique arrangement makes the United States *the only country in the world in which the setting of drug standards enforced by the government remains in the hands of private organizations.*

The USP and NF, together with the American Medical Association, act through a co-ordinating group called the United States Adopted Name Council to propose generic names for drugs. FDA has the final word on selection, and the word is usually one of approval.

Drug Prices in the United States and Abroad

It is common knowledge that there are tremendous differences in prices for the same prescribed drug in this country and abroad. A 1971 study released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to update a 1967 investigation by the Task Force on Prescription Drugs showed that manufacturers of 20 popular prescription drugs charge U.S. druggists higher prices than they do druggists in eight other nations: Ireland, New Zealand, United Kingdom, Italy, Brazil, Australia, Sweden and Canada.

Edmond N. Jacoby and Dennis L. Hefner, authors of the HEW study, acknowledge that their findings do not measure the extent that economic factors such as labor costs and the size of markets influence price. They state further: "General knowledge of the problem suggests that it would be unwise to assume that price discrimination is a minor factor . . . the study shows that prices in the U.S. are generally higher than in any other country, according to comparative studies."¹⁷

The governments of six of the nations studied play an official role in the cost of pharmaceuticals. Australia and Ireland pay a part of the retail price of prescription drugs. In Sweden, payment is assumed for half of the first \$3 and for everything over that amount. Ireland's system is scaled to the patient's income, and the Australian method of payment assumes all costs except a nominal co-payment fee. Significantly, all three of these countries do pay the total cost for medicines needed in the treatment of chronic diseases. The United Kingdom and Italy pursue a policy of full retail price payment for medicines. The sixth country, New Zealand, pays for filling prescriptions with the least expensive brand of a drug.

A Philadelphia druggist who has been

looking into the legality of importing American drugs made at plants in the West Indies found that for the same drug, Stelazine (Smith, Kline, and French), West Indies' pharmacists are charged \$2.60 (100 mg) compared to the \$6.70 Philadelphia pharmacists must pay for the same quantity.

Although local economic conditions may account for part of the cost difference, they are not the complete explanation for the wide gap in percentage markup. (See Appendix 11.)

Disparities in prescription drug prices are as much a function of buying branded drugs as of importing them from foreign manufacturers. Every year, the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration accept bids from manufacturers on the drugs they purchase. DOD and VA buy *all* of their drugs by generic name and the lowest responsible bidder is awarded the contract. Examples of the methods through which U.S. government agencies are able to purchase prescription drugs at lower prices than the U.S. public are numerous. In one case, a contract for tetracycline was awarded in 1971 to an Italian manufacturer, Carlos Erba of Milan. A significant factor in this decision was that such contracts may be awarded by DOD to foreign firms only if the acquisition cost is at least 50% less than the lowest bid from a responsible domestic manufacturer.

In domestic contracts, price variation is nearly as extreme. The VA purchased 38,592 bottles of tetracycline (250 mg, 100 capsules) in FY 1971 from Rachelle Labs Inc. of Long Beach, California, for \$1.44 each. Rachelle sells them to druggists for \$3.70 each, according to the 1971 Blue Book. True, retail drug stores do not purchase in quantities as large as the government, but that alone hardly seems sufficient reason for a 250% price difference. Some observers have suggested that DOD and VA pay very little while the general public makes up the slack. The prices for these drugs sold by competitive bid can vary considerably in relation to the costs to retailers. A District of Columbia drug store owner informed researchers for this study that Serpasil (reserpine) was sold to retailers in the Washington area for \$33.15 (1000 capsules) and to the government for \$1.60 (1000 capsules).¹⁸

Disparities obviously exist. The price paid by American consumers for a prescription drug may often be ten or even several hundred times as much as its cost to produce. The consumer is hopelessly trapped between an urgent need for the drug and a lack of open price competition in the retail marketplace.

Patents and patent protection

One aspect of the market structure which is a basic factor in the high price of prescription drugs in the United States is the patent system. Most prescription drugs developed in this country are covered by 17-year patents which give the manufacturers a monopoly on their drug products and allow them to set any price they wish without fear of competition. The rationale for this protection is that research and development costs require a compensatory period of competition-free sales.

Manufacturers contend that even during the 17-year period, originally designated as a period in which to recoup losses, their prices are fair and reasonable. The hollowness of this argument can be seen in what happens when a patent expires and a manufacturer is faced with competition—the price drops dramatically.

For example, Upjohn has reduced the price of its brand of tetracycline, Panmycin, by 73% since 1966, when its patent expired—from \$14.94 per hundred to \$3.94 in 1971. Smith, Kline, and French dropped its price

of Thorazine (50 capsules, 30 mg) by approximately 16% when its patent expired in 1970.¹⁹

Frequently the patent period outlasts the marketability of the product. Occasionally, the company owning the patent improves or otherwise changes the basic drug so that it is subject to a new patent, thereby prolonging the manufacturer's monopoly.

Aside from the serious moral question of whether it is proper to give a private manufacturer a monopoly on a product of life and death importance and thus the right to charge any price he wishes, "the built-in 17-year patent monopoly on drug products," according to Philadelphia pharmacist Edward Pastor, "forces the poor, aged and sick American patient to pay unconscionably outrageous prices for his prescription."²⁰

The government, however, has statutory immunity from this problem. For example, the Department of Defense, which spends in the neighborhood of a quarter of a billion dollars annually on drugs and biologicals turns, at times, to unlicensed domestic or foreign manufacturers because their prices are often half those charged by the domestic patent holders and their licensees. The government then has to pay a reasonable royalty to U.S. patent holders. Consumers, however, don't have this advantage and, therefore, pay more.

A recent survey of world patent practices²¹ shows that 54 of 80 nations studied deny patent protection for pharmaceuticals. These include Canada, Japan, Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries. In addition, Italy and Turkey deny patents for processes used in the manufacture of pharmaceuticals.

The United States, Belgium and South Africa are the only major nations, according to the survey, "in which it is believed one can obtain claims to medical processes for the treatment of man."²²

The HEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs, reported:

"Patents play a prominent role in each of the two main features of competition in the prescription drug industry: first, rivalry in the development of new drugs and drug products; and second, in the promotion and advertising of exclusive specialties. It is the exclusive property rights afforded by patents, and the commercial benefits derived from them, that developed the first of these rivalries and set the stage for the second."²³

Whoever holds the patent on a product in the United States, controls its manufacture, distribution and sale. If a competitor develops a new process for producing the same product, he is prohibited by the patent law from manufacturing or selling that product, even if he can make it better, more inexpensively and more efficiently. It is self-evident that this runs counter to the basic philosophy behind U.S. patent law—the promotion of science and the useful arts—and it discourages research on processes.

It is undeniable that the developer of a new manufacturing process for a therapeutic drug should be entitled to patent it under a reasonable royalty arrangement and to secure a license for the patent at a reasonable rate. However, an equally valid observation is that a limitation on or abolition of patent protection would directly promote price competition and maximize product rivalry.

University of Houston economist Henry Steele advocates eliminating drug product patents and ordering compulsory licensing of drug process patents at reasonable royalty rates. He also advocates a total ban on trade names for drugs, with the requirement that drugs be identified, labeled, advertised and sold only by use of their generic name and the name of the manufacturer.²⁴

The drug industry contends that without the incentive of patent protection many of the new drugs developed in recent years would not have been discovered. This argument is not totally without merit, and a reasonable period of patent protection may be

necessary to encourage the development of new drugs and to give the manufacturer an opportunity to earn back his investment (at a reasonable rate of profit, as opposed to the present levels).

Most patent drugs tend to pay for themselves in their first three years on the market: "In the industry characterized by rapid product turnover and a high rate of obsolescence, three years of exclusive patent protection is said to be a reasonable period to recoup research and marketing investments and to make a profit," according to the HEW drug study. "Numerous studies—including one by Arthur D. Little, Inc.—have shown that the greatest portion of sales of a new prescription drug product is likely to occur in the first few years after its introduction, even though many such products continue to sell and generate profits for many years after the patent has expired."²⁵

With the publication of this report, legislation is being introduced to provide for compulsory licensing of prescription drug patents. (Other legislation also being introduced is discussed in the chapter on Recommendations.) Under this bill, when a company has applied for a license under a drug patent and it is not granted within 90 days, it could apply to the Federal Trade Commission to order such licensing. If the price charged or quoted to druggists by the patent holder is more than 500% of the cost of production for the drug in finished form, the FTC could order a hearing on the application.

The Commission could then order the granting of an unrestricted license to make, use and sell the drug. It could even order granting an unrestricted trademark license if it feels that is necessary to foster competition.

No such orders could be issued within the first year of the patent and might be delayed up to five years after issuance, if necessary. The licensee would be required to pay the original patent holder a royalty, not exceeding 8% of gross sales. If a patent holder refuses to issue a license to FTC orders, he could have his patent cancelled.

This bill would permit major recovery of the investment by the patent holder and help foster price competition among the rival companies. Consumers would benefit by the arrangement and so would manufacturers except that the latter's excessive profits would be replaced by reasonable profits.

Senator Estes Kefauver, after holding extensive hearings over a decade ago on drug prices, concluded: "Free competition has been hampered by patent monopoly control of prescription sales." Reform of drug patent laws is needed, he added, because of the fact that "by any test and under any standard, prices and profits in the ethical drug industry are excessive and unreasonable."

He continued:

"Alone among the industrialized nations of the world, we grant product patents on drugs with no provision for compulsory licensing or any other protection to the public interest. Since drugs are vital to the health of the nation, we must recognize that some limitations on patent monopolies are justified by the captive position of the users and the relationship of drugs to public health."²⁶

The HEW Task Force adds:

"... it has been argued that drug makers should not be allowed to use trademarks and patents in a way that would give them control of the drug markets both at the retail and manufacturing level. It has been asserted that exclusive patents, combined with multi-million-dollar drug advertising campaigns, can keep new or small companies out of the high profit circle and effectively stifle price competition in the marketplace."²⁷

The exclusive vacuum created by the patent structure has helped to keep the prices

of certain drugs at a high level. Drug manufacturers argue that patent protection provides the incentive for competition in the research and development of new drugs. However, such protection stifles competition in price. This was the conclusion of a former FTC economist who stated that "Concentration in the production of drugs is high because of the patent privilege."²⁸

FOOTNOTES

¹ *The Drug Makers and Drug Distributors, Task Force on Prescription Drugs, Background Papers, Health, Education and Welfare, December, 1968*, p. 39.

² *Prescription Drug Data Summary 1972*.

³ The Pharmaceutical Manufacturer's Association (PMA), which represents 95% of the U.S. drug makers, estimates in its annual survey report 1971-72 that 1972 domestic pharmaceutical sales were \$5.3 billion and foreign sales \$2.7 billion.

⁴ National Science Foundation's report, *Research and Development in Industry 1970*, showed funds for R & D performance as a percentage of net sales were 6.5% in 1970. In dollars, this was set at \$486 million, which would mean about \$7.5 billion total sales. The report showed that \$486 million included \$75 million for basic research, which would equal about 1% of net sales (p. 84). In contrast, PMA reports the industry spent \$577 million on human-use R & D in 1971 in this country; industry observers feel that figure is inflated by the inclusion of some marketing expenses.

⁵ "In Brief Summary: Prescription Drug Advertising 1962-71," by H. W. Chadduck, *FDA Papers*, February, 1972, p. 13.

⁶ *Regulation of Prescription Drug Advertising*. Report of House Government Operations Committee, Washington, D.C., December 10, 1970, p. 2.

⁷ *Final Report*, Task Force on Prescription Drugs, Department of HEW, February 7, 1969, p. 7.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Final Report*, op. cit., p. 9.

¹⁰ *American Druggist*, August 7, 1972.

¹¹ *American Druggist*, August 27, 1972, p. 26.

¹² *Final Report*, op. cit. p. 8.

¹³ *Product Management*, October 1972, p. 41ff.

¹⁴ *Business Week*, November 11, 1972, p. 87 ff.

¹⁵ *Prescription Drug Data Summary*, 1972, Dept. of HEW, p. 24.

¹⁶ *The Drug Makers and Drug Distributors, Task Force on Prescription Drugs, Background Papers, Health, Education and Welfare, December 1968*, p. 50.

¹⁷ Edmond N. Jacoby and Dennis R. Hefner in their report to HEW on prescription drugs.

¹⁸ *Blue Book*, 1971 lists CIBA's price of 1000 capsules (0.25 mg) of Serpasil at \$39.50, and the same product generically as reserpine, from APC for \$1.60, a difference of more than 2469%!

¹⁹ *Handbook on Prescription Drugs*, Richard Burack, M.D., Pantheon Books, New York, 1967, p. 88, and *Blue Book* 1970, 1971.

²⁰ Personal letter to Congressman Rosenthal.

²¹ *World Patent Law and Practice* by J. W. Baxter, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., New York, 1971, pp. 230-232.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *The Drug Makers and Drug Distributors, op. cit.*, p. 37.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁶ *Congressional Record*, April 12, 1961, Vol. 107, 87th Congress.

²⁷ *Drug Makers and Drug Distributors*, p. 30.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

VII.—PHARMACIES AND PHARMACISTS

The final link in the prescription drug supply chain to the public is the retail pharmacy and the pharmacist. The most common is the independent, neighborhood drug store, which outnumbers chain stores

nationally by better than seven to one.¹ Sizes and types of pharmacies vary widely. It is rare to find one that is solely in the business of dispensing drugs. Most more closely resemble a general store, selling a broad variety of products unrelated to health and medicine. The pharmacy today without a lunch counter, garden supply display, auto parts center and clothing department is more the exception than the rule, especially in the case of chain pharmacies, where prescription drugs constitute about 11% of the sales volume.²

The role of the prescription counter in the drug store's overall profit picture depends on a number of different factors. Drugs are traditionally high markup items and are counted on to supply a significant portion of a retailer's profits. The type of store (independent, chain, discount), the location (inner city, suburbs, medical arts building), proximity to competition, type of operation (discount, drugs only) and services offered (home delivery, 24-hour operation, credit) are all variable factors in the determination of the prices of the store's products. Since most nonprescription drug products are advertised, the consumer has a chance to shop comparatively; but in the case of prescription drug products, the pharmacist has a relatively free hand in charging whatever fee he wishes.

It has been stated that drug products are a rather unique commodity because they are usually purchased with some degree of urgency. However, consumers should not be blind to the fact that they can get a better buy with a little comparison shopping. Most druggists will quote prices for a prescription before it is filled (they are required to do so in New York); a very few will even quote prices on the phone.

Consumers in 1971 had 2.2 billion prescriptions filled. Just over 31% were for hospital inpatients. The remainder were accounted for as follows: independent commercial pharmacy 42.7%, chain pharmacy 6.9%; other retail outlets (department stores, supermarkets, etc.) 6.8%, hospitals (outpatient pharmacies) 7.7% and dispensing physicians 4.8%.³

HEW estimated the number of resident pharmacists in the country in 1971 at 129,287. The vast majority worked in community pharmacies (45,889 owner/partners and 60,505 employees for a total of 106,394) 11,840 were in hospital pharmacies, 6,307 in teaching and government and 4,745 in manufacturing and wholesaling.⁴

Drug substitution

In nearly every state, the pharmacist is forbidden to fill a prescription with anything other than the exact branded item specified by the physician. The HEW Task Force reports:

"Substitution of a drug or brand of drug different from that prescribed by the physician is specifically prohibited in the pharmacy laws or rules and regulations of 47 states, but there are no written rules against it in the District of Columbia, Alaska, Missouri or Vermont. In the District and Vermont, however, the license of a pharmacist may be revoked for substitution, on the grounds that it is unethical conduct."⁵

Maryland enacted a law in 1972 that permits the pharmacist to substitute a generic equivalent for the brand stated on the prescription unless the prescribing physician specifically prohibits it. The law, to take effect in early 1973, requires the pharmacist to notify the practitioner in writing within 48 hours of the product substituted. The pharmacist is required also to pass on any savings to the consumer.

Substitution already exists widely in practice, if not in law. It is not uncommon for a pharmacist, when presented with a prescrip-

tion for a drug he does not have in stock, to call the prescribing doctor and ask for a substitution or suggest to the doctor that he be allowed to use a drug already on hand.

Substitution is presently prohibited where the doctor prescribes a specific brand; however, when he writes the prescription generically, the pharmacist is free to use (i.e. substitute) any manufacturer's generic equivalent. This situation offers a mixed blessing. On the one hand, there is an opportunity to save the consumer some money. However, there also is potential for abuse because the pharmacist with a generic prescription is in a position to dispense the item on his shelf with the largest profit margin, usually a brand-name equivalent.

Generic prescribing, on the other hand, permits the druggist to carry a smaller inventory, thus reducing his expenditures and, theoretically, permitting him to pass some savings on to the consumer. However, it has been shown that a pharmacy usually purchases those products with the highest turnover. These tend to be the higher priced brand name drugs more frequently prescribed by physicians than lower cost products of equal quality but less well-known because not as much money and effort has been spent promoting them.

Another factor in the issue of substitution is the method a pharmacist uses to set his retail prices. A few are beginning to use a flat dispensing fee in place of the usual percentage markup. The two systems differ primarily in terms of philosophy. The flat fee is meant to level off the costs between higher and lower priced drugs.

The pharmacist will add the fee, based on what he considers his expenses in filling the prescription, to his cost for the drugs he dispenses instead of pricing them by percentage markup from the wholesale cost. The HEW Task Force reports:

"There is some fear that the use of dispensing fee will greatly increase the total costs to long-term users of low cost medications, who under the markup system would normally receive prescriptions below actual dispensing costs. . . . These patients may be properly served in appropriately selected cases if physicians can be induced to prescribe in larger quantities; thus the patient would pay one dispensing fee for a medication which would last several months, instead of several fees for smaller quantities of the medication prescribed a number of times."⁶

The use of the dispensing fee is not without pitfalls for the consumer when the pharmacist has the option of substituting drugs. If his markup is based on a percentage of the product's wholesale cost, he could be inclined to use the higher cost, and therefore, higher profit item. But if he charges a fixed fee, regardless of the wholesale price, he might be more likely to stock lower cost items since he would be making the same profit but have less capital tied up in stock.

Repeal of anti-substitution restrictions, a movement gaining popularity among some pharmacists and the public, would necessarily have to be tied to some method of protecting consumers against abuses in order to be fully effective. For example, a pharmacist may fill a generically-written prescription with a brand name drug for several reasons:

1. He does not have the drug in its generic form. (One Washington, D.C. chain store druggist reported that when he is out of the generic but does have the brand version, he will ask the patient if he approves, and then charge the generic price.)

2. He prefers to dispense the drug of a manufacturer in whom he has confidence.

3. He is seeking a greater profit.

Pharmacists and physicians are sharply divided on the issue of substitution, as they are on the issue of drug price advertising. Most

druggists would prefer that the prohibitions be lifted, giving them discretion over the manufacturer of a drug product when the prescription calls for a multi-source item. Doctors, on the other hand, vigorously oppose this as a usurpation of their role in specifying the exact medication they want for a patient. As in the case of price advertising, lines are drawn between pharmaceutical companies and organizations, such as the National Pharmaceutical Council (NPC), and independent retailers and laymen. The NPC, composed of the 25 largest pharmaceutical manufacturers, actively opposes drug substitutions as "destructive to pharmacy" and "deceitful to physicians."¹ The group is further dedicated to the use of brand name products only, claiming that they are the safest and most effective drugs.

Although NPC's concern for the medical care of the American public is their stated goal, their alignment with that segment of the pharmaceutical and medical profession which constantly opposes consumer-oriented programs casts serious doubt on their motives.

Brand versus generic prescribing and advertising

Closely related to the issue of substitution and an integral factor in the price of prescriptions is the question of brand vs. generic superiority. The development of a brand name occurs when the larger drug houses register a trademark name for the new drugs they develop. The same practice is followed when they begin to market a drug developed by another company but for which the original 17-year patent has expired. Smaller manufacturers will, most often, market their product by the generic name.² Since these small companies do not undertake the expensive tasks of researching, developing and advertising new drugs, the prices at which they sell their products are generally lower.

Most of the uncertainties about generic drugs center around their equivalency in both quality and therapeutic effect. Brand name advocates contend that their drugs are of higher quality and are subject to more quality tests and controls. There is no convincing evidence to show that they do the job any better.

It is often difficult to tell who made a drug, despite the name of the manufacturer on the product. This is because one producer frequently provides a large number of firms with the same drug, which is then marketed under a variety of brand and generic names.

Doctors today often find it difficult to assess the quality of drugs available because experience with a given drug is usually limited.

Evidence of this problem, according to Dr. Henry E. Simmons, director of FDA's Bureau of Drugs, "is the fact that some professionals will prescribe the highest-price product when the same product is being offered at a substantial savings by equally large or experienced firms." Further evidence, he added, is that doctors often are unaware that their patients are "paying a higher price for a brand name drug when the same drug manufacturer offers the same drug at a lower price generically."

"Some seem to mistakenly think that 'big manufacturer' or 'brand name' is good, while 'smaller manufacturer' or 'generic name' is of necessity bad. *This impression is just not borne out by the facts today.*" [Emphasis added]³

From a pharmacological perspective, the inert ingredients which go into the finished product may or may not effect the performance of the drug (although they are not supposed to). According to the brand name advocates, the inactive ingredients in a drug compound do make a difference. Dr. Alfred Gilman, a pharmacologist, remarked in 1967 in a letter to Senator Russell B. Long, chair-

man of the Senate Finance Committee, that he was "appalled by statements which implied that cheaper marketed generic drugs are equivalent merely because of chemical analysis."

This argument may be shown to be tenuous in the face of contradictory testimony from experts who believe that the factors of dissolution and release of medication are of little consequence in the performance of a drug.

William Apple, executive director of the American Pharmaceutical Association, stated in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in 1967: "Authorities in the medical and pharmaceutical sciences seem generally agreed that the likelihood is remote that a drug product meeting established standards under federal drug laws will not perform clinically as expected."

It is not the purpose of this report to make scientific judgments regarding the question of generic vs. brand superiority. Suffice it to say that the Food and Drug Administration does recognize as safe and effective generic drugs which comply with its minimum standards, and the Defense Department and Veterans' Administration purchase their drugs by generic name.

Usually a physician will prescribe a drug with which he is most familiar and in which he has confidence. It is generally true, however, that the typical clinician has very little first-hand knowledge of the performance weaknesses and strengths of generic versus brand name formulations. What second-hand knowledge he has is probably derived from information furnished through "detail men" from large drug houses. "Prescribing physicians are still exposed far too often to drug promotional ads designed primarily to promote sales rather than to provide the physician with the full facts necessary for the rational selection and use of drugs," reported the Committee on Government Operations' Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.¹⁰ It further stated: "While blatant misrepresentations and omissions have become less frequent, they have often been replaced by more subtle attempts to convey misleading messages."

"Prescription drugs occupy an unusual position in the marketplace because such drugs are ordinarily selected by the physician who prescribes them rather than the person who purchases or uses them" the report concluded. "Consequently, the prescription drug promotional effort is directed to the physician rather than the consumer."¹¹

As a general rule, very few doctors prescribe generically, even though patients could often save a considerable amount of money if prescriptions were written that way. According to a spokesman for the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, "The first place where the consumer should receive prescription price information is in the physician's office. The physician should be responsible for informing his patient of the general price range and generic names of the drugs he has prescribed."

Through their concentrated advertising to physicians and pharmacists, pharmaceutical manufacturers have successfully implanted the notion that brand name means quality. Although the trend in recent years has been toward an increasing number of generically-written prescriptions, an estimated 90% of prescriptions written today specify a trademarked drug product.

With a growing number of major drug manufacturers marketing their own so-called generic lines, it is interesting to note the position of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, as stated by its President, C. Joseph Stetler: "We do not claim that the existence of a trademarked name gives assurance of superior quality, nor do we contend that a drug product which happens to be sold under the official name of its active ingredient is automatically suspected of

poor quality. Since the majority of such generically labelled products are made by PMA firms, it is obvious that we would not take such a position." In response to a question concerning the rising competition between generic drug houses and brand manufacturers, he answered, "We do not contend that there is a considerable difference among manufacturers in the degree of skill and devotion to consistent built-in quality, and we do contend that prescribers and dispensers should have knowledge of and confidence in the sources of the drugs they choose. As for the new kind of competition involved in the emergence of branded generics, if the question means an intensification of price competition, this would be a change only of degree, because we have had price competition all along."¹²

Pharmacists express mixed feelings about the generic drug controversy. None appear opposed to dispensing generic drugs, although most are more familiar with the brand name products. This is largely due to the fact that small drug manufacturers do not indulge in large advertising and promotion campaigns.

Advocates of generic prescribing contend it could have hundreds of millions of dollars annually in prescription costs for the elderly alone and millions more for the rest of the population. Critics counter that only 20-25% of all the prescription drugs on the market would be affected because the rest are under patents and not available generically. This is borne out to some extent by the HEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs, which discovered that of the 409 drugs dispensed most often to the elderly in 1969, lower-priced generic equivalents were available for only 67.¹³

Drug costs

The burden of high prescription drug costs falls most heavily on the elderly and others on fixed incomes. Although only about 10% of the population is 65 or older, this group accounts for 25% of all retail prescription drug expenditures.¹⁴ In 1971 these expenditures totaled \$1.2 billion. The average per capita expenditure on drugs by the elderly was \$52.49, nearly triple the cost for persons under 65 (\$18.12 per capita).¹⁵

The HEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs found that generic prescribing for 67 of the drugs most frequently dispensed for the elderly could have reduced the acquisition cost—the wholesale cost to the retailer—from nearly \$74.9 million to \$33.4 million, representing a potential savings of \$41.5 million or 55.3% at the wholesale level. The savings to consumers would depend on the markup established by the pharmacist.¹⁶

If the retail markup were set so that the pharmacist would receive the same gross profit on generic prescriptions, the total retail price for those drugs would drop from \$150 million to \$108 million, a savings to elderly consumers of \$41.5 million or 27.7% on the 63 drug products most frequently dispensed and available generically.¹⁷ (See Appendix 12 for a generic vs. brand price comparison of 63 of those drugs.)

The American population as a whole spent \$4.4 billion on prescription drugs (\$20.89 per capita) at retail outlets, according to HEW; *Product Management* magazine put the figure at \$5 billion for 1971. Just a decade earlier, Americans spent only \$2.2 billion (\$12.05 per capita) on prescription drugs and in 1950 the figure was \$1 billion (\$6.74 each).¹⁸

In an attempt to facilitate generic prescribing and dispensing, Massachusetts adopted a Formulary Act in 1970 which requires that all prescriptions written for brand name drugs include the generic name as well, if available.¹⁹ If the prescription fails to list the generic equivalent, it becomes an illegal prescription, one which technically should not be filled by a pharmacist. Under this act, physicians may prescribe formulary drugs

by generic name only or by brand name and generic name. If a doctor insists on a particular brand name drug, he can include on the prescription the phrase, "no substitutes" or "brand only" or add the name of the manufacturer.

Dr. Richard Burach, chairman of the Massachusetts Drug Formulary Commission stated, "The Formulary Commission urges physicians not to use this alternate mechanism indiscriminately. . . . It is the responsibility of the physician to be certain that a clinical impression that he may have of the superiority of any brand name drug over its generic counterpart is substantiated by factual, clinical evidence that is current and authoritative."²⁰

Some physicians, especially those in group practices, are beginning to use prescription blanks that call for generic filling unless specified otherwise. Group Health Association (GHA) of Washington, D.C., uses prescription blanks which permit the physician to check a box specifying: "Dispense any manufacturer's product of same established name" or "Dispense specified brand only."

The action taken in Massachusetts and by GHA is exemplary and is a move in a positive direction to help consumers know more about their drug costs. Although drug substitution by itself is no panacea it can result in significant dollar savings for consumers.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Prescription Drug Data Summary 1971*, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1971, pp. 29-30.

² *American Druggist*, May 29, 1972, p. 17.

³ *Prescription Drug Data Summary 1972*, Department of HEW, Washington, D.C., Table IV-2, p. 27.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Table IV-1, p. 26.

⁵ *The Drug Makers and the Drug Distributors*, HEW, December 1968, p. 80.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁷ This is NPC, pamphlet published by National Pharmaceutical Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.

⁸ Also known as the United States Adopted Name (USAN) because it is officially adopted by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare on the advice of the USAN Council, a coordinating group composed of representatives from the American Medical Association, the U.S. Pharmacopeia, the American Pharmaceutical Association, as publisher of the National Formulary, and the Food and Drug Administration.

⁹ *American Druggist*, November 27, 1972, pp. 24-25.

¹⁰ Report of Committee on Government Operations, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. "Regulation of Rx Drug Advertising," December 10, 1970, p. 16.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹² *Drug Trade News*, Vol. 47, No. 15, July 24, 1972. Medical Econ. Co., Oradell, New Jersey.

¹³ *The Drug Users*, Task Force on Prescription Drugs, Background Papers, Health, Education, and Welfare, October 1, 1968, pp. 81-82.

¹⁴ *Final Report*, HEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs, p. 1.

¹⁵ *Prescription Drug Data Summary 1972*, Department of HEW, Social Security Administration Office of Research and Statistics, pp. 6-7.

¹⁶ *The Drug Users*, op. cit., p. 36.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

¹⁸ *Prescription Drug Data Summary 1971*, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

¹⁹ Massachusetts General Laws Annotated, Chapter 17, Section 13, and Chapter 112, Section 12D; Chapter 717 Massachusetts Statutes 1970.

²⁰ "Drug Substitution Approved by AMA," Article in *Drug Trade News*, July 12, 1971, p. 2.

CHAPTER VIII—RETAIL ADVERTISING PRACTICES AND PROHIBITIONS

The consumer is at a distinct economic disadvantage in the retail prescription drug market as a result of strong and effective anti-competitive industry practices.

Meaningful price competition, which is available throughout our market system on almost all products and services, is seen as anathema by those associated with drug retailing—even though competition exists there at the wholesale level. All kinds of reasons are given—professional ethics, prevention of drug abuse, difficulty in consumer understanding, complexity of factors involved—but none stands up under close scrutiny. The fact is that those druggists who control the profession—the independents—believe they would have great difficulty competing with the chains and discounters if consumers could compare prices of prescription drugs as easily as they do OTC drugs, groceries, clothing and nearly all other consumer products.

Laws and regulations in 37 states forbid advertising prescription drugs by price or name: 17 by statute (Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Virginia and Wyoming) and 20 by regulation (Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin). (See Appendix 13.)

In three of these states (New Mexico, Ohio and Washington) advertising is not specifically banned but rendered impractical by numerous restrictions—to the point of being considered effectively prohibited.

Drug stores in 10 states may not advertise the fact that they have discount prices. Statutes in California, Maryland and New Jersey and regulations in Colorado, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New York and Wisconsin prohibit the use of such terms as "discount," "cut rate" or word with a similar connotation in connection with prescription drugs.

The legal status of such restrictions, especially those which are not by statute but are promulgated by state pharmacy boards, is at this time unclear and is being tested in the courts.

Court challenges are pending in at least 11 states (Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin). Recent challenges have succeeded in Florida, Pennsylvania, Oregon and have failed in New Jersey and New Mexico, though new suits are pending there.

Michigan's prohibition on retail prescription drug price advertising was declared unconstitutional on Dec. 6, 1972, by Judge Joseph L. Carter of Baltimore's Superior Court. The restriction, he ruled, violated the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

"The portion of society most injured by such prohibitions is the elderly living on a low income from Social Security and/or pensions," he stated. "The lifting of advertising restrictions can only further alleviate the inflated prices of prescription drugs. . . ."

Judge Carter found "The pharmacist is both a professional and a retailer. His functions include not only the compounding of drugs in filling prescriptions, but such commercially oriented endeavors as merchandising and marketing." This led him to conclude that the ban on drug price advertising does not relate to the pharmacist's status as a professional but rather to his retail activities. "When the regulation of pharmacy extends beyond the qualifications of pharmacists and the safety of the products, and en-

compasses the commercial aspects of the profession," he wrote in his opinion, "serious questions of constitutional validity arise."

The ruling is not binding statewide until affirmed by the Court of Appeals. An appeal was filed in early February by attorneys from the state's Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, who contend Judge Carter's decision dealt only with the civil statute and ignored a criminal statute prohibiting the advertising of controlled substances and prescription drugs.

In New York, Governor Nelson Rockefeller has submitted legislation to legalize drug price advertising.

On September 22, 1972, Congressman Rosenthal, acting with the New York Consumer Assembly and Ms. Etta Ringel, a Medicare patient, filed suit in New York State Supreme Court to have the state's prohibition on prescription drug price advertising declared unconstitutional. Named as defendants are the State Board of Regents and the State Board of Pharmacy. The Regents, with the assistance and advise of the Pharmacy Board, promulgate rules governing the pharmacy profession, including the prohibition on retail drug price advertising.

The suit contends that the Regents' promulgation of such rules exceeds the authority granted them by the legislature and constitutes "an unreasonable exercise of the state's police power, bearing on rational or substantial relationship to the public's health, safety and welfare."

Similar suits were filed in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut by Pathmark, one of the largest supermarket and pharmacy chains in the East. Governor Thomas Meskill of Connecticut announced support for the suit and said he would ask his state's legislature to repeal its anti-advertising law.¹

Not all states with "no-ad" laws and regulations enforce them. The Michigan attorney general, according to the American Pharmaceutical Association, has said he will not defend pharmacy board enforcement against drug price advertising.

A drug advertising ban proposed by the Missouri Board of Pharmacy was declared invalid by the state attorney general because "It is difficult to understand how the public welfare can be prejudiced by the dissemination of truthful information concerning the name, nature and price of drugs which can be purchased only upon proper prescriptions."²

Ohio has permitted drug price advertising but, in recent years, very little, if any, such advertising has been placed. In 1971, the pharmacy profession won a two-year battle when the Ohio State Legislature enacted a law making it impossible as a practical matter for a pharmacy to advertise any prescription drug.

The original language of the legislation, as proposed by the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association (a trade organization for pharmacists) and the State Pharmacy Board, called for a total advertising prohibition. Only vigorous lobbying by the state's advertising media and the Newspaper Publishers Association prevented a complete ban. The bill had the support not only of the pharmacy groups, drug manufacturers and state pharmacy board, but also of the state's leading drug chains, including the discounters.

All in all, it was a defeat for consumers and for the free enterprise system of open competition in the marketplace.

One of the most widely publicized cases in which a pharmacy chain challenged the general ban against price advertising involves Oso Drug, Inc., a Chicago-based chain which operates 177 stores in 18 states, including 84 in the Chicago area. In October 1971 Oso began posting the prices of the 100 most

Footnotes at end of chapter.

commonly prescribed drugs in all stores. Within a few weeks, Osco found itself under the gun of the pharmacy establishment on all sides.

Following Osco's fight to be seen and heard by the consumer, the chain was the target of implicit and overt harassment. An affidavit filed in North Dakota's federal court described the harassment Osco had received there and in other states. Rival pharmacists phoned Osco's director of professional services and called him a "traitor." Most pharmacists, departing from ethical standards, stopped giving Osco pharmacists the prescriptions of customers who wished to transfer their patronage. The affidavit made public Osco's fears that newly registered pharmacists and graduating pharmacy students would shy away from jobs at Osco lest they jeopardize their professional standards and licenses. The court was told that professors and other prominent members of the pharmaceutical community had made possibly damaging remarks about Osco's possible loss of license in order to turn students of pharmacy from the company.

Richard G. Cline, president of the chain, contends that price posting does not constitute advertising and is therefore not illegal. "What we're trying to do is let the marketplace operate freely," he explained, and "allow competitive forces to play." Despite opposition from independent drug retailers, customer response has been favorable, he reported.

Support for Osco's position has come from the U.S. Justice Department's Antitrust Division. Then Assistant Attorney General Richard W. McLaren, in response to a letter from Cline in late 1971, stated that he was "pleased to learn of the initiation of a program with the apparent potential to effectively provide much-needed price information in this area."

The Justice Department has repeatedly stressed that laws prohibiting drug price advertising should be repealed. In a research paper and policy statement to the Council of State Governments, it stated the following:

"Competition is our basic national policy. It has proven to be the most effective spur to business efficiency, innovation, and low prices. Prohibitions on drug advertising represent departures from this national economic policy. . . . The Department of Justice believes that the major effect of legislation or regulations prohibiting price advertising of prescription drugs is to reduce retailer incentives to engage in price competition with resulting higher costs to the public." [Emphasis added]

The report concludes:

"Accordingly, it is the Department's view that existing state legislation or regulations which prohibit or restrict price advertising of prescription drugs may well be averse to the public interest. Since such restrictions appear to be unnecessary to protection of the public and result in unjustifiable expenditures by consumers, the Department feels they should be eliminated."⁵

Unfortunately, the Justice Department's sympathy for the consumer does not extend far enough for it to actively prosecute pharmacy boards or support legislation designed to do exactly what it advocates, that is, remove all prohibitions on prescription drug advertising. Such legislation was introduced by Congressman Rosenthal in the 92d Congress (H.R. 4423, the Prescription Drug Advertising Act of 1971) and is being reintroduced in the 93d Congress.

There is ample evidence that support for such legislation as this covers a broad spectrum of organizations and interest groups. The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association has repeatedly advocated abolishing state laws and regulations against prescrip-

tion drug advertising. Pharmacies would be encouraged to advertise the prices of prescription drugs, PMA contends, as a means of fostering price competition at the local level and helping reduce retail costs of prescriptions.

Legal precedent for the abolition of anti-advertising laws is also well established. In 1971, appellant Edward Pastor, a Philadelphia pharmacist, was upheld in his effort to advertise prescription drug prices. The Pennsylvania State Board of Pharmacy at that time urged the Superior Court of Pennsylvania to prohibit drug price advertising for these reasons: prohibiting advertising of narcotics and dangerous drugs keeps them out of the public eye; price advertising encourages consumers to shop comparatively, making it harder for a physician to "monitor" the drugs his patient is taking; price advertising will encourage retailers to buy unusually large quantities of drugs, resulting in faster deterioration of unused drugs on the pharmacist's shelf.

Pastor argued that this prohibition in the Pharmacy Act was unconstitutional because it contravened the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. The court ruled in his favor on January 7, 1971.

Pennsylvania, Florida and Massachusetts began to permit price posting in 1971 and the result appears to be lower retail prices for consumers in Philadelphia, Miami and Boston. In comparing drug prices in the states allowing advertising with those which have rules preventing such action, Pastor concluded:

"The Philadelphia patient pays an average of 34% less for his prescription than does the New York City patient. The patient in Miami, Florida, pays an average of 29% less than does the patient in New York. The reason can only be attributed to the competition created by advertising. . . . There can be no question, but that *prescription prices are sharply reduced in areas permitting advertising.*"⁶

Advertisements run in the spring and summer of 1971 by Pastor and two unrelated pharmacies with the same name, U.S. Drug Company, (Wilmington, Delaware, and Hallandale, Florida) offer illustrations:

1. Advertised prices for 100 tetracycline capsules (250 mg) ranged from \$1.93 to \$2.97, all of which are substantially lower than those figures quoted in the Rosenthal survey. For less than one third the quantity (30 capsules) the average price for generic tetracycline was \$3.44 in New York City pharmacies and \$4.31 in Washington, D.C. (See Appendix 14 for sample ads and Appendix 15 for comparison of advertised and non-advertised prices.)

2. Another example of reduced costs may be seen in the case of the antihistamine chlorpheniramine maleate. The Rosenthal survey showed that this drug was available in Washington, D.C., area pharmacies in generic form at an average price of \$1.78 for 25 4-mg tablets. The Florida pharmacy advertised 100 tablets of the same dosage for 19 cents. The brand name equivalent, Chlor-Trimeton, averaged \$1.56 for 25 tablets in the Rosenthal survey. Advertised prices for four times that quantity ranged from \$2.43 to \$2.77.

3. In the case of ampicillin, 30 capsules of that drug (250 mg) averaged \$8.80 in Washington stores and \$6.55 in New York City pharmacies in the Rosenthal study; a Philadelphia pharmacy advertised 100 capsules for \$14.97.

The president of U.S. Drug of Hallandale, Fla., Bernard B. Applebaum, reported that response to his company's advertising "has been without a doubt overwhelming. Our customers are glad we are not operating behind an unforeseen price. The people know what they are paying for their medication

when they give our pharmacist their prescription."⁷

According to the rules of many state pharmacy boards, price advertising is prohibited under the heading of "Unprofessional Conduct." The New York state regulation⁸ reads as follows:

"Unprofessional conduct in the practice of pharmacy shall include . . . advertising and/or displaying signs which in any manner tend to deceive or mislead the public."

Certainly the advertising of prices of prescription drugs cannot be construed to mislead the public; on the contrary, the revelation of prices, in allowing more freedom of choice in filling a prescription and lowering prices, would be a positive step toward equalization of fees, thus relieving the plight of millions of Americans who unknowingly pay outrageous amounts for the maintenance of their health.

Even in states where advertising is legal, the pressures are strong not to do so. A District of Columbia pharmacist reported that one of his outlets was directed by the Board of Pharmacy to move a large sign reading "Discount" because it was too near the prescription counter.

In general, state pharmacy board members are independent pharmacists appointed by the governor. Only two states—California and Massachusetts—have public members on their boards. For business purposes, independents prefer to have pharmacies operate under a system of "price maintenance," thereby limiting the information to the public and keeping the issue of drug prices from the public eye.

There are numerous examples of how pressure is wielded on state legislatures to enact pro-pharmacy legislation. In New Jersey, consumers are "protected" by a 1965 "Ethics Law" under which there is no legal way for the consumer to learn the price of his prescription before it is filled. Pharmacists are not only prohibited from advertising prices, but they are also barred from quoting prices over the telephone, and even in person, unless the customer is about to have his prescription filled. Sidney Greenblatt, secretary of the New Jersey State Board of Pharmacy, calls the measure "a consumer protection law." A more accurate description would be a "pharmacist protection law."

The city of Boston, recognizing the problem of price disparity, has taken positive action to provide consumers with extensive price information. Regulations of the Boston Department of Health and Hospitals require pharmacists to post the prices they charge for approximately 200 of the most frequently prescribed drugs. Although three Boston pharmacy owners brought suit against the city over the regulation, the State Supreme Court affirmed a lower court ruling and it went into effect in late June 1971. A similar measure has been introduced in the Massachusetts legislature, which, if enacted, will make price posting mandatory throughout the state.

The regulation grew out of a survey conducted by Albert Judd, planning and research officer of the Boston Consumer's Council, which "claimed to find that pricing of prescriptions by Boston pharmacists was 'irrational' . . . and that consumers need the kind of guidance they will presumably get from the posted price listing."⁹

Compliance with the Boston price posting regulation, according to Samuel B. Spencer, executive director of the Consumer's Council, is almost 100%.¹⁰ Although he reported that impact was difficult to measure in some cases, one immediate effect was that pharmacies which had been overcharging for their prescriptions "substantially dropped" their prices.

The price chart distributed to Boston pharmacists contains explicit directions for the posting of drug prices, and the city's 225

Footnotes at end of article.

pharmacies presently list the prices of 190 frequently prescribed drugs. There are three price listings for each drug according to quantity, and suggestions as to the method of comparison shopping that will best allow consumers to evaluate the reasonableness of the prices at each pharmacy.

It appears that the removal of prohibitions on retail prescription price advertising alone will not be sufficient to foster open price competition in the drug marketplace. Experience has shown that where such restrictions were removed, advertising did not necessarily follow. This is believed to be largely due to pressures from the pharmacy establishment, using pharmacist-employees to influence their employers. Academic pharmacists work hard to indoctrinate their young students against retail price advertising (but they are strangely silent when it comes to wholesale advertising including some so blatant as to show the manufacturer's product in the window of a cash register). Therefore, it will be necessary to make price posting mandatory, as is done in Boston. Posting has the additional value of informing the consumer of the price when he walks in the drug store. The disadvantage, of course, is that he cannot do his comparative shopping in his own home, as he can when advertising is permitted. Taken together, though, advertising and posting complement each other very well and would be of immense value to the consumer.

Price posting, as was required under Phase II economic controls, did not prove very effective because of broad exemptions and lack of adequate enforcement. Early in 1972 when the Price Commission suggested pharmacies post their base prices like other retailers, the American Pharmaceutical Association denounced it as "Police state" tactics that engendered a "vigilante system on enforcement."

But when the tables were turned and some pharmacists began violating APHA canons forbidding advertising, they were hounded by their fellow pharmacists, including other retailers, educators and public officials in what *Consumer Reports* termed "vigilante tactics with a vengeance."⁹ The prime targets of these were Oso and its pharmacists.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in its Task Force findings, has suggested that there exists a definite need for prescription pricing information of both brand name and generic drugs to be made readily available to physician and patient alike.¹⁰

Through the kind of legislation proposed in Chapter XI of this study, the essential need of the consuming public to be provided with necessary price information can be accomplished.

"If the patient is to maintain the right to select a pharmacy, he also has a right to know the prices it charges and to compare these with other prices," declares the HEW report. It calls on medical associations, pharmacy associations and consumer groups to work together at the local level to develop mechanisms whereby patients may obtain long-term information on local prescription prices, especially for maintenance drugs.¹¹

The conclusion reached in a study on drug advertising reported in *Consumer Reports* is especially applicable as a summation of the findings and spirit of this report:

"All in all, here is a case where honest-to-goodness price advertising is much needed. Only the law stands in the way."¹²

FOOTNOTES

¹ *American Druggist*, October 2, 1972, p. 27.

² *Market Restraints in the Retail Drug Industry*, F. Marion Fletcher, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1967, p. 232.

³ Research Paper and Policy Statement of the United States Department of Justice

Regarding State Restrictions on the Advertising of Retail Prescription Drugs, Summer 1971, pp 1-3, 8.

⁴ Personal letter to Congressman Rosenthal from Edward Pastor, July 26, 1971.

⁵ Personal letter to Congressman Rosenthal.

⁶ Section 63.3 of the *Regulations of the Commission of Education*, June 1, 1972.

⁷ "Boston Pharmacies Must Post Rx Prices," *American Druggist*, July 12, 1971, p. 30.

⁸ Personal Interview.

⁹ *Consumer Reports*, March 1972, p. 186 ff.

¹⁰ *The Drug Users*, *Ibid*, Chapter 5.

¹¹ *Final Report, Task Force on Prescription Drugs*, H. E. W., Washington, D.C., February 17, 1969, p. 18.

¹² April 28, 1970, p. 279.

CHAPTER IX—SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The problems

Americans spend some \$7 billion a year on prescription drugs, and the evidence is strong that they are being overcharged, on the average, by at least 25%.

For each dollar the drug manufacturers grossed on national sales in 1971, they spent a penny on basic research, three cents on quality control and 25 cents on advertising, promotion and marketing.

The high cost of drugs is due primarily to a lack of open retail competition, overprotective patent laws, exorbitant promotional expenditures, arbitrary pricing practices, unreasonable markups and inefficient management. They can all be summed up in a single term: Economic self-interest.

The drug makers are earning profits at a rate nearly double that of other U.S. manufacturing corporations. Their enormous profits are due largely to the fact that they are over-protected by government.

Because prescription drug prices are not posted or advertised, clerks or pharmacists can and do sometimes change the price on the basis of the customer's age, sex, race or appearance. At some stores prescription prices are even negotiable.

The retail drug market is unique in that the people who pay for and consume the pharmaceutical products are not the ones who must be persuaded by the industry's advertising and promotion.

The consumer is at a distinct economic disadvantage in the retail prescription drug market as a result of strong and effective anti-competitive laws and industry practices.

Another factor keeping retail prices high is the lack of concern shown by physicians for the price their patients will have to pay for the medicine they prescribe.

The pharmacy establishment's opposition to retail drug price advertising stems from a fear of price competition, despite pious pronouncements to the contrary.

Only two of the 50 states—California and Massachusetts—have public members on their state pharmacy boards.

A survey of 122 drug stores in Queens, N.Y., and the Washington, D.C., area revealed the following:

For one drug, tetracycline, which wholesales for \$5.2, retail prices quoted ranged from \$1.95 to \$9.90.

For another drug, ampicillin, which wholesales for \$3.90, retail prices ranged from \$4.95 to \$15.00.

For a third drug, the antihistamine chlorpheniramine maleate, which wholesales at \$0.04, retail prices ranged from \$1.35 to \$2.43.

The drug makers spend over \$1 billion a year on promotion. These expenditures are excessive and add needlessly, but enormously, to the price consumers pay.

Questionnaire

Questionnaires sent to 24,000 Queens, N.Y., households revealed.

Nine out of ten persons responding felt prescription prices are prohibitively high;

95% said prescription drug prices should be advertised in order to facilitate comparison shopping, equalize prices and provide the freedom of choice which is available in the purchase of nearly every other consumer product;

Most persons apparently are unaware that they could save money by asking their doctors to prescribe their medicine generically;

Half said they did not even ask the price of the prescription before it is filled, a practice which could result in considerable savings;

Most persons had 10 or more prescriptions filled annually, seven of them for the same drug.

Three out of four of those responding found prices on over half of their prescriptions vary from store to store by at least 25%;

Most use only one pharmacy, picking it on the basis of convenience first then price (services are a minor factor in the choice of the pharmacy).

Drug price survey

Two separate surveys of 122 drug stores in Queens, N.Y., and in the Washington, D.C., area revealed a wide disparity in retail prices charged for identical drugs. Excessive markups also were found; in one case a drug was priced at 6,000% over the pharmacist's cost, but in most cases the markups were in the neighborhood of 100%.

Consumers pay considerably less for their prescriptions if they are written for a generic drug and if the purchaser is able to do some comparison shopping.

Without asking consumers, pharmacists frequently substitute more expensive brand name drugs when the prescription calls for a generic drug. Such substitution, now permitted in most, if not all, states must be prohibited to prevent this kind of abuse.

Prices for the same drug vary not only from store to store, but even from customer to customer at the same store. This is possible because prices are not advertised and are rarely posted.

Similar surveys in other cities, by consumer groups and the news media, showed similar results.

Factors influencing drug pricing

Prescription drugs are perhaps the only major consumer product on the market today for which there is no convenient method of retail price competition. This is no accident. Over the years the consumer has been conditioned to believe that money should be no object where his health is concerned; but in reality, at least as far as prescription drugs are concerned, cost bears little or no relationship to quality. The identical drug can cost \$1 or \$10 or even more, depending on the manufacturer and the seller.

Along with just about everything else they buy, the poor also pay more for their prescriptions. This is often because there are fewer pharmacies in low-income areas, store insurance is harder to get there, it is difficult to hire a pharmacist to work in those areas and crime is a major problem. Equally important is the fact that the poor do not enjoy the mobility of the more affluent customer who has a car and can shop around for the best price.

The retailers who fight so vigorously against prescription drug price advertising frequently are the victims themselves of overpricing by large pharmaceutical manufacturers, but they apparently fear the giants more than they care about their customers. Small independent druggists fear competition with mass merchandisers; the chains and discounters fear competition with one another, and they all believe that prescription drug advertising would foster such competition.

Prescription drug advertising controversy

Because the pharmacy establishment dominates the pharmacy regulators, the pharmacy boards and commissions of the various states promulgate rules not in the consumer's interest.

Pharmacists argue against advertising, contending that it would lead to drug abuse. This is simply not so. Prescription drugs are products whose access, content and use are tightly controlled and will continue to be tightly controlled whether there is retail price advertising or not. Moreover, it taxes the boundaries of rationality to imply that informing consumers of prices could lead them irreversibly down the path of drug abuse.

Pharmacists also oppose advertising prices of their products on the grounds that they are professionals like doctors and lawyers. This argument is based on fallacious reasoning. Pharmacists do perform an invaluable service that requires great care. But they do not perform a professional service as complex and individualized as that of a doctor or lawyer. In fact, the pharmacist does not perform a professional service so much as he sells a mass-produced, fully compounded and pre-packaged product. Less than 5% of the prescriptions require him to compound any medicine.

Those prescription drug products dispensed by the pharmacist are sold to him through the vigorous use of price advertising and promotion, methods he relies on at the wholesale level but steadfastly opposes at the retail level.

The drug industry

One of the most significant factors contributing to the high price of prescription drugs in this country is the patent law. When the 17-year patent protection period for a new drug ends, prices tend to drop dramatically. Until that time, however, the manufacturer has a monopoly on production and distribution. A recent survey of world patent practices shows that 54 of 80 nations studied denied patent protection for pharmaceuticals. This often contributes to the tremendous differences between drug prices in this country and elsewhere.

The drug industry contends that without the incentive of patent protection many of the new drugs developed in recent years would not have been discovered. There is a need for a degree of patent protection, but the 17-year monopoly seems excessive. The answer lies in compulsory licensing of prescription drug patents.

A study by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare concluded that "much of the drug industry's research and development activities would appear to provide only minor contributions to medical progress."

Pharmacies and pharmacists

Independent neighborhood pharmacies outnumber chain stores by seven to one and filled more than 43% of the prescriptions consumers purchased in 1971. Chain stores filled 7% and other retail outlets accounted for another 7%. (Hospitals filled 38% and physicians 5%).

The owners of independent drug stores and the pharmacists who work there are the dominant influences in the profession and its policies. They are a strong lobbying power in the nation's state houses and in the Congress.

They have been able to have retail prescription drug price advertising banned in more than two-thirds of the states.

They have not been as successful, however, in overturning anti-substitution laws which forbid pharmacists from filling a prescription with anything other than the exact branded item specified by the prescribing doctor. However, when no brand is specified by the doctor, the pharmacist is free to substitute any manufacturer's generic equivalent.

"This situation offers a mixed blessing. There is a potential for abuse because the

pharmacist with a generic prescription is in a position to indulge in price gouging by using the item on his shelf with the biggest profit margin.

"Generic prescribing, on the other hand, permits the druggist to carry a small inventory, thereby reducing his expenditures and, theoretically, permitting him to pass some savings on to the consumer."

Critics of generic prescribing contend that only 20-25% of all prescription drugs on the market could be effected because the rest are under patents and not available generically. Nonetheless, there is great potential for savings.

The burden of high prescription costs falls most heavily on the elderly and others on fixed incomes. Although, only about 10% of the population is 65 or older, this group accounts for about 25% of all prescription expenditures; in 1971 that amounted to about \$1 billion.

Generic prescribing for 67 of the drugs most frequently dispensed for the elderly in 1970 could have reduced the wholesale cost to the retailer from nearly \$74.9 million to \$33.4 million, according to an HEW study. If retail markups were set so that the pharmacist could receive the same gross profit on generic prescriptions as on brand name ones, the total *retail* price for those drugs would drop from \$150 million to \$108 million, a savings to elderly consumers of nearly 28%, according to HEW.

Drug substitution is no panacea for the consumer but is an important step forward. As long as anti-substitution laws exist, there is little prospect for passing on to the consumer the benefits of price competition in the drug field.

Closely related to the issue of substitution and an integral factor in the price of prescriptions is the question of brand vs. generic superiority. Enormous promotion budgets are more responsible for the popularity of trademarked drugs than any superiority of either quality or therapeutic effect. In fact, there is no convincing evidence to show that brand-name drugs do the job any better than the lesser-known generics.

Retail advertising practices and prohibitions

Statutes and regulations in 37 states forbid advertising of prescription drugs by price or name. Court challenges are pending in at least 11 of these states on issues of advertising and/or posting. Recent challenges have succeeded in three states (Florida, Pennsylvania and Oregon) and have failed in two more (New Jersey and New Mexico) though new suits are pending there. The legal status of such restrictions, especially those not by statute but by state pharmacy board regulation, is at this time unclear and is being tested in the courts.

Federal legislation to permit drug price advertising is being introduced in Congress with publication of this report. (See chapter X.)

Drug price advertising can be extremely useful mechanism for the consumer in two respects:

1. Information regarding drug prices would be readily available and allow more freedom of choice in getting a prescription filled, and

2. Increased price competition would push prices lower.

In Philadelphia, where drug price advertising is permitted and practiced, a survey showed that the consumer pays an average of 34% less for prescriptions than the patient in New York City, where advertising is still illegal.

The removal of prohibitions on retail prescription price advertising alone will not be sufficient to foster open price competition in the market-place. Experience has shown that where such restrictions were removed widespread advertising did not necessarily follow. This is believed to be largely due to

the pressures from the pharmacy establishment. Therefore, it appears necessary to make price posting mandatory, in addition to permitting advertising at the discretion of the pharmacy.

Posting has the additional value of informing the consumer of the price when he walks into the store; the disadvantage, of course, is that he cannot do his comparative shopping in his own home, as he does with other advertised products. Taken together, though, advertising and posting complement each other and would be of immense value to the consumer.

CHAPTER X—RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to fully implement the consumer's right to be informed of the prices of the prescription drugs he uses, this study recommends the following:

A. Enactment of legislation (details on next page) requiring:

1. An end to all blanket prohibitions on retail prescription drug price advertising.
2. The mandatory posting of prices for the 100 most commonly prescribed drugs.
3. The open dating of all perishable prescription drugs, showing clearly on the dispensed products' label the date beyond which the potency is diminished or the chemical composition is altered by age.

4. Labeling and advertising of prescription drugs by their established name, and an end to all ant subsitution laws.

5. Compulsory licensing of new prescription drugs during the 17-year patent.

B. The drug industry and appropriate federal regulatory agencies should take necessary action to curtail deceptive drug advertising claims in the popular media as well as trade and professional publications, especially for over-the-counter drugs.

C. Consumer advocates should be named to pharmacy boards and commissions in all states and the District of Columbia.

D. As noted in this study, the Department of Justice has termed most drug ad restrictions "unjustified" and has called on the states to repeal them. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and the President's consumer advisor also have endorsed such a move. Therefore, the administration is strongly urged to support legislation prohibiting drug price advertising restraints and to initiate anti-trust proceedings to eliminate the barriers to price competition. The states and their pharmacy boards are likewise urged to voluntarily remove these anti-consumer restrictions.

E. The pharmacy profession is urged to remove voluntarily all barriers to adequate consumer information by adopting the reforms called for in this report.

*Legislation**The Prescription Drug Information Act*

This legislation has two purposes. It will make prohibitions against the advertising of prescription drug prices an unfair act or practice in commerce, and it will require drug stores to post the current prices of their 100 most commonly prescribed drugs. Posting would complement advertising by countering peer pressures on pharmacists not to advertise and by fostering competition through comparison shopping.

The Prescription Drug Freshness Act

This bill requires open-dating for drugs. Any drug that does not have an indefinite shelf life must be prominently labeled as to the date beyond which its potency or efficacy becomes diminished. This is already done at the wholesale level and should be done for the consumer as well.

The FDA has expressed concern over reports that over-aged drugs are sometimes sold to consumers and that consequent deterioration may be responsible for some injuries and deaths.

There is no defensible reason why this information should be denied the consumer.

There is an obvious and serious potential health hazard involved since these are the dates beyond which the effectiveness or potency of the drug diminishes below that specified by the manufacturer.

Opponents of this proposal contend it would encourage self-diagnosis; there is no evidence to support that position. However, it would have the additional benefit of preventing needless duplicate purchases by a consumer who may need the same drug prescribed once again by the physician.

The Prescription Drug Labeling Act

This bill would require that in labeling and advertising of certain drugs sold by prescription, the "established" or generic name must appear each time the proprietary or brand name is used. It would also give the consumer and the pharmacist the option of filling the prescription with the generic equivalent. Where there is such substitution, it must not be done to sell a higher-priced product but to save money for the consumer.

The Prescription Drug Patent Licensing Act

When a company has applied for a license under a drug patent and it is not granted within 90 days, the company could apply to the Federal Trade Commission for an order requiring such licensing. If the price charged or quoted to druggists by the patent holder is more than five times the cost of production, the FTC could order a hearing on the application. It could then order the granting of an unrestricted license to make, use, and sell the drug. That order could include granting an unrestricted trademark license, if the FTC feels that it is in the interest of competition.

CHAPTER XI—HOW TO GET THE BEST RX BUY

Consumers need not wait until all anti-advertising laws are repealed and meaningful price posting becomes a reality in order to avoid paying excessive prices for the medicine they need. Here are some things that can be helpful:

Consumers

1. Let your doctor know you want to get the best buy for your money.
 - a. Ask him to prescribe the medicine generically.
 - b. If you are going to be on the medication for a long time, ask him to prescribe it in a large quantity so you don't have to make repeated and costly trips to the pharmacy; after all, it costs the pharmacist more to dispense 50 capsules four times than to sell you 200 at one time.
 - c. Ask him to suggest a pharmacy with low prices.
 - d. If the prescription is small, ask the doctor if he has some office samples he can give you instead.

2. Shop around.
 - a. Ask the pharmacist what he will charge before you have your prescription filled; if he won't tell you or you think his price is too high, try somewhere else.

- b. Look for the services you want, such as convenience, credit, delivery, 24-hour service, patient profile records. If that's what you're looking for, you can expect to pay extra for it; if you want the lowest possible price, expect bare bones service (in some stores that means never even seeing the pharmacist, only a clerk).

- c. It may be a good idea to get two prescriptions from your doctor for the identical medication; have one filled at the discount store (if the price there is lowest) and leave another at a pharmacy that delivers, just for emergencies.

- d. Ask for Medicare, senior citizen and similar discounts if you think you're eligible, but wait until the standard customer price has been quoted.

Doctors

1. Survey pharmacies in your area for prices of commonly prescribed drugs.

- a. Check with patients about where to find best buys.

b. Ask drug company representatives for precise information on wholesale prices; most can also provide helpful information on retail prices in the area.

c. Pass this information on to patients.

2. Prescribe generically and in quantity, where possible.

a. Write the prescription generically so that the patient can purchase the medication you specify at the lowest possible price.

b. If the patient is going to be on the medication for a long time, consider writing the prescription for a large amount. The savings (in money and bother) can be significant.

c. Prescribe standard quantities (the Physicians' Desk Reference has this data) and, where appropriate, economical dosage forms. This is especially important for elderly persons who have fixed incomes and must take maintenance drugs. If (the patient's dosage form is increased by his physician—e.g., from 250 mg to 500 mg—he would be better off economically to get a new prescription for the larger dosage form than to continue taking the old medicine but doubling the quantity to get the same dosage.)

3. If the medication is too costly for the patient, Medicaid may help if the patient is eligible.

a. If not, some pharmacists may be willing to help a needy customer, if the doctor alerts them.

b. There is a code between physicians and pharmacists to do this: PP on a prescription means "poor patient" and ARB means "any reliable brand." So warned, the pharmacist can adjust his price or substitute a lower-cost drug.

4. Write prescriptions legibly.

Pharmacists

1. Post your prices and quote prices over the phone or in person for the consumer shopping for the best buy.

- a. Don't overlook an opportunity to sell yourself and your service. Explain clearly to customers just what professional services you offer and what they cost.

- b. In other words, justify your charges, don't conceal them. The best way to do this maybe on a sign prominently displayed near the pharmacy counter.

2. When a customer brings in a prescription for a high-price trademarked drug, suggest a generic substitution and call the physician for permission.

- a. When the customer already has a generic prescription, fill it with the lowest cost product available.

- b. In either case, pass the savings on to the customer.

3. Use your influence in the pharmacy profession to voluntarily remove the barriers to adequate consumer information such as restrictions on retail price advertising. You can also begin by labeling your prescriptions with the generic name of the drug and the date beyond which it should not be used.

APPENDIX I

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: The cost of prescription drugs is a serious problem for many persons. In conjunction with a study I am conducting concerning retail prescription pricing practices, I am sending this questionnaire to a select group of residents of Queens. Your answers will be of great value.

1. How many prescriptions have you had filled in the past year? (14.9%) 0-5; (25.5%) 5-10; (22.3%) 10-20; (38.4%) Over 20.

How many of these prescriptions are for the same drugs? 7.

3. Of the number of prescriptions filled for the same drug, have you found much variance in price at different stores? (78.6%) Yes; (21.4%) No.

What percentage difference have you found? (38.5%), 10-20; (50%) 25-50; (5.8%) over 100.

4. Do you generally have prescriptions filled at the same pharmacy? (79.3%) Yes; (20.7%) No.

5. What factor is most important to you when choosing a pharmacy? (43.6%) Convenience; (37.6%) Price; (12%) Services (such as delivery, credit, etc.); (6.8%) Other (specify).

6. Do you know whether your doctor prescribes brand-name drugs or drugs by their generic (chemical) names? (36.1%) Brand name; (30.1%) Generic name; (33.7%) Don't know.

Do you ever ask him to prescribe generally? (13%) Yes; (87%) No.

7. What kind of pharmacy fills your prescriptions? (65%) Independently owned, small; (8.8%) Chain drugstore; (22.9%) Discount drugstore; (3.29%) Pharmacy counter in any other store.

8. Do you ask your druggist the price of a prescription before you have it filled? Yes (45.1%); No (54.9%).

9. Do you feel prescription costs are (a) too high 91%; (b) about right 9%; or (c) low 0%?

10. Would you like to see prescription prices advertised so you could compare costs more easily? (95%) Yes; (5%) No.

Please return this questionnaire as soon as possible using the self-addressed mailer on the other side. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

BEN ROSENTHAL.

APPENDIX 2—DRUG PRICE SURVEY RESULTS

In the 1971 portion of the survey, two types of prescriptions were used. One was written generically and the other specified a brand name product. Prices quoted in response to the generic prescriptions were not necessarily for non-trademarked products but were frequently for higher-cost brand name drugs. This had the effect of making generic prices appear higher than they should. To prevent this type of consumer abuse, consumers should specify they want the lowest cost equivalent product available. In addition, legislation permitting generic prescribing and abolishing anti-substitution restrictions should contain a provision guaranteeing that when substitution is made it must be with a lower-priced product.

Wholesale price data is from the 1971 American Druggist *Blue Book*.

TETRACYCLINE, 1972—56 CAPSULES, 250 MG.

	Washington, Queens, N.Y.	D.C.
Highest	\$6.00	\$5.50
Lowest	\$2.49	\$1.50
Average	\$3.81	\$3.38
Wholesale	\$0.98	\$0.98
Stores	9	10
Average markup (percent)	289	245
Prices quoted	\$2.49	\$1.50
Do	\$2.85	\$1.88
Do	\$3.34	\$1.95
Do	\$3.39	\$2.13
Do	\$3.55	\$2.18
Do	\$3.79	\$3.28
Do	\$4.00	\$4.45
Do	\$4.95	\$5.45
Do	\$6.00	\$5.50
		\$5.50

AMPICILLIN, 1972—56 CAPSULES, 250 MG.

	Queens, N.Y.	Washington, D.C.
Highest	\$16.75	\$17.95
Lowest	\$5.95	\$8.40
Average	\$9.20	\$11.60
Wholesale	\$7.28	\$7.28
Stores	16	10
Average markup (percent)	26	59
Prices quoted	\$5.95	\$8.40
Do	\$6.50	\$9.09
Do	\$6.50	\$9.33
Do	\$6.50	\$9.35
Do	\$6.75	\$9.99
Do	\$7.85	\$11.20
Do	\$7.95	\$11.20
Do	\$7.95	\$12.95

AMPICILLIN, 1972—56 CAPSULES, 250 MG.

	Queens, N.Y.	Washington, D.C.
Prices quoted (Continued)		
Do.	\$8.00	\$16.80
Do.	\$8.50	\$17.95
Do.	\$9.20	
Do.	\$10.00	
Do.	\$10.00	
Do.	\$11.50	
Do.	\$12.50	
Do.	\$14.00	
Do.	\$16.75	

CHLORPHENIRAMINE MALEATE, 1972—60 TABLETS, 4 MG.

	Queens, N.Y.	Washington, D.C.
Highest.		
Lowest.	\$4.95	\$5.13
Average.	\$3.85	\$4.22
Wholesale.	\$0.10	\$0.10
Stores.	7	10
Average markup (percent).	3,750	4,120
Prices quoted.	\$1.85	\$3.50
Do.	\$1.95	\$3.75
Do.	\$2.85	\$3.95
Do.	\$3.75	\$3.95
Do.	\$3.79	\$4.00
Do.	\$3.85	\$4.00
Do.	\$3.95	\$4.00
Do.	\$4.95	\$4.83
Do.	\$5.13	\$5.13
Do.	\$5.13	\$5.13

TETRACYCLINE, 1971—30 CAPSULES, 250 MG.

	Queens, N.Y.	Washington, D.C.
Highest.		
Lowest.	\$5.95	\$9.90
Average.	\$1.95	\$2.75
Wholesale.	\$3.05	\$3.53
Stores.	\$0.52	\$0.52
Average markup (percent).	11	5
Prices quoted.	\$1.95	\$2.75
Do.	\$2.10	\$2.90
Do.	\$2.29	\$2.90
Do.	\$2.45	\$2.90
Do.	\$2.95	\$9.90
Do.	\$2.95	
Do.	\$3.25	
Do.	\$4.50	
Do.	\$4.50	
Do.	\$4.95	
Do.	\$5.95	

TETRACYCIN (ROERIG), 1971—30 CAPSULES, 250 MG.

	Queens, N.Y.	Washington, D.C.
Highest.		
Lowest.	\$4.29	\$5.00
Average.	\$2.00	\$3.00
Wholesale.	\$2.91	\$4.24
Stores.	\$1.28	\$1.28
Average markup (percent).	127	231
Prices quoted.	\$2.00	\$3.00
Do.	\$2.29	\$3.00
Do.	\$2.45	\$3.35
Do.	\$2.45	\$3.35
Do.	\$2.75	\$3.50
Do.	\$2.95	\$5.00
Do.	\$3.00	
Do.	\$3.25	
Do.	\$4.50	
Do.	\$4.95	

AMPICILLIN, 1971—30 CAPSULES, 250 MG.

	Queens, N.Y.	Washington, D.C.
Highest.		
Lowest.	\$9.00	\$15.00
Average.	\$4.95	\$5.65
Wholesale.	\$6.50	\$8.80
Stores.	\$3.90	\$3.90
Average markup (percent).	68	126
Prices quoted.	\$4.95	\$5.65
Do.	\$4.95	\$6.00
Do.	\$5.47	\$6.04
Do.	\$5.89	\$8.43
Do.	\$5.95	\$11.65
Do.	\$6.00	\$15.00

Queens,
N.Y. Washington,
D.C.

Do.	\$6.29
Do.	\$6.50
Do.	\$7.95
Do.	\$8.00
Do.	\$8.09
Do.	\$9.00
Do.	\$9.00

POLYCILLIN (BRISTOL), 1971—30 CAPSULES, 250 MG.

Queens,
N.Y. Washington,
D.C.

Highest.	\$9.95	\$10.00
Lowest.	\$6.95	\$8.05
Average.	\$8.78	\$9.03
Wholesale.	\$5.15	\$5.15
Stores.	10	6
Average markup (percent).	70	75
Prices quoted.	\$6.95	\$8.05
Do.	\$7.00	\$8.40
Do.	\$8.09	\$9.14
Do.	\$8.95	\$9.14
Do.	\$8.95	\$9.45
Do.	\$9.00	\$10.00
Do.	\$9.19	
Do.	\$9.90	
Do.	\$9.90	
Do.	\$9.95	

CHLORPHENIRAMINE MALEATE, 1971—25 TABLETS, 4 MG.

Queens,
N.Y. Washington,
D.C.

Highest.	\$2.43
Lowest.	\$1.35
Average.	\$1.79
Wholesale.	\$0.04
Stores.	6
Average markup (percent).	4,375
Prices quoted.	\$1.35
Do.	\$1.50
Do.	\$1.70
Do.	\$1.70
Do.	\$1.98
Do.	\$2.43

1 Not surveyed.

CHLORTRIMETON, 1971—25 TABLETS, 4 MG.

Queens,
N.Y. Washington,
D.C.

Highest.	\$1.90
Lowest.	\$1.20
Average.	\$1.56
Wholesale.	\$0.61
Stores.	6
Average markup (percent).	156
Prices quoted.	\$1.20
Do.	\$1.38
Do.	\$1.43
Do.	\$1.70
Do.	\$1.75
Do.	\$1.90

1 Not surveyed.

APPENDIX 3

DRUG PRICE SURVEY RESULTS, 1971: QUEENS, N.Y.

Name, address, and price per prescription

Tetracycline, 30 capsules, 250 mg.:

Jewel Pharmacy & Surgical Company (Rondex), 46-27 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$2.95.

Kissena Pharmacy (would not say), 143-12

45th Ave., Flushing, \$4.95.

Jo-Mar (Aberdeen), 44-45 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$2.29.

King's Pharmacy (would not say), 44-03

Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$2.95.

Carlyle Drugs (Bristol), 44-08 Kissena

Blvd., Flushing, \$4.50.

Park Lane Chemists (Blue Quartz), 42-95

Main Street, Flushing, \$1.95.

A.C. (Pure-Pak), 41-99 Main Street, Flushing, \$2.10.

Post Pharmacy, Inc. (Heather), 41-56 Main

Street, Flushing, \$3.25.

Plaza-Rexall Pharmacy (Rondex), 40-42

Main Street, Flushing, \$2.45.

Plaza Pharmacy (would not say), 39-19
103rd, Corona, \$5.95.Cut-Rate (would not say), Northern Blvd
and 101st, Flushing, \$4.50.Tetracycline (Roerig), 30 capsules, 250 mg.:
Jewel Pharmacy & Surgical Company (Roerig), 46-27 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$2.45.

Jo-Mar (Roerig), 44-45 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$2.29.

King's Pharmacy (Roerig), 44-03 Kissena
Blvd., Flushing, \$2.00.Carlyle Drugs (Bristol), 44-08 Kissena
Blvd., Flushing, \$4.50.Park Lane Chemists (Roerig) 42-95 Main
Street, Flushing, \$2.45.A.C. (Roerig) 41-99 Main Street, Flushing,
\$3.00.Post Pharmacy, Inc., (Roerig) 41-56 Main
Street, Flushing, \$3.25.Plaza-Rexall Pharmacy (Roerig) 40-42
Main Street, Flushing, \$2.95.Plaza Pharmacy (Spencer-Mead)* 39-19
103rd, Corona, \$4.95.Cut-Rate (would not say) Northern Blvd.
& 101st, Flushing, \$2.75.Ampicillin 30 capsules, 250 mg.:
Hunter Garden, Inc. (Parke-Davis) 147-48

Northern Blvd., Flushing, \$6.00.

Caesar Chemists (Bristol) Parsons & North
ern Blvd., Flushing, \$8.00.North Bowne (Rugby) 141-02 Northern
Blvd., Flushing, \$5.95.Main Street Pharmacy (Beecham) Main
Street & Northern Blvd., Flushing, \$6.29.Foods Plus (Squibb) 37-09 Main Street,
Flushing, \$5.47, \$5.89.*Lewis Pharmacy (Penbritin) 136-98 Roose
velt Ave., Flushing, \$7.95.Kleins (Spencer-Mead) 136-20 Roosevelt
Ave., Flushing, \$4.95.

Genovese Drug Stores, Inc. (Penbritin)

136-51 Roosevelt Ave., Flushing, \$8.09.

Centro de Medicos (Spencer-Mead) Roose
velt Ave. & 104th St., Corona, \$4.95.Square Pharmacy (Squibb) 103-04 Roose
velt Ave., Corona, \$9.00.

Unnamed store (Beecham) Roosevelt Ave.,

Corona, \$6.50.

Polycillin (Bristol) 30 capsules, 250 mg.:
Hunter Garden Drugs, Inc. (Bristol) 147-48

Northern Blvd., Flushing, \$8.95.

Caesar Chemists (Bristol) Parson & North
ern Blvd., Flushing, \$9.00.North Bowne (Bristol) 141-02 Northern
Blvd., Flushing, \$8.95.Main Street Pharmacy (Bristol) Main
Street & Northern Blvd., Flushing, \$6.95.Foods Plus (Bristol) 37-09 Main Street,
Flushing, \$9.19.Lewis Pharmacy (Bristol) 136-98 Roose
velt Ave., Flushing, \$7.00.

Genovese Drug Stores, Inc. (Bristol) 136-51

Roosevelt Ave., Flushing, \$8.09.

Centro de Medicos (Bristol) Roosevelt Ave.
& 104th St., Corona, \$9.00.Square Pharmacy (Bristol) 103-04 Roose
velt Ave., Corona, \$9.00.

Unnamed store (Bristol) Roosevelt Ave.,

Corona, \$9.90.

DRUG PRICE SURVEY RESULTS, 1972: QUEENS,
NEW YORK

Tetracycline 56 capsules, 250 mg.:

Forman Pharmacy, 179-01 Union Turn
pike, Flushing, \$4.95.Surrey-Pike Pharmacy, 179-02 Union
Turnpike, Jamaica, \$6.00.Post Pharmacy, 41-56 Main Street, Flushing,
\$4.00.1 To substitute a branded product other
than that specified by the prescribing physician
(in this case, Tetracycline by Roerig) is
illegal in New York. Prescriptions in this
study, however, were not filled since only
price quotes were requested; nothing illegal
was done by the pharmacists here.

2 Ibid.

3 Two researchers for this study visited this
store and each was quoted a different price
for the identical prescription.

Courtesy Drugs, 40-06 Main Street, Flushing, \$2.85.
 Whelan's, 39-07 Main Street, Flushing, \$3.34.
 North Main Pharmacy, 137-06 Northern Blvd., Flushing, \$3.55.
 Foods-Plus Products, 37-09 Main Street, Flushing, \$3.79.
 Genovese Drug Stores, 136-51 Roosevelt Ave., Flushing, \$2.49.
 CVS Pharmacy, 40-13 Main Street, Flushing, \$3.39.
Ampicillin, 56 capsules, 250 mg.: RXD Prescription Center, 95-05 57th Ave., Rego Park, \$8.00.
 Franklin Pharmacy, 95-19 57th Ave., Elmhurst, \$11.50.
 Sherwood Drugs, 97-21 57th Ave., Forest Hills, \$7.95.
 Wolin's Pharmacy, 96-02 Roosevelt Ave., Corona, \$5.95.
 Mishkin's Store, 37-26 Junction Blvd., Corona, \$8.50.
 Junction Pharmacy, 38-10 Junction Blvd., Corona, \$6.50.
 Hilltop Pharmacy, 167-23 Union Turnpike, Flushing, \$10.00.
 Salzman Chemists, 149-19 Union Turnpike, Flushing, \$7.95.
 Rexall Drugs, 79-07 Main Street, Flushing, \$6.75.
 Dorsey Drugs, 71-44 Main Street, Flushing, \$16.75, \$14.00.
 Belle Drugs, 72-48 Main Street, Flushing, \$10.00.
 Whelan's Drug Co., 71-55 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$9.20.
 Regency Drug Store, 77-39 Vleigh Place, Flushing, \$12.50.
 Norden Chemists, 79-01 Main Street, Flushing, \$6.50.
 Art Chemists, 59-25 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$6.50.
 Campus Drugs, 59-04 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, \$7.85.
Chlorpheniramine Maleate, 60 tablets, 4 mg.: Estrin Pharmacy, 48-01 Bell Blvd., Bayside, \$3.95.
 Bell Blvd. Pharmacy, 47-48 Bell Blvd., Bayside, \$3.75.
 Bayside Pharmacy, 42-35 Bell Blvd., Bayside, \$4.95.
 Bay Ter Chemists, 40-05 Bell Blvd., Bayside, \$3.85.
 Oakland Pharmacy, 61-28 Springfield Blvd., Bayside, \$1.95.
 Springfield Drug Inc., Springfield Blvd., Bayside, \$3.79.
 Salida Drug Co., 210-17 Horace Harding Expwy., Bayside, \$1.85, \$2.85.⁵

APPENDIX 4

DRUG PRICE SURVEY RESULTS, 1971:

WASHINGTON, D.C., AREA

Name, address, and price per prescription

Tetracycline, 30 capsules, 250 mg.: People's Drug Stores, 3471 N. Fairfax Dr., Arlington, \$2.90.
 People's Drug Stores, 7 Dupont Circle N.W., D.C., \$2.90.
 Drug Fair, 2901 S. Glebe Rd., Arlington, \$2.75.
 Georgetown Pharmacy, 1344 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., D.C., \$2.90.
 Community Pharmacy, 1130 Maryland Ave., N.E., D.C., \$9.90.
Tetracycline (Roerig) 30 capsules, 250 mg.: Drug Fair, 1201 E St., N.W., D.C., \$3.35.
 Drug Fair, 2207 N. Pershing Dr., Arlington, \$3.35.
 People's Drug Stores, 433 L'Enfant Plaza, D.C., \$3.50.
 Dart Drugs, 18th & I St., N.W., D.C., \$3.00.
 Dorchester Pharmacy, 2480 16th Ave., N.W., D.C., \$5.00.
 Matthews Apothecary, 2202 Georgia Ave., N.W., D.C., \$3.00.

Ampicillin, 30 capsules, 250 mg.: People's Drug Stores, 801 N. Capitol St., D.C., \$8.43.
 People's Drug Stores, Town Center Shopping Center, D.C., \$6.04.
 Dalmo Discount Center, 1213 F St., N.W., D.C., \$6.00.
 Drug Fair, Laurel Montpelier Shopping Center, Md., \$5.65.
 Beacon Pharmacy, 4th & Rhode Island N.E., D.C., \$15.00.
 Robinson's Apothecary, 922 E. Capitol St., D.C., \$11.65.
Polycillin (Bristol), 30 capsules, 250 mg.: People's Drug Stores, 717 14th St. N.W., D.C., \$9.14.
 Rodman's Discount Store, 10362 Lee Highway, Fairfax, \$8.40.
 Drug Fair, 1245 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., D.C., \$8.05.
 People's Drugs, 2271 Bel Pre Rd., Silver Spring, \$9.14.
 Tschiffely Bros., Druggists, 1218 Connecticut Ave., N.W., D.C., \$10.00.
 Morton's Rexall Pharmacy, 301 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E., D.C., \$9.45.
Chlorpheniramine Maleate, 25 tablets, 4 mg.: Drug Fair, 1701 K Street N.W., D.C., \$1.70.
 Drug Fair, 8555 Georgia Ave., Silver Spring, \$1.70.
 People's Drug Stores, 6213 Georgia Ave., N.W., D.C., \$2.43.
 Dart Drugs, 11th & E St., N.W., D.C., \$1.98.
 Eyres Pharmacy, 1932 Nichols Ave., S.E., D.C., \$1.50.
 Woodlawn Pharmacy, 1219 N. Glebe Rd., Arlington, \$1.35.
Chlortrimeton, 25 tablets, 4 mg.: Dart Drugs, 1111 G St., N.W., D.C., \$1.43.
 Dart Drugs, 1901 Michigan Ave., N.E., D.C., \$1.38.
 Drug Fair, 1815 Connecticut Ave., N.W., D.C., \$1.70.
 Rodman's Discount Center, 5100 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., D.C., \$1.20.
 Chevy Chase Pharmacy, 5636 Connecticut Ave., N.W., D.C., \$1.75.
 The Apothecary, 5415 Cedar Lane, Bethesda, \$1.90.

DRUG PRICE SURVEY RESULTS, 1972; WASHINGTON, D.C., AREA

Tetracycline, 56 capsules, 250 mg.: People's Drug Stores, Tyson's Corner Center, McLean, \$1.50.
 Dart Drugs, Tyson's Corner Center, McLean, \$2.18.
 Dart Drugs, Chain Bridge, \$2.13.
 People's Drug Stores, Chain Bridge, \$1.88.
 Drug Fair, 1312 Chain Bridge, \$1.95.
 McLean Medical Building, 1515 Chain Bridge, \$4.45.
 Georgetown Pharmacy, 1344 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., D.C., \$5.45.
 People's Drug Stores, 1403 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., D.C., \$3.28.
 Pearson's Pharmacy, Wisconsin & Calvert, N.W., D.C., \$5.50.
 Chevy Chase Pharmacy, Wisconsin & Northampton, Chevy Chase, \$5.50.
Ampicillin, 56 capsules, 250 mg.: People's Drug Stores, 3400 Wisconsin Ave., N.W., D.C., \$9.99.
 McLean Drugs, Wisconsin & Weazey St., N.W., D.C., \$17.95.
 People's Drug Stores, 4000 Wisconsin & Albemarle, \$9.33.
 Drug Fair, Westbard Ave., Bethesda, \$9.00.
 Rodman's Drug, 5100 Wisconsin Ave., D.C., \$8.40.
 People's Drug Stores, 21 Wisconsin Circle, Chevy Chase, \$11.20.
 Dart Drugs, Old Georgetown Rd. & Commerce La., D.C., \$9.09.
 Bethesda Medical Building, Woodlawn Street, \$9.35.
 Governor's Pharmacy, Battery Lane, Bethesda, \$16.80, \$11.20.¹

Glen Echo Pharmacy, Goldsboro Rd., Bethesda, \$12.75.
Chlorpheniramine Maleate, 60 tablets, 4 mg.: People's Drug Stores, Pennsylvania & 7th, S.E., D.C., \$4.83.
 People's Drug Stores, 2529 Pennsylvania, S.E., D.C., \$5.13.
 Leader Drug's, 3240 Pennsylvania, S.E., D.C., \$3.95.
 Fairfax Village Pharmacy, 3829 Pennsylvania, Fairfax, \$4.00.
 Drug Fair, 7953 Annapolis Road, \$4.00.
 Dart Drugs, 8315 Annapolis Road, \$3.50.
 People's Drug Stores, 9520 Georgia Ave., Silver Spring, \$5.13.
 Drug Fair, 8555 Georgia Ave., Silver Spring, \$4.00.
 Bemar Pharmacy, 9330 Georgia Ave., Silver Spring, \$3.95.
 Brenner's Pharmacy, 9400 Georgia Ave., Silver Spring, \$3.75.
 (Appendix 5 not reproduced in the RECORD.)

APPENDIX 6

COMPARATIVE DRUG PRICES

The following data, compiled from the 1972 Red Book, shows the wide variety of wholesale prices at which three widely prescribed drugs are available.

Name of drug, company, and price
(250 mg/100 caps)

Tetracycline: American Pharmaceutical Co., \$2.82.
Tetracycline: American Quinine Co., \$2.10.
Tetracycline: BBC Labs, \$2.95.
Tetracycline: Barre Drug Co., Inc., The, \$2.80.
Tetracycline: Barry-Martin Pharmaceuticals, Inc., \$4.40.
Tetracycline: Bell Pharmacal Co., \$3.50.
Tetracycline: Bowman Pharmaceutical, \$3.10.
Bristacycline: Bristol Labs, \$4.17.
Tetracycline, Burrough Bros. Pharmaceuticals, Inc., \$4.75.
Tetracycline: Carroll Chemical Co., The, \$2.25.
Tetracycline: Columbia Medical Co., \$2.10.
Tetracycline: Docra Pharmaceutical Co., \$7.50.
Tetracycline: Faraday Laboratories, Inc., \$3.25.
Tetracycline: Interstate Drug Exchange, Inc., \$1.75.
Tetracycline: Jenkins Labs., Inc., \$3.50.
Tetracycline: Kasar Laboratories, \$3.15.
Tetracycline: Lannett Co., Inc., The, \$6.00.
Achromycin V: Lederle Labs, \$4.50.
Tetracycline: Lit Drug Co., \$37.20.
Kesso-Tetra: McKesson Labs, \$4.25.
Tetracycline: Penhurst Pharmacal Co., \$2.50.
Tetracycline: Pharmex, Inc., \$2.95.
Tetracycline: Premo Pharmaceutical Labs., Inc., \$4.25.
Tetracycline: Rachelle Labs., Inc., \$3.55.
Tetracycline: Roerig, J.B., Co., \$4.25.
Tetracycline: Richlyn Labs, \$3.20.
Tetracycline: Robinson Laboratory, Inc., \$3.50.
Tetracycline: Sheraton Labs., Inc., \$3.75.
Tetracycline: Stanlabs, Inc., \$4.50.
Tetracycline: Stayner Corp., \$3.25.
Tetracycline: Sterimed Brand, \$2.40.
Tetracycline: TMCO Pharmaceuticals, Inc., \$3.00.
Tetracycline: Towne Paulsen & Co., Inc., \$3.35.
Tetracycline: Tracy Pharmacal Co., \$6.50.
Tetracycline: Ulmer Pharmacal Co., The, \$3.00.
Tetracycline: United States Pharmacal Co., \$5.50.
Panmycin Hydrochloride: Upjohn, \$3.94.
Tetracycline: West-Ward, Inc., \$2.40.
Tetracycline: Zenith Laboratories, Inc., \$2.75.

(5 mg/100 tabs)

Prednisone: American Pharmaceutical Corp., \$1.35.

⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid.

¹ Two researchers for this study visited this store and each was quoted a different price for the identical prescription.

Prednisone: Approved Pharmaceutical Corp., \$1.10.
 Prednisone: Arcum Pharmaceutical Corp., \$8.50.
 Prednisone: BBC Labs, \$1.40.
 Prednisone: Barre Drug Co., Inc., The, \$1.15.
 Prednisone: Barry-Martin Pharmaceuticals, Inc., \$1.50.
 Prednisone: Bell Pharmacal Co., \$2.20.
 Prednisone: Blaine Co., \$1.50.
 Prednisone: Bowman Pharmaceutical, \$1.35.
 Prednisone: Burrough Bros. Pharmaceuticals, \$1.80.
 Prednisone, CMC-Consolidated Midland Corp., \$0.90.
 Prednisone: Canfield, C.R. & Co., \$1.37.
 Prednisone: Carroll Chemical Co., The, \$0.95.
 Prednisone: Columbia Medical Co., \$1.10.
 Prednisone: Corvit Pharmaceuticals, \$1.25.
 Prednisone: Daniels, Robert, & Co., Inc., \$1.25.
 Prednisone: Dunhall Pharmaceuticals, Inc., \$3.15.
 Prednisone: Faraday Laboratories, Inc., \$1.20.
 Prednisone: Hall, Don, Labs, \$2.00.
 Prednisone: Kirkman Labs., Inc., \$1.50.
 Prednisone: Lannett Co., Inc., The, \$1.20.
 Prednisone: Lemmon Pharmacal Co., \$2.30.
 Prednisone: Lit Drug Co., \$10.98.
 Prednisone: McKesson Pharmaceuticals, \$1.60.
 Delta: Merck Sharp & Dohme, \$2.20.
 Prednisone: Penhurst Pharmacal Co., \$0.95.
 Prednisone: Pharmex, Inc., \$1.60.
 Prednisone: Premo Pharmaceutical Labs., Inc., \$1.50.
 Prednisone, Progress Labs., Inc., \$1.80.

Prednisone: Purepac Pharmaceutical Co., \$1.20.
 Prednisone: Robinson Laboratory, Inc., \$1.75.
 Prednisone: Rowell Laboratories, Inc., \$1.88.
 Prednisone: Stanlabs, Inc., \$1.40.
 Prednisone: Stayner Corp., \$1.70.
 Prednisone: Supreme Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., \$1.00.
 Prednisone: Towne, Paulsen & Co., Inc., \$1.65.
 Prednisone: USV Pharmaceutical Corp., \$2.64.
 Prednisone: Ulmer Pharmacal Co., The, \$1.25.
 Prednisone: West-Ward, Inc., \$1.20.
 Prednisone: Winsale Drug Co., \$0.85.
 Prednisone: Zemmer Co., Inc., The, \$0.80.
 Prednisone (Deltasone): Upjohn, \$2.82.
 (0.1 mg/1000 tabs)
 Reserpine: American Pharmaceutical Co., \$1.32.
 Reserpine: American Quinine Co., \$1.30.
 Reserpine: Approved Pharmaceutical Corp., \$1.26.
 Reserpine: Arcum Pharmaceutical Corp., \$2.00.
 Reserpine: BBC Labs, \$2.00.
 Reserpine: Barry-Martin Pharmaceuticals, Inc., \$1.75.
 Reserpine: Bell Pharmacal Co., \$2.00.
 Reserpine: Blue Cross (Halsey), \$1.25.
 Reserpine: Burroughs Bros. Pharmaceuticals, Inc., \$2.00.
 Reserpine: CMC-Consolidated Midland Corp., \$1.75.
 Reserpine: Carroll Chemical Co., The, \$1.00.
 Reserpine: Columbia Medical Co., \$1.25.
 Serpasil: Ciba Pharmaceutical Co., \$23.50.

Reserpine: Corvit Pharmaceuticals, \$2.00.
 Reserpine: Daniels, Robert, & Co., Inc., \$1.30.
 Reserpine: Faraday Laboratories, Inc., \$1.25.
 Reserpine: Gotham Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., \$2.40.
 Reserpine: Harvey Labs., Inc., \$2.00.
 Reserpine: High Chemical Co., \$2.90.
 Reserpine: Horton & Converse, \$1.75.
 Reserpine: Kasar Laboratories, \$1.25.
 Reserpine: Lit Drug Co., \$2.06.
 Reserpine: McKesson Pharmaceuticals, \$2.75.
 Reserpine: Moore, H. L., Drug Exchange, Inc., \$0.75.
 Reserpine: Noyes, P. J., The, Co., \$8.00.
 Reserpine: Pharmex, Inc., \$1.75.
 Reserpine: Progress Labs., Inc., \$2.50.
 Reserpine: Queen City Pharmacal Co., \$3.75.
 Reserpine: Raway Pharmacal Co., \$2.90.
 Reserpine: Robinson Laboratory, Inc., \$1.80.
 Reserpine: Sheraton Labs., Inc., \$2.00.
 Reserpine: Stanlabs, Inc., \$1.85.
 Reserpine: Stayner, Corp., \$2.00.
 Reserpine: Sterimed Brand, \$1.38.
 Reserpine: Supreme Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., \$1.15.
 Reserpine: Towne, Paulsen & Co., Inc., \$2.86.
 Reserpine: Truxton, C. O., Inc., \$1.20.
 Reserpine: Ulmer Pharmacal Co., The, \$1.65.
 Reserpine: Vita-Fore Products Co., \$0.95.
 Reserpine: West-Ward, Inc., \$1.60.
 Reserpine: Winsale Drug Co., \$1.10.
 (Appendices 7-9 not reproduced in the RECORD.)

APPENDIX 10

MAJOR DRUG PRODUCERS AND THEIR PROFITS

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Producer	Sales	Assets	Profits	Profit percent of stockholder equity	Producer	Sales	Assets	Profits	Profit percent of stockholder equity
American Home Products	\$1,429,355	\$925,462	\$160,021	26.7	Abbott Labs	\$458,105	\$464,605	\$23,378	8.7
Warner-Lambert (Parke-Davis)	1,346,054	1,085,744	108,095	14.5	Upjohn	438,387	421,181	39,787	13.5
American Cyanamid	1,283,485	1,281,238	94,111	11.1	Schering-Plough	436,841	378,362	59,185	21.5
Bristol Myers	1,066,410	796,431	75,767	17.8	Richardson-Merrell	408,520	374,297	29,817	12.3
Pfizer	951,544	1,036,564	90,585	15.1	Smith Kline & French	357,153	297,325	44,871	21.5
Squibb	830,196	780,663	63,450	14.7	Morton Norwich	345,634	366,431	21,785	11.6
Merck	828,515	709,224	127,176	24.4	Kendall	294,388	194,428	11,547	9.8
Eli Lilly	723,347	787,301	96,149	18.7	Baxter Labs	242,146	368,554	18,177	10.8
Sterling Drug	652,371	457,760	63,079	18.8	G. D. Searle	226,891	253,772	36,004	25.5

NOTES

The 10 companies with the highest return on sales include 5—G. D. Searle, Merck, Schering-Plough, Eli Lilly, and Smith Kline & French Labs—in the pharmaceutical group.

Pharmaceuticals overall have the 2d highest return on stockholders equity, 15.1 percent.

Individually, G. D. Searle is 6th in the top fortune 500 at 25.5 percent, Merck is 7th at 24.4 percent, and Upjohn, Smith Kline & French are close behind with 21.5 percent each.

The industry posted a 9.8-percent gain in sales over 1970. All companies increased sales over the previous year, and all showed profit. No losses.

Some firms, such as American Home Products and American Cyanamid, manufacture other products in addition to pharmaceuticals.

Source: Fortune magazine, May 1972.

APPENDIX 11

DRUG PRICE COMPARISON: UNITED STATES AND ABROAD

The products used in this chart were taken from a study done in 1970 by the Social Security Administration to show the great variation from country to country for a single drug product by the same company.

The prices stated refer to those paid to the manufacturer by the retailer for 100 tablets or capsules.

Drug: Ampicillin (250 mgs.)
 Company: Bristol Laboratory.
 US—\$21.84.
 Ireland—\$9.31.
 New Zealand—\$11.30.
 United Kingdom—\$8.23.
 Drug: Erythromycin (250 mgs.)
 Company: Abbott Labs.
 US—\$26.12.
 Brazil—\$11.92.

Ireland—\$8.56.
 United Kingdom—\$10.02.
 Drug: Diazepam (5 mgs.).
 Company: Roche.
 US—\$8.03.
 Italy—\$3.42.
 New Zealand—\$2.72.
 Ireland—\$2.46.
 Drug: Trifluoperazine HCl (5 mgs.).
 Company: Smith, French and Kline.
 US—\$9.75.
 Brazil—\$2.42.
 Ireland—\$2.78.
 United Kingdom—\$2.59.
 Drug: Glutethimide.
 Company: Ciba.
 US—\$8.00.
 Ireland—\$9.92.
 United Kingdom—\$1.00.
 New Zealand—\$1.23.
 A comparison of U.S. and foreign prices

for two drugs marketed by Smith, Kline & French was prepared by Philadelphia pharmacist Edward Pastor.

Thorazine¹ (50 tablets, 30 mgs.) is sold to:
 U.S. pharmacists for \$3.03.²
 French pharmacists for \$0.51.
 German pharmacists for \$0.94.
 British pharmacists for \$0.77.
 Stelazine (1000 tablets, 1 mg.) is sold to:
 U.S. pharmacists for \$3.50.
 Antigua pharmacists for \$26.03.
 (1000 tablets, 2 mgs.):
 U.S. pharmacists for \$82.00.
 Trinidad pharmacists for \$34.13.
 (1000 tablets, 50 mgs.):
 U.S. pharmacists for \$88.00.
 Barbados pharmacists for \$39.50.

¹ Developed by Rhone-Poulenc of France and exclusively licensed to SKF.

² Blue Book 1971 lists \$4.20.

APPENDIX 12
COMPARISON OF BRAND VERSUS GENERIC PRICES

Brand name	Price	Generic name	Price	Difference	Brand name	Price	Generic name	Price	Difference
Achromycin	\$2.56	Tetracycline hydrochloride	\$0.66	\$1.90	Neprospan	\$3.49	Meprobamate	\$1.01	\$2.48
Achromycin V	2.39	Tetracycline hydrochloride	.66	1.73	Metandren	2.59	Methyltestosterone	.04	.25
Atarax	2.38	Hydroxyzine hydrochloride	2.31	.07	Milpath	3.67	Meprobamate tridihexethyl chloride	3.44	.23
Butisol sodium	1.14	Butabarbital, sodium	.10	1.04	Miltown	2.75	Meprobamate	1.01	1.74
Chloromycetin	5.11	Chloramphenicol	3.04	2.07	Miltrate	3.66	Meprobamate pentaerythritol	3.34	.32
Chlor-Trimeton	.71	Chlorpheniramine maleate	.15	.56			Tetranitrate		
Cort-Dome	1.71	Hydrocortisone	1.08	.63	Naqua	1.68	Trichlor methiazide	1.47	.21
Coumadin	2.31	Sodium warfarin	1.55	.76	Naturetin	2.19	Bendoflumethiazide	1.85	.34
Cryostodigin	.41	Digitoxin	.09	.32	Nembutal	.46	Sodium pentobarbital	.12	.34
Decadron	3.10	Dexamethasone	1.36	1.74	Nitrobid	2.07	Nitroglycerin	.08	1.99
Delta dome	1.00	Prednisone	.29	.71	Noctec	1.08	Chloral Hydrate	.29	.79
Demerol	.57	Meperidine	.43	.14	Norpramin	3.02	Desipramine	2.91	.11
Dexamyl	2.80	Dextroamphetamine sulphate	.94	1.86	Pavabid	4.37	Papaverine	3.26	1.09
Dexedrine	2.71	Dextroamphetamine sulphate	.19	2.52	Pentidol	1.99	Penicillin G. Potassium	.23	1.76
Digifortis	.54	Digitalis	.06	.48	Pentritol	4.15	Pentaerythritol tetranitrate	.10	4.05
Digitora	.22	Digitalis	.06	.16	Penn-Vee-K	2.62	Potassium phenozymethyl	2.43	.19
Dilantin	1.02	Diphenylhydantoin	.43	.59			Penicillin		
Elixophyllin	1.38	Theophylline	.97	.41	Peritate	2.42	Pentaerythritol tetranitrate	.10	2.32
Empirin compound	.78	APC/Codeine	.60	.18	Peritate-SA	3.37	Pentaerythritol tetranitrate	.10	3.27
Epitrate	2.34	Epinephrine bitartrate	1.19	1.15	Phenaphen w/Codeine	.85	Aspirin Codeine hyoscymine	.56	.29
Equanil	2.70	Meprobamate	1.01	1.69			Sulphate phenobarbital		
Equanitrate	4.24	Meprobamate pentaerythritol	3.34	.90	Polycillin	4.49	Ampicillin	4.48	.01
Esidrix	1.97	Hydrochlorothiazide	1.96	.01	Premarin	2.85	Conjugated estrogens equine	2.25	.60
Hydrodiuril-Ka	2.18	Hydrochlorothiazide potassium chloride	2.05	.13	Prolixin	1.91	Fluphenazine	1.53	.38
Hydropres	3.37	Hydrochlorothiazide, reserpine	2.21	1.16	Purodin	.34	Digitoxin	.09	.25
Isopto Carpine	1.13	Pilocarpine	.87	.26	Pyribenzamine	1.00	Tripeptenamine hydrochloride	.17	.83
Isuprel mistometer	2.50	Isoproterenol	2.49	.01	Raudixin	3.12	Rauwolfia serpentina	.12	3.00
Kenacort	3.82	Triamcinolone	2.93	.89	Seconal sodium	.49	Secobarbital	.12	.37
Lanoxin	.48	Digoxin	.09	.39	Serpasil	2.04	Reserpine	.05	1.99
Luminal	.14	Phenobarbital	.07	.07	Teldrin	1.40	Chlorpheniramine maleate	.15	1.25
Mandelamine	1.71	Methenamine mandelate	.58	1.13	Tetracyc	2.60	Tetracycline hydrochloride	.66	1.94
Mebaral	.68	Nephobarbital	.18	.50	Tetrex	2.82	Tetracycline phosphate complex	2.41	.41
					Trasentine	2.24	Adiphenine	2.10	.14
					Vioform hydrocortisone	2.86	Hydrocortisone, iodochlorhydraxyquin	1.83	1.03

Note: Prices of 63 drugs commonly prescribed for the elderly and for which both brand name and generic equivalents were available. Prices quoted are average acquisition cost to retailer, for average prescription.

Source: The Drug Users, Task Force on Prescription Drugs, p. 140 ff.

APPENDIX 13
Rx ADVERTISING RESTRICTIONS

Prohibitions			
Statute	Regulation	None	Pending litigation
Alaska	Alabama	Delaware	Connecticut—Supermarket General Corp. (Pathmark) v. Board of Pharmacy.
Arizona	Arkansas	District of Columbia	Hawaii.
California	Colorado	Florida	Illinois—Osco Registered Pharmacists v. Department of Registration and Education of the State of Illinois.
Connecticut	Hawaii	Idaho	Maryland—Baltimore White Cross Corp. (Revco) v. Commissioners of Pharmacy, Sav-A-Lot, Inc. v. Commissioners of Pharmacy (in this case, a Baltimore court ruled the law unconstitutional in late 1972, but the State is appealing).
Georgia	Illinois	Iowa	Mississippi.
Louisiana	Indiana	Kentucky	New Jersey—Supermarket General Corp. v. Board of Pharmacy.
Maryland	Kansas	Missouri	New Mexico.
Massachusetts	Maine	Montana	New York—Suits pending against Board of Regents:
Michigan	Minnesota	New Hampshire	1. Benjamin S. Rosenthal and Ms. Etta Ringel and the Consumer Assembly of New York.
Nevada	Mississippi	Oregon	2. Supermarket General Corp.
New Jersey	Nebraska	Pennsylvania	3. Eric G. Urowsky.
New Mexico	New York	South Carolina	North Carolina—Revco Southeast Drug Centers, Inc. v. Board of Pharmacy.
North Dakota	North Carolina	Tennessee	South Dakota—State Board of Pharmacy of the State of South Dakota v. Osco Drug, Inc.
Ohio ¹	Rhode Island	Utah	Wisconsin—Osco v. State Board of Pharmacy.
Oklahoma	South Dakota		
Virginia	Texas		
Wyoming	Vermont		
	Washington ¹		
	West Virginia		
	Wisconsin		

¹ While price advertising is not specifically prohibited it is made impractical and the effect of these State measures is to ban it.

Rx ADVERTISING RESTRICTIONS

State	Form	Litigation	Notes
Alabama	Regulation	None	Pharmacy Board actively working against the advertising of prescription drugs, act 205, sec. 3.
Alaska	Statute	do	Statute is new—it replaces old territorial law. Alaska Statutes, sec. 08.80.420(b).
Arizona	do	do	ARS—1956—revised Aug. 11, 1970, p. 221.
Arkansas	Regulation	do	Arkansas State Board of Pharmacy (regulations).
California	Statute	do	1 of only 2 States with public member on board. Business and Professions code 651,651.3.
Colorado	Regulation	do	Colorado State Board of Pharmacy rules and regulations, regulations 3, 5, 6.
Connecticut	Statute	Suit pending	Governor agrees with Pathmark suit. He asked legislature to repeal statute, Connecticut General States Statute, ch. 382, "The Pharmacy Act."
Delaware	None	None	Seeking legislation to add consumer to pharmacy board.
District of Columbia	do	do	Congress must change the law for a public member to sit on the board. Mandatory price posting legislation pending.
Florida	do	do	Law declared unconstitutional in 1971.
Georgia	Statute	do	Georgia General Statutes.
Hawaii	Regulation	Suit pending	Board rules and regulations, ch. 18, sec. 15.
Idaho	None	None	Rules and Regulations Administration of Illinois Pharmacy Laws, reg. V(21); board considering public member. Up to legislature to provide for public member.
Illinois	Regulation	Suit pending	Compilation of laws regulating the practice of pharmacy, in the State of Indiana, regulation 20.
Indiana	do	None	Currently preparing a statute much like Illinois—not fully drafted. Considering increasing board to 5 members including 2 public members.
Iowa	None	do	May be new legislation. Kansas Pharmacy Law Rules and Regulations [68-2-17] January 1968.
Kansas	Regulation	do	Louisiana General Statutes, sec. 1225.
Kentucky	None	do	Laws relating to apothecaries title 32, 22 and the rules and regulations.
Louisiana	Statute	do	
Maine	Regulation	do	

Rx ADVERTISING RESTRICTIONS—Continued

State	Form	Litigation	Notes
Maryland	Statute	Suit pending	As of Dec. 1, 1972, new law permits substitution of generic drug for name brand—savings must be passed on to consumer—enforcement procedures still shaky. Bill in House would permit prescription drug price advertising art. 43, sec. 266A(c)(4), Annotated Code of Maryland.
Massachusetts	do	None	Boston requires pharmacies to post the prices of 200 frequently prescribed drugs. Legislature has bill which would require price posting across the State. Massachusetts's Board of Pharmacy has 1 public member. Commonwealth of Massachusetts Pharmacy Law (sec. 46, ch. 94C). With California, 1 of only 2 States with public member on pharmacy board.
Michigan	do	do	Board expressed support for the addition of consumer representative on board, legislation expected on this matter. Michigan General Statutes.
Minnesota	Regulation	do	Regulations of the State Board of Pharmacy, Regulation No. 37.
Mississippi	do	Suit pending	State of Mississippi pharmacy laws, art. IV 1., p. 48.
Missouri	None	None	
Montana	do	do	
Nebraska	Regulation	do	Posting of Rx prices is not considered advertising. Board proposes its own composition to include 1 hospital and 3 community pharmacists plus 1 consumer member. Statutes, Rules and Regulations Relating to Pharmacy (sec. 71-148).
Nevada	Statute	do	Nevada Pharmacy Law 639.261-639.288.
New Hampshire	None	do	Commission of Pharmacy and Practical Chemistry—Controlled Drug Act 1972.
New Jersey	Statute	Suit pending	State of New Jersey, sec. 45, 14-12 Pharmacy Act.
New Mexico	do	do	Law tested and upheld previously. New Mexico Laws and Regulations Drug and Cosmetic Act (1972), sec. 54-6-36 (K).
New York	Regulation	do	Bill in Assembly to allow Rx advertising. Regulations of the Commissioner of Education on Unprofessional Conduct (sec. 63.3).
North Carolina	do	do	Code of professional conduct North Carolina Board of Pharmacy.
North Dakota	Statute	None	Posting presently—North Dakota Century Code—sec. 43-15-10 (1.6).
Ohio	do	do	Ohio Pharmacy Practice Act, sec. 4729.36.
Oklahoma	do	do	Board took administrative action against some pharmacies that advertised prices. Attorney general says price posting must be allowed (59 O.S. 1961 736.1).
Oregon	None	do	Regulation was overturned in 1965.
Pennsylvania	do	do	Board coming out with new regulations which will set some sort of guidelines. Earlier law overturned in 1971 by State Supreme Court.
Rhode Island	Regulation	do	Pharmacy—General Laws of Rhode Island, ch. 5-19, rule No. 11.
South Carolina	None	do	
South Dakota	Regulation	Suit pending	South Dakota House considering 2 bills which essentially would allow advertising. State Board of Pharmacy Rules and Regulations, sec. E, No. 13.
Tennessee	None	None	
Texas	Regulation	do	Texas Pharmacy Regulations, sec. 5(1), p. 23.
Utah	None	do	
Vermont	Regulation	do	Attorney general says Rx advertising can't be prohibited. Board planning on revamping regulation. Plan to put consumer on board. Mandatory price posting law isn't enforced strongly at the moment.
Virginia	Statute	do	Seeking to appoint consumer member. Board encourages price information. In 1971 Federal District Court upheld the board against Revco. Commonwealth of Virginia, Drug Control Act (1970).
Washington	Regulation	do	Board allows ad in public media but makes it impractical. Washington State Board of Pharmacy Regulations. WAC 360-24-040.
West Virginia	do	do	West Virginia Board of Pharmacy Regulation.
Wisconsin	do	Suit pending	Pending bill bans pharmacy board from adopting or enforcing rules prohibiting RX price ads. Dane County Circuit Court declared board's regulation invalid. Board is waiting for attorney general's decision to appeal. Regulation of Pharmacy Examining Board, Phar. 1.17 and 1.18.
Wyoming	Statute	None	Pharmacy Laws of the State of Wyoming, sec. 23.1C, p. 4.

Source: Survey of State pharmacy boards conducted between July and October 1972.

(Appendix 14 not reproduced in the RECORD.)

APPENDIX 15

ADVERTISED VS. NONADVERTISED PRICES: A UNIT PRICE COMPARISON PER CAPSULE AND PER TABLET

[Amounts in cents]

	No advertising, Rosenthal Survey		Advertising, newspaper advertisements				
	District of Columbia	New York	Delaware A ¹	Philadelphia A ²	Philadelphia B ³	Florida ⁴	District of Columbia ⁴
Ampicillin (250 mg.):							
30 caps.	29.3	21.8					
56 caps.	20.7	16.4					
100 caps.							
Tetracycline (250 mg.):							
30 caps.	14.4	11.5					
56 caps.	6.0	6.8					
100 caps.							
Chlorpheniramine maleate (4 mg.):							
25 tabs.	7.2						
60 tabs.	7.0	6.4					
100 tabs.							
Chlortrimeton (4 mg.):							
25 tabs.	6.2						
100 tabs.							

¹ U.S. Drug Co., Wilmington, Del. (Phil. Eve. Bulletin).² Key Pharmacy Inc., Philadelphia, Pa. (Phil. Sun Bulletin) May 16, 1972.³ Pastor's Philadelphia (Phila. Inquirer) Sept. 23, 1971.⁴ U.S. Drug Co., Hallandale, Fla. (Miami Herald).⁴ Dart Drug Co., Washington, D.C. Mar. 9, 1972. Believed to be one of only few such ads in Washington area.

STRIP MINING

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following documents for the RECORD:

THE HILLS OF APPALACHIA ARE BLEEDING
(Statement of Rep. KEN HECHLER (Democrat of West Virginia), Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, March 13, 1973)

The hills of Appalachia are bleeding. Strip mining for coal has gouged deep and gaping gashes. The guts of our once-proud mountains have been ripped out and dumped

into the gullies. When you fly over the Appalachian area, you see entire mountain-tops which have been scalped off. Other hills have been literally peeled all the way around like an apple. Thousands of miles of ugly high-walls stand starkly against the horizon. Once clear streams take on a yellow or orange hue, or become sluggish with silt and sediment and thus are prime candidates for flooding.

When trees and topsoil are uprooted, and the overburden pushed down the hillsides, these whole areas are vulnerable to more erosion and landslides.

Right above the coal is a layer of pyrite. Either rain or ground water quickly reacts with the pyrite or acidic oil and oxygen to produce sulfuric acid in the streams and people's water supply. Fish and plant life can't survive in these conditions. And who wants to live where your water supply is unfit to drink, where the streams you fished or swam in as a youngster are polluted, where your very home is in danger from boulders, blasting and bulldozers?

THE HUMAN SUFFERING

Too much of the argument over strip mining has centered on economics and technology. Not enough emphasis has been placed on the terrible suffering of those human beings who try to survive in strip-mined areas. It's about time this Congress listen to people like Mrs. Bige Richie of Knott County, Ky., whose baby's grave was ruthlessly violated, the casket thrown over the hill and piled over with boulders and dirt by the strip miners. It's about time the Congress listen to Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Kincaid of Fayette County, W. Va., who say that "when the rains come and there isn't anything to stop the drainage, the mountains slide and the spoil banks fall down to the next highwall, and so on until the whole mountain slides."

In Amherstdale, W. Va., the people in Buffalo Creek hollow used to worry about the mud and rock-slides which came down from the strip mines high on the mountain above, but this memory was wiped out on February 26, 1972, when a coal company slag pile burst and released a 30-foot wall of water which killed 125 people in the Buffalo Creek, Valley. Only a major tragedy not directly caused by strip mining enabled the people to forget the terrible conditions caused by strip mining. It is about time the Congress listened to people like Glen Holiday of Stotesbury, W. Va., who had a hole torn in his roof by a 16-inch boulder unleashed by a nearby strip mining operation.

WE HAVE THE POWER TO DECIDE

We sit here in Congress, and listen attentively to the lobbyists who tell us how much money they would lose if they had to stop passing on the social costs of strip mining to future generations. They come in with their briefcases and in their best polished manner they prove conclusively that mankind is caught in some kind of a trap which forces us to keep on ripping up our land. As human beings, we must have the will to decide our own destiny.

We started regulating the strip mining of coal 36 years ago in West Virginia, with a law which everybody said had "teeth" in it. Every State has had the same experience: the State legislature passes a law which everybody can "live" with. This means that if there are not enough loopholes in the law, the coal industry makes sure that enforcement is ineffective.

I know that this committee is determined to act in the public interest. But I submit to you that it is almost too late to save the land and the people in the Appalachian region where I live. Most of the strip mine regulation bills before this committee are so weak on their very face, so shot through with loopholes, so lacking in public participation, and so namby-pamby in their enforcement procedures that they will do little more than raise false hopes.

A REVOLUTION BREWING

With all the emphasis at my command, I report to this committee that a revolution is brewing in Appalachia. The people are not going to stand by any longer while strip miners rip up their homeland. The people have been waiting with rising impatience for Congress to act to stop this

wholesale destruction of the forests, soil, hills, streams, and the homes of the people. If Congress just passes one of these innocuous bills designed to quiet the public outcry while meeting the demands of the National Coal Association and the American Mining Congress, then there'll be a Boston Tea Party which won't be a tea party. And in the western states of Colorado, Wyoming and Montana, where billions of tons of stripable coal reserves are being eyed eagerly by the strip miners, I am sure the people in those states are determined that they not be turned into instant Appalachias.

STRINGENT PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

On February 15, 1973, President Nixon sent a message to Congress which outlined his proposals for natural resources and the environment. The rhetoric of that message was exemplary. I applaud the President's statement which included these phrases:

"Surface and underground mining can too often cause serious air and water pollution as well as unnecessary destruction of wildlife habitats and aesthetic and recreational areas. New legislation with stringent performance standards is required to regulate abuses of surface and underground mining in a manner compatible with the environment."

The key issue which confronts the Congress is whether "stringent performance standards" are indeed included in the legislation proposed and enacted.

Many years ago, Alexander Pope wrote this couplet:

"For forms of government let fools contest
Whate'er is best administered is best."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR HAS BAD ENFORCEMENT RECORD

I contend that the Department of the Interior has proven by its miserable record of non-enforcement of its own strip mining regulations on public and Indian lands that it is incapable of applying "stringent performance standards". To document my contention, I cite the August 10, 1972 Report of the General Accounting Office, entitled "Administration of Regulations for Surface Exploration, Mining and Reclamation of Public and Indian Coal Lands."

Coal prospecting permits or strip mining leases have been issued by the Department of the Interior on 1.6 million acres of public lands and 700,000 acres of Indian lands. Under Interior's 1969 regulations, the Department is supposed to conduct "technical examinations" of the effects that the proposed mining operations will have upon the environment, and as a basis for formulating appropriate reclamation requirements. The GAO concluded that "the regulations (of the Department of the Interior) if properly implemented, should help in protecting environmental values."

TECHNICAL EXAMINATIONS NOT MADE

Although the regulations had been in force for more than three years, the GAO found that out of 65 permits and coal leases granted, the required technical examinations had not been conducted for 35 of the 65 operations. The GAO Report also found that some coal operators were proceeding "without approved exploration plans—an essential element of control in protecting the environment—and some plans had been approved without technical examination." The GAO Report also concluded: "Some compliance and performance bonds covering the requirements, including reclamation, of leases or permits had not been obtained from the operators. The amounts of some of those that had been obtained were not sufficient to cover the estimate cost of the reclamation requirements of the permits or leases." The GAO Report also concluded that "some of the reports required to be submitted by the operators to the Department at various stages of the operations on such matters as grading and back-filling, planting and

abandoning operations had not been submitted."

The GAO had this to say in its August 10, 1972 Report on the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 so far as strip mining on public and Indian lands was concerned:

"The Department's regulations require consideration of the ecological factors for coal permits and leases issued on Indian and public lands. To implement the environmental Act, the Council on Environmental Quality requires that each Federal agency prepare formal procedures for the preparation of environmental impact statements. The Bureau of Land Management procedures do not comply with the Council's implementing guidelines because they do not outline the criteria to determine when and under what circumstances environmental impact statements should be prepared. . . . The Bureau of Indian Affairs has not developed any procedures for the preparation of environmental impact statements under the Environmental Act. . . ."

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT DODGES RESPONSIBILITY

You would think that when a GAO Report, fully documented, arrives at such devastating conclusions, then there would be very definite steps to correct these shortcomings by the Department of the Interior. Instead, the Department of the Interior made an incredible series of responses to the GAO Report in a statement on October 11, 1972. Here is an excerpt of the essence of the response by the Department of the Interior, which contended:

". . . that the GAO Report was not in all cases factual and accurate. After reviewing the report, it is my opinion that its findings were more representative of clerical shortcomings than dereliction of this Department's responsibility to properly administer the public lands.

". . . we agree with GAO's lead finding and conclusion that 'the Department's regulations, if properly implemented, should help in protecting environmental values.' We believe that significant strides have been made in the past three years in implementing the regulations and that we now have fully implemented these regulations."

A number of developments followed the October 11, 1972, effort of the Department of the Interior to shrug off these criticisms of its own strip mining and reclamation regulations on public and Indian lands. On October 27, 1972, the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, Hon. Russell Train, wrote to the Secretary of the Interior as follows:

"We recommend that the Department give serious consideration to the adoption of regulations that would strengthen its ability to more effectively manage the coal resources on public lands. . . . In light of the GAO Report . . . we urge you to accelerate completion of that analysis and preparation of an environmental impact statement on your overall coal leasing program."

On November 3, 1972, a letter from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Hon. William D. Ruckelshaus, stated:

"We have found the GAO Report to be a useful analysis of management problems that have contributed to the continued degradation of public lands and resources from mining operations and mineral explorations . . ."

GAO REITERATES ITS CRITICISMS

But the crowning blow to the contention of the Department of the Interior that the GAO Report was factually inaccurate and due to clerical errors came in a follow-up report released by the GAO on January 31, 1973. The GAO had been asked to comment on the Department of the Interior's contentions, and the January 31, 1973 GAO Report concluded:

The Bureau of Land Management's May 4, 1972 procedures "do not provide adequate

criteria to determine when and under what circumstances BLM should prepare individual environmental impact statements" pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act;

BLM "has not yet issued" an environmental impact statement on the overall coal leasing program, despite the plea of the Chairman of the CEQ on October 26, 1972;

That after BLM issues this long-delayed statement, "criteria will be necessary to identify those actions which qualify as exceptions to the program and which justify individual statements";

That if the "Department's policy is" not to require site examinations in all cases, it should state "the specific circumstances under which site examinations would not be required and . . . the documentation required to support such determinations."

MISERABLE RECORD OF NONENFORCEMENT

I have reviewed in some detail this little exchange between the Department of the Interior and the General Accounting Office, for two reasons; first, to demonstrate that the Department of the Interior is apparently not very enthusiastic about enforcing its own regulations to protect public and Indian lands against the damage caused by the strip mining of coal, or to enforce adequate reclamation; second, if the Department of the Interior is demonstrably weak in protecting public and Indian lands, how could this Department be expected to enforce what the President terms "stringent performance standards" on nonpublic lands?

The inescapable conclusion is that the Department of the Interior has shown by its past performance that it is not likely to enforce any strip mining law aggressively. For this reason, I strongly recommend that jurisdiction over enforcement of strip mining be placed in the Environmental Protection Agency.

WHY EPA MUST CONTROL STRIP MINING

The Department of the Interior is basically a management agency; it manages lands and resources. It is also committed as a national policy to the development of higher production of minerals, an objective which I support only when it can be achieved without the excessive amount of damage to our other great resources—the soil, timber, water supply, human beings and other affected resources. The Environmental Protection Agency is not a management agency like the Department of the Interior; it is an agency which is occupied with setting standards and regulations, a function EPA already performs in the case of control of air and water pollution and the control of pesticides.

Many of the environmental problems associated with coal mining relate to air and water pollution, so it is logical and reasonable for EPA to have this function. I might add also that the Environmental Protection Agency, unlike the Department of the Interior, already has on board the necessary personnel highly trained in measuring environmental effects and setting the kind of stringent performance standards which the President called for.

REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL'S DEVASTATING ANALYSIS

An excellent analysis of the administration strip mining bill was made by my colleague from Michigan, Rep. John D. Dingell, on February 21, 1973. This is a devastating point-by-point analysis which should be carefully considered by this committee when drafting any legislation on surface mining, and I ask that Rep. Dingell's analysis appear along with my remarks.

Perhaps the most striking defect in the administration bill, which has been introduced as S. 923, is the lengthy period allowed before any regulations become effective. Over two years has now passed since I introduced my first bill in the House of Representatives

to abolish the strip mining of coal. When hearings were held on this bill, some of my colleagues berated me for wanting to bring strip mining to a grinding halt without an adequate phase-out period to enable deep mining to take up the slack. My critics pointed the finger at me as though I was the cause of the energy crisis. Yet fully eighteen months have elapsed since the first House and Senate hearings on that bill in 1971, and unregulated strip mining proceeds apace.

UNCONSCIONABLE DELAY UNDER ADMINISTRATION BILL

The administration bill provides an unconscionably long period of delay before regulations become effective. Let us assume that the Congress enacts legislation by October 1, 1973, which would require a remarkable burst of speed to accomplish. The states are allowed a two-year period from the passage of the bill to develop and submit their proposed regulations. Then the Department of the Interior must approve these regulations, which presumably could be done within six months, carrying us forward to March 1, 1976. Within one year after approval of the State regulations, active mining operations must obtain permits. This brings us to March 1, 1977. But even this date can be extended to March 1, 1978, by the provision in the administration bill which provides that the permit "may allow" the strip mine operator up to two years after the approval date "to come into compliance with performance standards." Now take the small strip-mine operator who produces less than 10,000 tons annually; he is allowed a total of five years after approval of the performance standards to be exempted from the performance standards.

What this amounts to is a free and unregulated license to strip away unmolested until about March 1, 1978, for the large strip miner, and March 1, 1981, for those stripers who produce less than 10,000 tons a year. And when any company sees liberal deadlines chalked up in bold letters like that, you can bet your D-9 dozer it will look like the Oklahoma land-rush to rip off the land before the performance standards become fully effective.

THE SKY-ROCKETING RATE OF STRIP MINING

The strip mining of coal has been skyrocketing upward at an alarming rate. In 1969, 38 percent of all coal was stripped and auger-mined; in 1970, that percentage was 44 percent; in 1971, for the first time in history, more coal was strip-mined and auger-mined than deep-mined. The 1972 figures show that total coal production increased to 590 million tons from the 1971 figure of 552 million tons. Of the 590 million tons, 52 percent was strip-mined and auger-mined in 1972, a record high in both percentage and tonnage. 4,650 acres a week are being ripped up by strip-mining. Already, the strip miners have gouged out the equivalent of a band of land a mile wide between New York and San Francisco.

It is interesting to note that more than 24 percent of the grand total of strip-mined production in this country has occurred since 1968. Because of the huge stripable reserves in Wyoming, Montana, Colorado and the west, and the likelihood that the new strip mining laws will stimulate a last minute rush to strip before regulation becomes effective, we can look for a sharp increase in strip mining and its effects in 1973 and 1974.

UNDERGROUND AND STRIPPABLE COAL RESERVES

How much tonnage of coal are we actually talking about when we consider deep mining and strip mining? The Bureau of Mines estimates that there are 45 billion tons of stripable coal left which can be recovered economically with the use of current technology. Approximately 356 billion tons of deep-minable coal reserves are available

which can be recovered economically with the use of current technology.

So what we are really talking about here is the environmental damage caused by only one-eighth of the total amount of coal available in the nation. I have never been able to figure out why, if there is an energy crisis and a lot of argument over whether or not reclamation will or will not work, we don't just go ahead and abolish strip mining and meet the energy crisis with deep-mined coal. Underground mining also employs many more people per ton of coal mined.

SAFETY RECORD IN UNDERGROUND MINES

To be sure, there are more accidents in deep mines, but a close look at the records of the major companies proves that this does not have to be the case. U.S. Steel which operates only captive mines and produces 99% of its coal through deep mining has by far the best safety records of any coal company. Similarly, Bethlehem Steel which operates largely deep mines, ranks second in injuries and third in fatalities. This shows clearly that if a commitment is made to safety, deep mines can become safe. Here is the data on the ten biggest producers from 1968 to 1971: (The Number in Parentheses Indicates the Ranking of the Company in Total Production)

U.S. Steel mines (4)	2.72
Bethlehem Steel mines (10)	12.27
Consolidation Coal (2)	18.68
General Dynamics mines (6)	38.74
Peabody Coal (1)	46.91
Old Ben Coal (9)	47.40
Amax Coal (8)	48.23
Pittston (5)	56.57
Eastern Associated Coal (7)	62.51
Island Creek Coal (3)	72.13

The differences are less marked but still significant when fatality rates are compiled.

Fatalities per million man-hours

U.S. Steel mines (4)	0.28
Amax Coal (8)	0.35
Bethlehem Steel mines (10)	0.44
Eastern Associated Coal (7)	0.53
General Dynamics mines (6)	0.72
Island Creek Coal (3)	0.85
Peabody Coal (1)	0.94
Old Ben Coal (9)	1.07
Pittston (5)	1.10
Consolidation Coal (2)	1.52

Particular note should be made of the Peabody figures: 80% of their coal production comes from surface mining, and their accident record isn't so hot. When you couple the good record of the captive mines with the fact that abolition will mean the easing of competitive pressures on presently marginal deep mines thus allowing them to make the necessary financial commitment to safety, you can see that underground mining can become a much safer occupation.

LOW SULFUR STRIPPABLE COAL

How much of the 45 billion tons of stripable coal is low sulfur? That's an important question in the light of tightening air pollution laws which have agitated the coal industry and the electric utilities who burn coal. The Bureau of Mines informs me that 32 billion of the 45 billion tons are low sulfur. Where is this low sulfur coal located? I am informed that 30 billion tons are located in the western states, and about 2 million tons in the east.

In contrast, deep mine low sulfur reserves number 221.5 billion tons with a full 61.2 billion available in the East.

STRIP MINING AND ELECTRICITY

In a very extensive study of the relation of surface mined coal to the production of electricity, Bruce Driver of the Environmental Policy Center drew the following conclusions based on Bureau of Mines data:

1. Most of the surface-mined coal burned to produce electricity has been area-mined. Only one state (North Carolina) has relied

on contour-auger-mined (steep-slope) coal for more than 40% of its electric power. Only two states relied on contour-auger coal for as much as a third of the electricity generated within these states (North Carolina and West Virginia).

2. An examination of low-sulfur deep mine reserves on a state by state basis indicates that there are more than ample low sulfur deep mine reserves to take the place of all surface-mined coal used to produce electricity for many hundreds of years, assuming present economic and technological conditions, and assuming that national energy demand levels continue to grow and that the use of surface-mined coal would continue to grow were its supply left unregulated or uncontrolled.

3. Deep-mined low sulfur reserves exist near those areas which would be most affected by a termination of all surface-mined supplies or of contour-auger-mined supplies. For example, the states of Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, the Carolinas, Tennessee, and Alabama are the states most reliant on contour-augered coal for the production of electric power. About seven-eighths of all contour-augered coal burned to produce electricity in the United States is burned in these nine states; this amounts to about 70 million tons. These nine states and states adjacent to them contain about 18.7 billion tons of low sulfur deep-mine coal or about 267 times the amount of contour-mined coal burned to produce electricity in these states in 1970. These 18.7 billion tons are minable under present economic and technological conditions. Much of this coal has a low or medium ash content. The major competing use for this coal is in the coke and gas plant industry to which about 90 million tons of coal were shipped in 1970 from the mining districts which contain the 18.7 billion tons. It is believed that much of the 18.7 billion tons is high metallurgical quality coal. But even were it to be assumed that all 90 million tons of coal shipped to coke and gas plants in 1970 had to be mined from the 18.7 billion tons of low sulfur coal, were contour and auger-mining phased out, there would still be about 117 years worth of supplies of this coal in the eastern states for the coke and gas industry as well as for the electric utility industry.

4. The costs of a switch to low sulfur deep-mined coal are not prohibitive. Capital costs may be much less than has been recently suggested by the National Coal Association. Based on Bureau of Mines FOB mine values of coal shipped to electric utilities, and calculated under conservative assumptions, the cost of power to consumers of a switch to deep mine coal from contour-augered coal would be in the neighborhood of \$100,000,000 or less than 50/year/individual, assuming that all additional costs are passed on to the consumer.

TVA'S STRIPMINE CONTRACTS RAVAGE THE LAND

Last year, I asked the General Accounting Office to review what the Tennessee Valley Authority was doing in its strip-mine contracts to insure that the soil, streams, forests and hillsides of Kentucky, Alabama, Tennessee and Illinois were being protected. In a report which the GAO made on August 9, 1972, there were many horror stories of landslides, stream pollution, and failure of the TVA itself to enforce its own reclamation regulations. By now this is a familiar story in every state which has a strip mine reclamation law, and in every Federal agency which is making weak gestures toward enforcing its own strip mining reclamation regulations. TVA is the Nation's largest producer of electric power, and its largest consumer of coal. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and George Norris would be turning over in their graves if they knew the extent of the destruction wrought on the land by an agency which Roosevelt and Norris designed to save the land.

Aubrey Wagner came up to the Capitol and asked to have lunch with me to dem-

onstrate that TVA was toughening its environmental regulations, and cracking down on its strip-mine contractors. "Why we even cancelled a contract last week," Mr. Wagner protested. "Big deal," I answered, "one cancelled contract after the thousands of acres you have ripped up and the landslides and pollution you have caused in the name of getting cheaper power."

TVA PURCHASES DEEP-MINED COAL

I am certain that as a result of the GAO Report, as a result of the agitation by the public in TVA strip-mined areas, yes by the "emotionalism" of some environmentalists who are blamed for causing the energy crisis, that TVA is starting to mend its ways ever so slightly. This year the TVA went west to get some of this great supply of strip-mined coal. But on November 12, 1972, came a shocker of an announcement by TVA that "experimental use of this type of coal (western sub-bituminous) at the Johnsonville Plant has shown major operating problems in addition to the very high transportation cost involved." Because of the very high water content of the western coal, it gummed up the Johnsonville Plant. A massive drying plant might be one answer, but this would result in reducing the mass during the drying process and thus the sulfur content would rise to unacceptable levels. So the upshot of all this is that TVA signed a long-term contract with the Old Ben Company for 2,192,000 tons of deep-mined Indiana coal. Because most eastern plants are built to burn local eastern coals, similar problems to those experienced by TVA can be expected with any other attempts to burn western coals in most eastern and southeastern power plants.

When Dr. William H. Miernyk of the Department of Economics of West Virginia University testifies before this committee, he will point out that strip mining in Appalachia is a short-term proposition, that the abolition of strip mining will not provoke the kind of economic disaster predicted by the National Coal Association, and strip mine abolition will force a conversion to deep mining which will produce more employment and income in the long-run because there are more deep-minable reserves.

SLOPE LIMITATION ON STRIP MINING

You will recall there was a great furor last October when the House Interior Committee reported out a bill, H.R. 6482, which in effect included an attempted slope limitation. That bill was passed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives, 265-75, and I was proud to vote for it although it did not go as far as I would have liked—abolition.

I confess I have not yet had a chance to read the entire report prepared by the Council on Environmental Quality for this committee, but some of the factual data intrigues me. In speaking about the problems of strip mining in Appalachia, the CEQ Report zeroes in on the effects of a slope limitation on strip mining in this area, and here is their significant conclusion:

"Because the overwhelming majority of U.S. reserves are recoverable only by underground mining and because of large and as yet untapped reserves in the West, the loss of reserves from a slope and a prohibition represents only about one percent of the total reserves."

It seems to me that if we are only talking about a paltry one percent of the total reserves, it is a crying shame that we have to proceed with the final destruction of Appalachia for the sake of one percent of the coal. I appeal to this committee to save our bleeding hills by writing into this legislation a very firm slope limitation. We are completely fed up with keeping the lights burning for the rest of the nation, while our soil washes down the rivers to the sea, our hills and forests are raped, our streams polluted, and our deep-mining industry suffers.

STRIP MINING THREATENS TOURISM

West Virginia and the Appalachia Region have vast tourist and recreation potential which strip mining threatens. In West Virginia, approximately 19,000 men and women are employed in the tourist industry directly, as against about 4,000 directly employed in strip mining. A recent study entitled "Opportunity Costs of Land Use: The Case of Coal Surface Mining" by Robert Spore, an economist at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, has found that the value of strip mining all the coal along the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River in Eastern Kentucky and Tennessee would total \$13,905,000 while the recreational value of this area totalled \$42,620,000. In short, the costs in terms of lost opportunities for recreation and tourism would be more than three times the value of all the coal in the area. All of this economic and recreational benefit to the people would be lost forever if strip mining were permitted. This pattern of lost opportunities is already the rule in some parts of Appalachia—only abolition will stem the tide.

I recall that when economic development programs were first proposed in the late 1950's, there were those who opined that the "ghost towns" of the old silver mining days made great tourist attractions. There are certainly some curiosity-seekers who may travel in the future to gaze on the massive and suicidal destruction which mankind has wrought through strip mining, but the ghoulish and macabre Charles Addams "characters" scarcely constitute working majorities of the populace.

RECLAMATION IN GREAT BRITAIN AND GERMANY

There have been many studies of reclamation in Germany and in Great Britain, where strip-mined coal constitutes less than 10 percent of the total coal production, in contrast to over 50 percent in the United States. There are some clear-cut differences between the land use ethics of Great Britain and Germany, where long and careful public planning precedes any attempt at strip mining—the pell-mell rush to strip which occurs in this country is unknown in Europe. Under our cowboy capitalist approach to mining, we have placed heavy emphasis on how you extract the minerals from the ground in the quickest and cheapest fashion. Coming from a state which specializes in extractive industry, I regret we also have a few extractive politicians who take out more than they put in, with very little reclamation, but that is another story. Throughout the mining industry, "reclamation" has become a recent craze, but it is sharply different in outlook than in Great Britain and Germany where true reclamation means reforestation and a thorough and intelligent restoration of the land. All too often aesthetics are the ruling yardstick of reclamation success in this country.

The extensive study, "Surface Mining and Land Reclamation in Germany", by E. A. Nephew of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory indicates that costs of reclamation in Germany amount to between \$3,000 and \$4,500 per acre, while in Great Britain they may run as high as \$7,179 per acre but average out close to \$4,000 an acre. (The cost per ton ranged from 63 cents to \$4.24/ton and averaged \$1.35/ton for all British reclamation efforts.) The topsoil and subsoil is carefully segregated, and later replaced, and rehabilitation of the land by experts in agriculture and forestry may take as long as five years following the mining operation.

DISMAL RECORD OF RECLAMATION IN UNITED STATES

The record for reclamation in this country is a dismal one. This is not due entirely to the lack of effort on the part of those operators and specialists charged with reclamation. There are a number of very serious problems with reclamation in this country which are not encountered in Germany and Great Britain. The critical environmental

variables for reclamation are slope, sulfur content of coal and shales, acid-alkali balance in spoils, amount of rainfall, depth and thickness of the coal seam, and amount and quality of the topsoil. In Appalachia, the combination of steep slopes, pyritic shales, heavy rainfall and thin topsoil combine to create monumental problems of erosion, sedimentation, landslides and acid drainage. The relatively flat, acid-free lands of Germany and Britain present no such difficulties.

Dr. Robert L. Smith, Professor of Wildlife Biology, Division of Forestry, West Virginia University, who will testify before this committee, recently stated: "In the southern mountains, it is obvious to anyone who views strip mine reclamation that reclamation is not successful, nor is the land being restored. It is impossible to put the excavated material back and to re-establish any semblance of previous ecological conditions." Dr. Smith points out that hydroseeding and heavy fertilization can produce some vegetation, but this is generally short-lived. He states that "on no slopes can grass stabilize the soil. Reforestation is not even attempted on the steep slopes."

ACID DRAINAGE PROBLEMS

In flatter areas, vegetation can be partially successful and could be a step in the process back to forestation. However, the basic problem with flat land reclamation in the East and the Midwest remains that of controlling acid drainage. Dr. Moid Ahmad of Ohio University, an eminent hydrologist, has shown conclusively, that so long as acid-causing pyrites are present in the overburden, no reclamation procedures can successfully stop acid drainage. Vegetation in no way insures an end to the acid drainage problem. A 1970 study conducted by Dr. Sutton of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources entitled "Reclamation of toxic coal mine spoil banks" has found that even the heavy use of fertilizers was ineffective in neutralizing acidity. Lime applied at a rate of 42 tons per acre was ineffective. Unless the acid can be eliminated, vegetation will decline and reclamation will be reversed thus creating a new orphaned land, complete with all the original environmental problems of unclaimed land.

A 1971 Case Western Reserve University study entitled "Ecological Effects of Strip Mining, A Comparative Study of Natural and Reclaimed Watershed" compared two watersheds in Belmont County in southeastern Ohio, one of which had not been stripped, the other which had been stripped and reclaimed in 1968 by the Hanna Coal Company. The report states:

"The water draining from the mined and reclaimed watershed is highly acidic, having an average pH of 3.5. In contrast, the water draining from the natural system is neutral or slightly basic, having an average pH of 7.9. . . . In the affected system, Fe (iron) was found in concentrations greater than 400 times that found in the natural system. SO_4 (sulfate) averaged 56 times that of the natural system, K (potassium) 2.8 times, Ca (calcium) nine times, Mg (magnesium) 30 times, Mn (manganese) over 1,320 times, and Al (aluminum) was found to be over 3,000 times that of the natural system. These large amounts of ions produced high concentrations of dissolved solids. Average dissolved solids of the affected systems were 90 times that of the natural system."

CHEMICALS RELEASED BY STRIP MINING

The report drew the following conclusions:

"1. Three years after reclamation one finds that the affected area cannot support plant or animal life.

2. Geologic formations high in sandstone must be reclaimed by better methods or should not be strip-mined at all.

3. The acid condition produced by strip mining releases amounts of minerals and nutrients which are toxic to plant-life.

4. The highly dissolved chemical load entering Piedmont Lake from the affected area is rapidly increasing the eutrophication processes in the lake, and thus it is altering and destroying lake habitats.

HIGH COST OF "RECLAMATION"

In short, good reclamation like that found in Germany can only be accomplished on flat areas free of pyritic and other acid-causing materials. And, this can only be accomplished through careful, comprehensive land use planning, strict performance standards for the reclamation process, full public access to the planning process, a continuing program or revegetation and forestation over a five to ten year period after completion of initial reclamation efforts, and above all a major commitment of money in the neighborhood of \$4,000 per acre such as the Europeans have put forth.

Nephew sums up the German approach philosophically:

"Probably the most compelling reason for farmland restoration, however, is the prevailing conviction that to allow valuable soil to be irrevocably destroyed by a strictly temporary land use—mining—would represent extreme folly."

NO SUCCESSFUL RECLAMATION IN THE WEST

We have examined the lands of the East and Midwest; what are the prospects for good reclamation in the flat lands of the West where massive stripping has been planned. Conditions in the West are vastly different from those in the East and Midwest, and also from those in Germany and Britain. Rainfall in Montana, Wyoming and the Dakotas is scarce; the area is dry grazing land with a very thin topsoil cover. Unlike the fertile Rhineland valley soil, Western soils are heavily sodic, alkaline or saline. According to the Department of Agriculture, when disturbed these soils become virtually impermeable to water, quite unstable, and very unfertile. Erosion problems become quite serious and grading spoil piles merely packs the soil producing clay pan which tends to hold water on the surface. No successful reclamation has been demonstrated in the West.

In a recent public statement, Dr. Robert Curry, an environmental geologist at the University of Montana and an acknowledged expert on western soils and geology, underlined the lack of experimental success in reclamation attempts in the West. He postulated natural recovery times of more than 100 years for stripped areas in the West.

In sum, meaningful reclamation such as that found in Britain and Germany is not possible to any extent in this country. The problems of acidic, saline and sodic soils, and the problem of steep slopes are truly insurmountable. Moreover, vesting enforcement authority in the Department of Interior insures that any substance that might appear in a regulatory bill will be completely gutted.

For all of these reasons, the conclusion is inescapable: the only answer is to abolish the strip mining of coal.

H.R. 1000

A bill to provide for the control of surface and underground coal mining operations which adversely affect the quality of our environment, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be cited as the "Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act of 1973".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares—

(1) that there are coal mining operations on public, private, and Indian lands in the Nation which adversely affect the environment by destroying or diminishing, for an indefinite period, the availability of public, private, and Indian lands for recreational,

commercial, industrial, agricultural, and forestry purposes, by causing erosion, landslides, and subsidence, by contributing to floods and the pollution of waters and air, by destroying fish and wildlife habitat and forests and otherwise impairing natural beauty, by frustrating efforts to conserve soil, water, and other natural resources, by destroying public and private property, and by creating hazards to life and property;

(2) that the public has a right to expect that the Federal Government, the States, and local government will utilize all practicable means and measures to protect and enhance the quality of our environment;

(3) that the integrity, productivity, and beauty of the land surface must be protected for the growing requirements of present and future generation;

(4) that the reserves of all needed grades of coal in the United States are sufficiently extensive to permit rigorous protection of the land surface in ways which will stimulate the development and utilization of nondestructive and efficient mining technologies while preserving our capacity to supply coal for the needs of society; and

(5) that coal mining operations are activities affecting interstate commerce which can contribute to the economic well-being, security, and general welfare of the Nation where conducted in a manner that will protect and enhance the quality of the human environment.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to provide for participation by the Federal Government with State and local governments, private individuals, and other interested persons in a comprehensive program to prevent further damage to the lands, waters, and natural resources of the Nation from unregulated or inadequately regulated surface and underground coal mining operations, to stabilize lands damaged by surface coal mining, to promote an effective continuing conservation land-use and management program for the coal mining industry, and to assist any worker adversely affected by this Act.

ADMINISTRATION OF ACT

SEC. 3. Except as specifically provided in this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (hereinafter called "Administrator") shall administer this Act.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

SEC. 4. Public participation in the development, revision, and enforcement of any regulation, standard, or guideline promulgated under this Act, and in the administration of this Act, shall be provided for, encouraged, and assisted by the Administrator and the States.

COAL MINES SUBJECT TO ACT

SEC. 5. Each coal mining operation, the products of which enter interstate commerce, or the operations or products of which indirectly or directly affect interstate commerce, and each operator of such mining operation, shall be subject to this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) The term "coal" includes bituminous coal, lignite, and anthracite.

(b) The term "surface coal mining" includes (1) all or any part of the process followed in the extraction of coal from a natural coal deposit after removing the overburden therefrom or in the extraction of coal by the auger method or any similar method which penetrates a coal seam and removes coal therefrom directly through a series of openings made by a machine which enters the coal seam from a surface excavation; (2) the removing of overburden for the purpose of determining the location, quality, or quantity of a natural coal deposit; (3) any area of land from which coal is extracted by surface coal mining, including private ways and roads within or pertinent to such area; and (4) land, facilities,

processes, and spoil banks resulting from, or used in, extracting coal from natural deposits by such mining, including land used for the deposition of coal wastes from surface coal mining operations.

(c) The term "overburden" means all of the earth and other materials removed or excavated for the purpose of exposing a coal seam in order to surface mine the coal, and includes earth and other materials removed from their natural state in the process of surface coal mining.

(d) The term "spoil bank" means any deposit of removed overburden, waste, culm banks, or other similar material from either surface or underground coal mining operations.

(e) The term "area of land affected" means (i) the land from which coal is removed by surface coal mining, (ii) any land in which the natural land surface has been disturbed as a result of, or incident to, surface coal mining activities, and (iii) any land on which are conducted the surface activities associated with underground coal mining, and includes but not limited to, private ways and roads appurtenant to any such land, and refuse banks, spoilage banks, culm banks, tailings, repair areas, storage areas, processing areas, shipping areas, and areas on which structures, facilities, equipment, machines, tools, or other materials or property which result, or are used in, any coal mining operation are situated.

(f) The term "operation" means all activities relating to the actual exploration and extraction of coal from a single tract of land or contiguous tracts of land.

(g) The term "operator" means any person engaged in a coal mining operation who removes or intends to remove coal from the earth by surface or underground coal mining operations, or who removes more than two hundred and fifty tons of overburden for the purpose of determining the location, quality, or quantity of a natural coal deposit.

(h) The term "person" includes corporations, companies, associates, firms, partnerships, societies, joint stock companies, and individuals.

(i) The term "stabilization" or "stabilize" means the process of preventing an area of land affected by surface coal mining from contributing to erosion, landslides, subsidence, floods, and the pollution of waters and air, and enabling such area to be used for the same purpose for which it was used prior to the beginning of such mining or to a higher and better purpose.

(j) The term "backfilling to approximate original contour" means the stabilization achieved by beginning at or beyond the top of the highwall and sloped to the toe of the spoil bank at a maximum angle not to exceed the approximate original contour of the land, with no depressions to accumulate water and with adequate provision for drainage.

(k) The term "contour" shall mean the surface coal mining of a seam of coal upon a natural down slope in excess of 14 degrees from the horizontal adjacent to the outcropping of a seam of coal.

(l) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication between any State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States and any other place outside the respective boundaries thereof, or wholly within the District of Columbia or any territory or possession of the United States, or between points in the same States, if passing through any point outside the boundaries thereof.

(m) The term "underground coal mining" means those coal mining operations carried out beneath the surface of any land or water area by means of shafts, tunnels, or other underground mine openings for the purpose of extracting coal.

GENERAL POWERS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 7. The Administrator, according to the provisions of this Act, shall—

(1) prescribe, in accordance with the provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions under this title;

(2) make investigations or inspections necessary to insure compliance with this Act and the rules and regulations adopted pursuant thereto;

(3) conduct public hearings;

(4) issue cease-and-desist orders to halt violations of this title;

(5) order the revocation, suspension, or modification of any permit for failure to comply with any of the provisions of this title or any rule and regulation adopted pursuant thereto;

(6) appoint such advisory committees, the majority of whose members shall have no interest in coal mining operations, and the meetings of which shall be open to the public, as may be of assistance to him in the development of programs and policies;

(7) review and vacate or modify orders and decisions issued by him;

(8) perform such other duties as are provided by this Act; and

(9) publish all findings and determinations required to be made by the Administrator under this Act.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 8. Not later than April 1 annually, and at such other times as he deems necessary, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report concerning activities conducted by him under this Act. Among other matters the Administrator shall include in such report, such recommendations for additional legislative action as he deems necessary or desirable to accomplish the purposes of this Act and the identification of any duty required by this Act that was not performed and the reasons why.

TITLE I—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COAL MINING LIMITATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) No surface coal mining shall hereafter be conducted in any area of the national wildlife refuge system, the national park system, or the national forest system. No underground coal mining shall be permitted in any designated wilderness area or in any area under study as a wilderness area.

(b) No operator shall begin or renew any surface coal mining operation in any State on or after the effective date of this Act.

(c) No operator shall conduct contour surface coal mining operations in any State on and after the effective date of this Act.

(d) Any operator who, on the effective date of this Act is actively carrying out surface mining operations, other than contour surface coal mining, may continue to do so as provided in this Act (i) if such operator obtains a permit under this title within six months after such date, and (ii) if the Administrator determines that such mining (A) is not in violation of, or will not result in any violation of, any provision of the Clean Air Act, as amended, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, or the Refuse Act of 1899 or any regulation promulgated pursuant to those Acts, and (B) does not cause, or will not result in, irrevocable or lasting injury to the public health or welfare, or damaging flooding or destruction of agricultural land, or dislocation or disturbance of surface or subsurface streams, or destruction of, or damage to, historic values, or destruction or damage to valuable recreational or wildlife areas, or destruction or damage of contiguous areas. Any permit issued to such operator shall be for a term of not to exceed twelve months and shall not be renewable: *Provided*, That the term of such permit shall not extend beyond eighteen months after enactment of this Act.

PERMIT APPLICATION; NOTICE; PUBLIC HEARING

SEC. 102. (a) Within two months after the effective date of this Act, no operator shall engage in surface or underground coal mining operations if he has not applied for a permit under the provisions of this Act. No operator shall hereafter engage in such operations if the Administrator denies a permit under this Act.

(b) Applications for a permit shall be made in writing to the Administrator upon forms prepared and furnished by him. Each application shall include, among other things, the following:

(1) the names and addresses of (A) the applicant; (B) all present legal owners of the property (surface and mineral) to be mined; (C) any purchaser of the property under a real estate contract; (D) the operator; and (E) if any of these be business entities other than a single proprietor, the names and addresses of the principal officers and resident agent shall be included;

(2) a description of the type of coal mining operation that exist or is proposed;

(3) the anticipated or actual starting and termination dates;

(4) in the case of a surface coal mining operation, the written statement of the owner of the surface of the land upon which the applicant proposes to engage in such operation, in a form approved by the Administrator and executed by such owner after the date of enactment of this Act, showing that such owner consents to such operations and the entry of such operator over and across such land for this purpose and to carry out fully the terms, conditions, and requirements of any permit and approved stabilization plan (such statement shall be in addition to any legal document the applicant may possess concerning his title or lease to the case);

(5) the name and address of the owners of all surface area within five hundred feet of any part of the area of land affected by such operations;

(6) a statement of any coal mining permits held by the applicant and the permit numbers;

(7) the names and address of every officer, partner, director, or person performing a function similar to a director, or the applicant, together with the name and address of any person owning, of record or beneficially, either alone or with associates, 10 per centum or more of any class of stock of the applicant;

(8) a statement of whether the applicant, any subsidiary, affiliate, or persons controlled by or under common control with the applicant or any person required to be identified by the Administrator has ever held a coal mining permit or license issued by any agency of the Federal Government or any State which permit or license has been suspended or revoked; and

(9) a statement of whether the applicant has ever had a coal mining bond or similar security deposited in lieu of bond forfeited.

(c) The application for a permit shall be accompanied by a map in duplicate, prepared and certified by a registered professional engineer or registered surveyor, on a scale of not less than four hundred feet to the inch or two copies of an enlarged United States Geological Survey topographic map showing all information pertinent to the successful coal mining of such area or areas under the provisions of this title, including, but not limited to, the results of test borings which the operator has conducted at the site of the proposed operation and include, when appropriate, the nature and depth of the overburden, the quantities and location of subsurface water, the thickness of the coal seam, an analysis including acidity of the coal seam, an analysis of the acidity of other surrounding strata, the crop line of the coal seam, and the location of the test boring holes; the names and locations of all known streams, creeks, or other bodies of water, existing and proposed roads, rail-

roads; utility lines and rights-of-way, buildings; cemeteries; and oil and gas wells on the area of affected land and within five hundred feet of such area, the location of proposed waste or refuse areas; and the drainage plan on, below, above, and away from the area of affected land, including subsurface waters above the seam of the coal to be removed and indicating the directional flow of water, constructed drainways, natural waterways used for drainage, and the stream of tributaries receiving or to receive this discharge. Aerial photographs of the tract of land to be affected are acceptable if the photographs provide such pertinent information. The map shall also identify the area, show the probable limits of adjacent mining operations, whether active or not, and such other data as the Administrator may require.

(d) An application for an original permit, and for any renewal of such permit, shall be accompanied by a certificate issued by an insurance company authorized to do business in the United States certifying that the applicant has a public liability insurance policy in force for the coal mining operation for which such permit is sought. Such policy shall provide for personal injury and property damage protection in an amount adequate to compensate the Federal Government and persons damaged as a result of coal mining and reclamation operations and entitled to compensation under applicable provisions of State law. Such policy shall be for the term of the permit plus not less than eighteen months thereafter.

(e) The original application for permit shall be accompanied by a fee of not less than \$500.

(f) The applicant for a permit to conduct a coal mining operation shall submit to the Administrator a copy of his advertisement of the ownership, precise location, and boundaries of the site intended to be mined. Such advertisement shall be placed in a newspaper of general circulation in the locality of the proposed coal mining at least once a week for four successive weeks. In addition, the applicant shall also submit as part of his application copies of letters which he has sent to various local governmental bodies, planning agencies, and sewage and water treatment authorities, or companies in whose watershed the mining will take place, notifying them of his intention to mine a particular tract of land.

(g) Upon receipt of an application, the Administrator shall determine the amount of bond per acre that a surface coal mining operator shall furnish before a permit is issued. The amount of bond shall be stated in the published notice of the application and be sent to the applicant.

(h) If the application and map are proper in all respects, the Administrator shall publish a notice thereof in the Federal Register and in a newspaper of general circulation in the locality. Any person or the officer or head of any Federal, State, or local governmental agency or authority shall have the right to file written objections to the proposed mining with the Administrator within thirty days after the last publication of the above notice.

APPROVAL OF PERMIT APPLICATION: PUBLIC HEARING

SEC. 103. (a) Upon the filing of an application as required in section 102 of this title, the Administrator shall investigate and may approve or disapprove the application for a permit.

(b) (1) No permit application shall be approved unless the Administrator finds, on the basis of the information set forth in the application or from information available to him, and made available to the applicant and the public, or obtained at a public hearing, that the applicable requirements of this title and the rules and regulations adopted thereunder will be observed, and

that, in the case of a surface coal mining application, there is probable cause to believe that the stabilization of the area of affected land can be achieved.

(2) If the Administrator finds, in the case of a surface coal mining permit application, that the overburden of a part of the area of land described in the application, but not all, is such that deposits of sediment in streambeds, landslides, or acid or mineralized water pollution in violation of State and Federal water quality standards, requirements, or limitations whichever is higher, cannot feasibly be prevented or controlled, he may permit such mining, but he shall delete such part of the land described in the application upon which such overburden exists.

(3) If the applicant is a partnership or corporation, no permit application shall be approved under this title if the Administrator finds that any officer, director, or an owner of a majority interest of the partnership or corporation—

(A) is presently ineligible to obtain a permit or license to conduct a coal mining operation under the law of the State in which the proposed mining is to be conducted;

(B) has had a permit revoked by the Administrator under this title; or

(C) has violated, and continues to violate, any law, rule, or regulation of the United States, or of any department or agency of the United States, pertaining to coal mining operations or stabilization.

Except that any such applicant with respect to whom any officer, director, or owner of a majority interest therein has had such a State permit or license revoked under State law, or has been denied such a State permit or license, prior to the effective date of this Act, shall not be precluded, by reason of such revocation or denial, from obtaining a permit under this title if it is currently eligible under this title to receive a permit; or any such applicant with respect to whom any officer, director, or owner of a majority interest therein has had a permit revoked by the Administrator under this title shall be ineligible to receive any additional permit until the end of three-year period beginning on the date of such revocation and only if the Administrator is satisfied that such applicant has taken the necessary steps to rectify the situation which gave rise to the revocation.

(4) No permit application shall be approved if the Administrator finds that any officer, director, or an owner of a majority interest of an applicant corporation or partnership is or has been an officer, director, or owner of a majority interest of any other corporation or partnership which—

(A) is presently ineligible to obtain a permit or license to conduct a coal mining operation under the law of the State in which the proposed mining is to be conducted;

(B) has had a permit revoked by the Administrator under this title; or

(C) has violated, and continues to violate, any law, rule, or regulation of the United States, or of any department or agency of the United States, pertaining to coal mining operations or stabilization.

Except that any such applicant corporation or partnership having such an officer, director, or majority owner who has had such a State permit or license revoked under State law, or who has been denied such a State permit or license, prior to the effective date of this Act, shall not be precluded, by reason of such revocation or denial, from obtaining a permit under this title if it is currently eligible to receive such a permit; or any such applicant corporation or partnership having such an officer, director, or majority owner who has had a permit revoked by the Administrator under this title shall be ineligible to receive any additional permit until the end of the three-year period begin-

ning on the date of such revocation and only if the Administrator is satisfied that such officer, director, or majority owner has taken the necessary steps to rectify the situation which gave rise to the revocation.

(5) All findings under this subsection shall be in writing and made available to the public.

(c) No permit application shall be approved for the purpose of coal mining of any area of land or the creation of spoil banks thereon which is within five hundred feet of any public road, or body of water, stream, or lake to which the public enjoys use and access, or to mine any area of land within one mile of other publicly owned land if mining of the area will adversely affect the publicly owned land: *Provided*, That in the case of any area within the national park system, the national wildlife refuge system, the national forest system, or a reservoir or dam site administered by the Corps of Engineers, the Administrator, at the request of the appropriate Secretary having jurisdiction over such area, shall require that mining not take place within up to three miles of such area.

(d) No permit application shall be approved if mining the area will adversely affect any publicly owned park, recreation area, refuge, or reservoir or dam site, unless screening and other measures approved by the Administrator are used, and the permit application shall so provide.

(e) No permit application shall be approved under this title if—

(1) the applicant is presently ineligible to obtain a permit or license to conduct a coal mining operation under the law of the State in which the proposed mining is to be conducted;

(2) the applicant has had a permit revoked by the Administrator under this title; or

(3) the applicant has violated, and continues to violate, any law, rule, or regulation of the United States, or of any department or agency of the United States, pertaining to coal mining operations or stabilization. Except that any applicant who has had such a State permit or license revoked under State law, or who has been denied such a State permit or license, prior to the effective date of this Act, shall not be precluded, by reason of such revocation or denial, from obtaining a permit under this title if he is currently eligible under this title to receive a permit; or any person who has had a permit revoked by the Administrator under this title shall be ineligible to receive any additional permit until the end of the three-year period beginning on the date of such revocation and only if the Administrator is satisfied that such person has taken the necessary steps to rectify the situation which gave rise to the revocation.

(f) No permit application shall be approved unless the plan of operation and, in the case of surface coal mining, stabilization required under this title is approved. The Administrator may approve a stabilization plan that complies with the requirements of this Act.

(g) (1) The Administrator shall notify the applicant by registered mail within thirty days after the expiration of the period established for receipt of written comments, unless a hearing or appeal is in progress, whether the application has been approved. If the Administrator fails to notify the applicant within the prescribed period, the applicant may request in writing a public hearing which shall be held within thirty days after receipt of the request.

(2) If written objections, including a request for a hearing, are filed after notice, the Administrator shall then hold a public hearing in the locality of the proposed mining within thirty days of the receipt of such objections. The date, time, and location of any public hearing held under this section shall be advertised by the Administrator in a newspaper of general circulation in the locality

for seven successive days and in the Federal Register. At such public hearing, the applicant for a permit shall have the burden of establishing that his application is in compliance with the applicable State and Federal laws.

(3) The Administrator shall make findings of fact and issue his decision, together with such findings, on the application for a permit not less than thirty days after the conclusion of such hearings unless all parties to the hearing agree to extend the period. The findings and decision shall be public.

(4) Any decision of the Administrator under subsection (f) (3) of this section shall be subject to judicial review in accordance with the provisions of section 106 of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (U.S.C. 816).

(h) Within thirty days after the effective date of this Act, the Administrator shall publish a permit form setting forth general conditions necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. At the time of approval of an application for a permit, the Administrator shall prescribe such special conditions as he deems appropriate.

(i) Permits issued under this title for underground coal mining operations shall be effective for five years, unless revoked or suspended prior thereto.

STABILIZATION PLAN

SEC. 104. A stabilization plan shall accompany every application for a permit for surface coal mining and it shall be made available to the public and be approved in the same manner as a permit. In any stabilization process the prime consideration shall be the maintenance of the maximum ecological value. The application shall include—

(a) a statement (1) of the highest and best use to which the land was put prior to the commencement of surface coal mining; (2) of the use which is proposed to be made of the land following stabilization; (3) of the manner in which mining operations will be conducted and whatever actions will be taken to prevent adverse environmental effects; and (4) that proper consideration has been given to insure that the plan is consistent with local environmental conditions and current mining and stabilization technologies;

(b) provisions that allow the plan, prior to approval and after consultation with the operator, to be subject to modification by the Administrator to avoid conflicts with State and Federal laws, and in accordance with this Act;

(c) provisions to maintain and improve the quality of water in surface and ground water systems; by, wherever applicable (1) diverting surface drainages to prevent contamination of water from, or inflow to, unstabilized mined areas or active mine workings, (2) properly treating drainage from mine workings, spoil or waste accumulations, and leaching operations where needed, (3) casing or sealing boreholes and wells, to insure overlying ground stability, (4) conducting surface coal mining or dredging so as to minimize slope failures and the adverse effects of highwalls and spoil banks, and (5) such other measures as may be technically feasible;

(d) provisions to return all mined areas to a condition that will not be injurious to public health and safety and that will be suitable for future productive use consistent with surrounding conditions;

(e) provisions to (1) stabilize mined areas and waste accumulations to prevent or control erosion and prevent attendant air and water pollution; (2) screen the view of operations and waste materials from surrounding areas; and (3) preserve top soil and use the

best available other soil material from the mining cycle to cover spoil material;

(f) provisions to insure that no part of the operation or waste accumulations will be located outside of the permit area, that all environmental damage will be contained within the permit area and that suitable restitution will be made for damage to offsite property;

(g) an estimate of the time schedule of the completion of all stages of stabilization;

(h) a description of the steps to be taken to insure that the surface coal mining operation complies with all applicable air and water laws and regulations and health and safety standards;

(i) a statement of the engineering techniques and the character and description of the equipment, a plan for the prevention of harmful surface water drainage and of water accumulation in the working area, a plan for backfilling, soil stabilization and compaction, grading, resurfacing, and revegetation in order to eliminate water or soil pollution, erosion, or flooding, and detailed estimate of the cost per acre of the stabilization;

(j) a statement of the intended future use or uses of the affected area, which may include water impoundments, water-oriented real estate developments, recreational area development, commercial or industrial site development, sanitary land fill, or agricultural development, including forage or other crops, and a complete description of the manner in which the intended use will be achieved; and

(k) provisions for approval by the Administrator of any proposed stabilization contract and of the reclamation work.

POSTING OF BONDS

SEC. 105. (a) After a permit application has been approved for surface coal mining but before such a permit is issued, the applicant shall file with the Administrator the bond for performance, on a form prescribed and furnished by the Administrator, payable to the United States and conditioned that the operator shall faithfully perform all the requirements of this Act. The amount of the bond required for each permit shall depend upon the stabilization requirements, and shall be determined by the Administrator. The amount of the bond shall be sufficient to assure the completion of the stabilization plan, even in the event of forfeiture and in no case shall the bond be less than \$5,000 or \$500 per acre in the aggregate, whichever is greater. Liability under the bond shall be for the duration of the coal mining operation and for a period of five years thereafter, unless released sooner as provided in this title. The Administrator may release portions of the bond in compliance with this title as stages of the stabilization plan are successfully completed, so long as the remaining balance of the bond is sufficient to assure the completion of the remaining stages of the uncompleted plan. The bond shall be executed by the operator and a corporate surety licensed to do business in the State where such operation is located, except that the operator may elect to deposit cash, negotiable bonds of the United States Government or such State, negotiable certificates of deposit having a par value equal to or greater than the amount of the surety bond and issued by any bank organized or transacting business in the United States.

(b) Cash or securities so deposited shall be deposited upon the same terms as the terms upon which surety bonds may be deposited. If one or more negotiable certificates of deposit are deposited with the Administrator in lieu of the surety bond, he shall require the bank which issued any certificate to pledge securities of the aggregate market value equal to the amount of such certificate

or certificates, which is in excess of the amount insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Such securities shall be security for the repayment of such negotiable certificate of deposit.

(c) Upon the receipt of the deposit of cash or securities, the Administrator shall immediately place the deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall receive and hold the deposit in safekeeping in the name of the United States, in trust for the purpose for which the deposit was made. The operator making the deposit may from time to time demand and receive from the Secretary of the Treasury, on the written order of the Administrator, the whole or any portion of the deposit if other acceptable securities of at least the same value are deposited in lieu thereof. The operator may demand of the Secretary of the Treasury and receive the interest and income from the securities as they become due and payable. When deposited securities mature or are called, the operator may request that the Secretary of the Treasury convert the securities into other acceptable securities by the operator, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall do so.

(d) In addition to the bond or deposit, before a permit is issued, the applicant shall pay a special stabilization fee of \$200 for each acre of land to be affected in the surface coal mining operation which fee shall be placed in the Coal Mine Lands Stabilization Fund established by this title.

(e) After the permit application has been approved, the bond or deposit filed, and the fees paid, the Administrator shall issue a permit to the applicant. Within ten days after the issuance the Administrator shall notify the State and the local official who has the duty of collecting real estate taxes in the local political subdivision in which the area of land to be affected is located that a permit has been issued and shall describe the location of the land.

STABILIZATION FUND

SEC. 106. (a) There is hereby created in the Department of the Treasury a revolving fund to be known as the Coal Mine Lands Stabilization Fund (hereinafter referred to in this title as the "fund").

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to the fund initially the sum of \$100,000,000, and such other sums as may thereafter be appropriated by the Congress.

(c) Moneys in the fund may be expended by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers for the purposes indicated in section 107 of this title.

(d) Fees and penalties which have been collected and any bond or deposit which has been forfeited under this Act shall also be deposited in the fund.

(e) Moneys derived from the sale, exchange, lease, or rental of stabilized land acquired by the United States shall be deposited in the fund.

(f) Moneys derived from any user charge imposed upon stabilized land acquired by the United States used for recreation purposes, after expenditures for operation, development, and maintenance have been deducted, shall be deposited in the fund.

ACQUISITION OF ABANDONMENT SURFACE COAL LAND

SEC. 107. (a) The Chief of the Corps of Engineers may acquire by purchase, donation, exchange, or otherwise land, which has been affected by surface coal mining operations, has not been fully stabilized prior to the effective date of this Act, and has been abandoned or is declared inactive as determined by him. Title to all lands acquired shall be taken in the name of the United States, but no deed shall be accepted or purchase price paid until the title thereof is

approved by the Attorney General of the United States. The price paid for land under this section shall not exceed the fair market value taking into account the unstabilized or partially stabilized condition of the land. Prior to making any acquisition of land under this section, the Chief of the Corps of Engineers shall (1) make a complete and thorough study with respect to those tracts of land which are available for acquisition under this section and based upon those findings he shall generally determine which tracts present the greatest adverse effect to the public together with his reasons, and (2) determine the cost of such acquisition and stabilization and the benefits of the public to be gained therefrom. Such findings shall be in writing and made available to the public. When Chief of the Corps of Engineers takes action to acquire an interest in land or mineral rights, and cannot reach an agreement with the persons who hold such interest or right as to what constitutes just compensation, or he cannot determine what person or persons hold title to such interest or rights, he shall request the Attorney General to file a condemnation suit and may take such interest or rights immediately upon payment by the United States either to such person or into the appropriate court such amount as he shall estimate to be the fair value of such interest or rights, except that he shall also pay to such person any further amount that may be subsequently awarded by a jury, with interest from the date of the taking.

(b) The Chief of the Corps of Engineers shall prepare plans and specifications for the stabilization of lands (including any waste or refuse storage area) to be acquired under this section. In preparing a plan of stabilization the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, shall utilize, with or without reimbursement, the specialized knowledge or experience of any Federal department or agency which can assist him in the development or implementation of the stabilization program required under this section.

(c) The Chief of the Corps of Engineers shall stabilize directly or by contract the lands (including any waste or refuse storage area), according to the prepared plans, as moneys become available to the fund, except that no such moneys shall be committed for the acquisition or stabilization of such lands until the Chief of the Corps has made such plans public and provided an opportunity for comment thereon, including an opportunity for public hearings.

(d) Administration of all lands stabilized under this section shall be in the Chief of the Corps until disposed of by him as set forth in this title.

(e) The Chief may use moneys from the fund for the engineering, administrative, and research costs necessary for stabilization of the lands.

(f) Moneys in the fund resulting from the forfeiture of surety bonds, or from other securities deposited by an applicant and not stabilized by him as required by this title, shall be used by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers first for stabilization of the land covered by the forfeited bond or deposit.

(g) (1) Where stabilized land is deemed to be suitable for commercial, industrial, residential, agricultural, or recreational development, the Chief of the Corps of Engineers may, after notice, sell such land by public sale under a system of competitive bidding, at not less than fair market value and under other such regulations as he may promulgate to insure that such lands are put to a proper use, as determined by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers. If any such land sold is not put to the use specified by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers in the terms of the sales agreement, then all right,

title, and interest in such land shall revert to the United States. Money received from such sale shall be deposited in the fund.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, stabilized land may be sold to the State or local government in which it is located at a price less than fair market value, which in no case shall be less than the cost to the United States of the purchase and stabilization of the land, as negotiated by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, to be used for a valid public purpose, except that, if such land will be used by the State or local government solely for wildlife or park purposes, such land may be sold to such State or local government for an amount equal to the cost to the United States of the purchase of such land. If any land sold to a State or local government under this paragraph is not used for a valid public purpose as specified by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers in the terms of the sales agreement then all right, title, and interest in such land shall revert to the United States. Money received from such sale shall be deposited in the fund.

(h) The Chief of the Corps of Engineers may direct that stabilized land may be improved for water-based or other recreational purposes, and that a reasonable user charge shall be imposed by him. Revenue derived from such stabilized lands shall be used first to assure proper maintenance of such stabilized lands, and any remaining moneys shall be deposited in the fund.

(i) To the extent that the Chief of the Corps of Engineers stabilized any land abandoned or declared inactive by reason of this title, he shall take appropriate action against the operator who, on the date of enactment of this Act, was conducting surface coal mining operations on such land to recover the actual costs to the United States of such stabilization. Such operator shall be liable for such costs for a period of seven years from the date of enactment of this Act. The Federal district court where such land is situated shall have jurisdiction over any such action.

RECLAMATION CONTRACT

Sec. 108. The Chief of the Corps of Engineers shall award each proposed stabilization contract to the lowest qualified bidder after sealed bids are received, opened, and published at the time and place fixed by the Chief of the Corps of Engineers and notice of the time and place at which the bids will be received, opened, and published, has been advertised at least once at least ten days before the opening of the bids, in a newspaper of general circulation in each county in which the area of land to be reclaimed under such contract is located. If no bids for the advertised contract are received at the time and place fixed for receiving them, the Chief of the Corps of Engineers may advertise again, but he may, if he deems the public interest will be best served thereby, enter into a contract without further advertisement for bids. The Chief of the Corps of Engineers may reject any or all bids received and may fix and publish again notice of the time and place at which new bids for the contract will be received, opened, and published.

ADDITIONAL CONTIGUOUS LAND BOND

Sec. 109. (a) The operator shall, prior to commencing mining on any additional contiguous land exceeding the estimate in the application for a permit, file with the Administrator an additional bond under the same requirements as the original bond and an additional fee of \$100 per acre, and all additional information which would have been required for the additional land if the land had been included in the original application for permit.

(b) If all the requirements imposed on the issuance of the original permit are met

by the application for the additional land, and if the total amount of the additional acreage does not exceed 10 per centum of the original permit acreage, the Administrator shall promptly issue an amended permit. The Administrator shall, within ten days after issuance, notify the appropriate State and county auditor of the amended permit.

(c) If the total amount of the additional acreage exceeds 10 per centum of the original permit acreage, the operator shall file for a separate and new permit for the operation.

PERMIT RENEWAL

Sec. 110. Any operator who holds a permit issued under this title to conduct underground coal mining operations and who wishes to continue such operations beyond the original permit period shall apply to renew his permit within ninety days prior to the anniversary date of the permit issuance. An additional fee of \$100 and a new map which outlines the area to be affected shall be filed with such application. Each renewal application shall be in a form prescribed by the Administrator and shall update the information provided in the original permit application. The Administrator shall approve the renewal application in accordance with procedures established by this title for approval of the original application.

REVOCATION AND SUSPENSION

Sec. 111. (a) The Administrator shall revoke or suspend any permit if, after notice and an opportunity for a public hearing, he determines that the operator has violated any provision of this title or any rules and regulations issued under this title.

(b) If the Administrator suspends or revokes the permit of the operator, he shall issue an order requiring the operator to immediately cease coal mining operations at that operation and, in the case of a revocation, shall declare as forfeited any performance surety bonds for the operation. Where a permit is suspended, the Administrator may, after notice and public hearing, terminate such order if all violations are abated and the Administrator determines such termination is in the public interest.

STABILIZATION OPERATIONS

Sec. 112. (a) Every surface coal mining operator shall stabilize the land affected by his mining. Every surface coal mining operator shall, in the process of mining—

(1) remove the topsoil from the land in a separate layer and segregate the topsoil in a separate pile so that the soil is kept in a usable condition for sustaining vegetation;

(2) backfill the operation so that the approximate original contour of the area of land affected is stabilized. There shall be no depressions in the contour to hold water which may produce siltation, highly mineralized drainage, or acid drainage. On natural slopes greater than 14 degrees or if the original contour of the area of land affected was such that soil erosion, slides, acid drainage, highly mineralized drainage will probably, in the opinion of the Administrator, occur before the planned vegetation will grow, the operator shall backfill and grade according to a plan of terracing and drainage that will eliminate the probable damage;

(3) backfill, grade, replace the topsoil which has been segregated unless a layer of soil which has been uncovered which is better able to support vegetation has been approved by the Administrator as a substitute, and plant stable and diverse vegetative covering as approved by the Administrator, or his regulations and rules. A quick growing temporary covering may be used, but such covering does not release the operator from his obligation to provide a stable and diverse vegetative covering. The process of reclamation shall progress as the mining progresses, as soon as practicable after the ex-

traction of the coal. All backfilling, grading, and resoilng shall be completed before the necessary equipment is moved from the area unless prior approval is received from the Administrator; and

(4) bury under adequate fill any toxic material, roof coal, pyritic shale, or material determined by the Administrator to be acid-producing, toxic, or creating a fire hazard or serious thermal problem. The operator shall remove or bury any metal, lumber, equipment, or other refuse resulting from the mining. The operator shall compact all fill in refuse disposal areas, so that underground air pockets are eliminated, and all combustible material shall be placed so that they will not ignite.

(b) The purpose of this section is to restore the area of land affected to the same or an equally useful purpose as before any mining. Any method of stabilization other than provided in this section may be proposed to the Administrator and shall be used only if he so approves. The Administrator may approve an alternative plan if the plan does not violate the purpose of this section.

(c) Throughout the mining process, the operator of an underground or surface coal mining operation shall prevent water pollution by siltation, acid drainage or excessive mineralization of surface or subsurface water.

DUMPING WASTE MATERIALS

SEC. 113. No coal mining operator shall throw, dump, pile, or otherwise place or permit the throwing, dumping, piling, or otherwise placing of any material of any type outside the area of land which is under permit, nor place any material in such a way that normal erosion, slides brought about by natural physical causes, or rain will permit the material to go outside the area of land which is under permit, nor place such material in a way that normal erosion, slides brought about by natural physical causes, or rain will permit the material to be deposited or discharged into any waterway. This prohibition includes the deposit of material on public highways from trucks hauling material from the operation.

USE OF EXPLOSIVES

SEC. 114. (a) Explosives may be used for the purpose of blasting in connection with any surface coal mining operation only in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Interior issued under this Act within sixty days after the effective date of this Act, or of a State if those regulations are determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(b) No blasting shall be done—

(1) where the course or channel of any surface or subsurface stream will be changed as a probable result of the blast; or

(2) where the banks of a stream will be ruptured permitting water to enter the strip mining pit; or

(3) where vibration or concussion will be felt beyond the licensed area unless prior written consent of the property owner or owners (where such vibrations or concussions will be felt) has been obtained; or

(4) where the stability of the roof strata of an operating underground mine or the watercourses entering such a mine will be adversely affected as a probable result of the blast.

(c) Before an explosion is about to be set off, sufficient warning shall be given so that any person approaching the area shall be given ample time to retreat a safe distance. Any public highway or entrance to the operation shall be barricaded and guarded by the operator if the highway or entrance is located within one thousand feet of any point of the blasting site.

(d) Before an explosion is to be set off within one thousand feet of occupied buildings or dwellings, any person within the area shall be notified, in a manner approved by the Secretary of the Interior within twenty-four hours prior to the blast. The Secretary shall designate the time period during which such blasting may be done. Any blasting shall be done between the hours of sunrise and sunset.

(e) The Director or the Commission may prohibit blasting in specific areas where the safety of the public or private property is endangered.

IDENTIFICATION OF MINING OPERATIONS

SEC. 115. (a) The operator shall conspicuously maintain a sign at each entrance to the operation which clearly shows the name, business address, and phone number of the operator and the permit number of the operation. The sign shall be at least three feet in size and shall be clearly visible.

OPERATOR'S PROGRESS REPORT

SEC. 116. (a) Within ninety days after the commencement of surface coal mining operations and each ninety days thereafter unless notified or waived by the Administrator, the operator of a surface coal mining operation shall file a report with the administrator on a form provided by him that accurately states the amount of coal produced, the number of employees, the days worked, the number and location of acres of land mined, number and location of acres of the land stabilized, and a description of the progress made toward the completion of the reclamation plan. An annual report with the same type of information shall be filed with the Administrator not later than the twenty-fifth day of January of each year for the previous year.

(b) Progress maps contained information specified by the Administrator may be required from the operator by him upon thirty days' notice. All such reports and maps shall be available to the public.

RELEASE OF BOND

SEC. 117. (a) Where the stabilizing of the mined area has been successful, as determined by the Administrator, the operator may file a request, on a form provided by the Administrator, for release of bond. The request shall state—

(1) the location of the area and number of acres;

(2) the permit number;

(3) the amount of bond; and

(4) the type and date of the reclamation activities.

(b) An inspection and evaluation of the reclamation of the area shall be made within ninety days after the request. If the Administrator finds that the stabilization meets the requirements of this Act, he shall, subject to the provisions of this section, send by registered mail to the operator a release of the bond or other security covering the area of stabilized land. He shall also at the same time send a copy of the release to the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon presentation of the release to the Secretary of the Treasury by the operator to whom it was issued, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the operator or his authorized agent the amount of bond or other security released by decision of the Administrator.

(c) If the Administrator does not approve of the stabilization performed by the operator, he shall notify the operator by registered mail within ninety days after the request is filed. The notice shall state the reasons for unacceptability.

(d) (1) The application for bond release shall contain a copy of an advertisement placed in a newspaper of general circulation in the locality of the surface coal mining. Such advertisement shall contain a notifica-

tion of the location, of the area and number of acres, the permit number, the amount of bond, and the type of stabilization and the degree of success. In addition, the applicant shall also submit as part of his request copies of letters which he has sent to various local governmental bodies, planning agencies, and sewage and water treatment authorities, or companies in whose watershed the mining will take place, notifying them of his intention to seek release from bond.

(2) Any person, or the officer or head of any Federal, State, or local government agency or authority shall have the right to file written objections to the proposed release from bond to the Administrator within thirty days after the last publication of the above notice. If written objections are filed, the Administrator shall then hold a public hearing in the locality of the mining operation proposed for release from bond within sixty days of the receipt of such objections. The date, time, and location of such public hearing shall be advertised by the Administrator in a newspaper of general circulation in the locality for seven successive days. At this public hearing, the applicant for release from bond shall have the burden of establishing that his request is in compliance with the applicable State and Federal laws.

(3) The Administrator, or his designate, shall make his decision on the request for release from bond not less than sixty days after the record of the hearing is transcribed.

(4) Any person who is aggrieved by the decision of the Administrator, or his designate, shall have the right of judicial review as provided by this Act.

(5) No bond shall be released except under the provisions of this section.

INSPECTORS

SEC. 118. (a) The Administrator shall determine the number of coal mining inspectors needed to implement this title, and shall appoint them subject to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service. Each inspector shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to the classification and General Schedule pay rates. The qualification and training provisions of section 505 of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 shall be applicable here.

(b) A coal mining inspector when making any necessary survey and inspection of coal mining operations under this title shall, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, administer and enforce all Federal coal mine health and safety laws, rules, and regulations and shall perform such other functions as prescribed by the Administrator.

INSPECTIONS

SEC. 119. (a) Inspectors appointed under this title shall visit each surface coal mine operation subject to this title, a minimum of twice monthly, and underground mining operations, a minimum of four times a year, on an irregular basis and without prior notice to the operator or any of his employees. The Administrator shall establish a system of continual rotation of inspectors so that an inspector does not visit the same operations only.

(b) Any inspector shall be admitted to any coal mining operation and shall be allowed to inspect the operation for the purpose of determining compliance with this Act, the rules and regulations of the Administrator, and the terms and conditions of any permit. Each inspector, upon detection of each violation, shall forthwith inform the operator in writing, and shall report in writing any such violation to the Administrator.

The Administrator shall as soon as possible notify the operator by registered mail of each violation and shall include with the notice a list of requirements determined by the Administrator to correct the violation, including the time period within which to meet the requirements. If at the end of the period, the requirement has not been met and the operator continues to fail to comply, the inspector shall notify the Administrator, who shall fix the time and place for a hearing to suspend or revoke the permit of the operator within thirty days of the end of the period. The Administrator shall send notice of the hearing by registered mail to the operator at least ten days before the hearing.

FORFEITURE OF BOND

SEC. 120. The Administrator shall notify the Attorney General of the United States of any forfeiture of performance surety bonds, and the Attorney General of the United States shall collect the forfeiture without delay and deposit it in the fund.

SUCCEEDING OPERATORS

SEC. 121. If an operator succeeds another at any uncompleted operation, by sale, assignment, lease, or otherwise, the Administrator may release the first operator from all liability under this Act only if both operators have complied with the requirements of this Act and the successor operator assumes full liability for stabilization procedures established therefor.

INSPECTION, MONITORING, AND ENTRY

SEC. 122. (a) For the purpose (i) of carrying out the provisions of this Act, or (ii) of determining whether any person is in violation of any provision of this title—

(1) the Administrator may require the operator of any coal mining operation to (A) establish and maintain such records, (B) make such reports, (C) install, use, and maintain such monitoring equipment or methods, (D) sample such emissions (in accordance with such methods, at such locations, at such intervals, and in such manner as the Administrator shall prescribe), and (E) provide such other information as he may reasonably require; and

(2) the Administrator or his authorized representative, upon presentation of his credentials—

(A) shall have a right of entry to, upon, or through any coal mining operation and any premises in which any records required to be maintained under paragraph (1) of this subsection are located, and

(B) may at reasonable times have access to and copy any records, inspect any monitoring equipment or method required under paragraph (1).

(b) Any records, reports, or information obtained under subsection (a) shall be available to the public, except that upon a showing satisfactory to the Administrator by any person that records, reports, or information, or particular part thereof, to which the Administrator has access under this section if made public, would divulge methods or processes entitled to protection as trade secrets of such person, the Administrator shall consider such record, report, or information or particular portion thereof confidential, except that such record, report, or information may be disclosed to other officers, employees, or authorized representatives of the United States concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act.

CITIZEN SUITS

SEC. 123. (a) Any person may commence a civil action on his own behalf—

(1) against any person, including (i) the United States, and (ii) any other governmental instrumentality or agency (to the ex-

tent permitted by the eleventh amendment to the Constitution), who is alleged to be in violation of this title, or

(2) against the Administrator and the Chief of the Corps of Engineers where there is alleged a failure of the Administrator or the Chief to perform any act or duty under this title which is not discretionary with the Administrator or the Chief.

(b) The district courts shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy or the citizenship of the parties, to enforce this title, or to require the Administrator or the Chief to perform such act or duty, as the case may be.

(c) Nothing in this section shall restrict any right which any person (or class of persons) may have under any statute or the common law to seek enforcement of this title or to seek any other relief, including relief against the Administrator or the Chief or any State agency.

APPEARANCE

SEC. 124. The Administrator shall request the Attorney General to appear and represent him in any civil action instituted under this Act to which the Administrator is a party. Unless the Attorney General notifies the Administrator that he will appear in such action, within a reasonable time attorneys appointed by the Administrator shall appear and represent him.

FEDERAL PROCUREMENT

SEC. 125. (a) No Federal agency may enter into any contract for the procurement of goods, materials, and services with any operator who is convicted of any offense under this title to perform such contract at any coal mining operation at which the violation which gave rise to such conviction occurred. The prohibition in the preceding sentence shall continue until the Administrator certifies that the condition giving rise to such a conviction has been corrected.

(b) The Administrator shall establish procedures to provide all Federal agencies with the notification necessary for the purpose of subsection (a).

(c) In order to implement the purposes and policy of this Act, the President shall, not more than ninety days after enactment of this Act, cause to be issued an order (1) requiring each Federal agency authorized to enter into contracts and each Federal agency which is empowered to extend Federal assistance by way of grant, loan, or contract to effectuate the purpose and policy of the Act in such contracting or assistance activities, and (2) setting forth procedures, sanctions, penalties, and such other provisions, as the President determines necessary to carry out such requirement.

(d) The President may exempt any contract, loan, or grant from all or part of the provisions of this section where he determines such exemption is necessary in the paramount interest of the United States and he shall notify the Congress of such exemption.

(e) The President shall annually report to the Congress on measures taken toward implementing the purpose and intent of this section, including but not limited to the progress and problems associated with implementation of this section.

GENERAL PROVISION RELATING TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING; JUDICIAL REVIEW OF REGULATIONS

SEC. 126. (a) For the purposes of obtaining information, or conducting investigations or public hearings under this title, the Administrator may issue subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books, and documents, and he may administer oaths. Upon a showing satisfactory to the Administrator by such owner or operator that such

papers, books, documents, or information or particular part thereof, if made public, would divulge trade secrets or secret processes of such owner or operator, the Administrator shall consider such record, report, or information or particular portion thereof confidential, except that such paper, book, document, or information, may be disclosed to other officers, employees or authorized representatives of the United States concerned with carrying out this title, or when relevant in any proceeding under this title. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena served upon any person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States and after notice to such person, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony before the Administrator to appear and produce papers, books, and documents before the Administrator, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. A verbatim transcript shall be made of all hearings held pursuant to this title.

(b) (1) A petition for review of action of the Administrator in promulgating any regulation under this title may be held only in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Any such petition shall be filed within thirty days from the date of such promulgation or after such date if such petition is based solely on grounds arising after such thirtieth day.

(2) Action of the Administrator with respect to which review could have been obtained under paragraph (1) shall not be subject to judicial review in civil or criminal proceedings for enforcement.

(c) In any judicial proceeding in which review is sought of a determination under this title required to be made on the record after notice and opportunity for hearing, if any party applies to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shows to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the proceeding before the Administrator, the court may order such additional evidence, and evidence in rebuttal thereof to be taken before the Administrator, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may deem proper. The Administrator may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of the additional evidence so taken and he shall file such modified or new findings, and his recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original determination with the return of such additional evidence.

EMPLOYEE PROTECTION

SEC. 127. (a) No person shall discharge or in any other way discriminate against or cause to be discharged or discriminated against any employee of a surface mine or any authorized representative thereof by reason of the fact that such employee or representative (1) has notified the Administrator or his authorized representative of any alleged violation or danger, (2) has filed, instituted, or caused to be filed or instituted any proceeding under this Act, or (3) has testified or is about to testify in any proceeding resulting from the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

(b) Any such employee or representative who believes that he has been discharged or otherwise discriminated against by any person in violation of subsection (a) of this

section may, within thirty days after such violation occurs, apply to the Secretary of Labor for a review of such alleged discharge or discrimination. A copy of the Application shall be sent to such person who shall be the respondent. Upon receipt of such application, the Secretary of Labor shall cause such investigation to be made as he deems appropriate. Such investigation shall provide an opportunity for a public hearing at the request of any party to enable the parties to present information relating to such violation. The parties shall be given written notice of the time and place of the hearing at least five days prior to the hearing. Any such hearing shall be of record and shall be subject to section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code. Upon receiving the report of such investigation, the Secretary shall make findings of fact. If he finds that such violation did occur, he shall issue a decision, incorporating an order therein, requiring the person committing such violation to take such affirmative action to abate the violation as the Secretary of Labor deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the rehiring or reinstatement of the employee or representative to his former position with back pay. If he finds that there was no such violation, he shall issue an order denying the application. Such order shall incorporate the Secretary's findings therein. Any order issued by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be subject to judicial review in accordance with section 126(b) of this title. Violations by any person of subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 130 of this title.

(c) Whenever an order is issued under this section, at the request of the applicant, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of all costs and expenses (including the attorney's fees) as determined by the Secretary of Labor to have been reasonably incurred by the applicant for, or in connection with, the institution and prosecution of such proceedings, shall be assessed against the person committing such violation.

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

SEC. 128. In addition to any other remedy at law or in equity under the provisions of this title, the Attorney General of the United States may, at the request of the Administrator, apply to an appropriate United States district court for relief by injunction to enforce compliance with, or restrain violations of, any provisions of this title or any rule, regulation, decision, or order made pursuant thereto.

ACTION FOR DAMAGES

SEC. 129. Any resident of the United States who is injured in any manner through the failure of any operator to comply with the provisions of this title, or of any regulation, order, license, or plan of reclamation issued by the Secretary, may bring an action for damages (including attorney fees) regardless of the amount involved, in an appropriate United States district court.

CIVIL PENALTY

SEC. 130. The operator of a coal mining operation respecting which a violation of any provision of this title or regulation or permit condition occurs shall be assessed a civil penalty by the Administrator of not to exceed \$10,000 for each violation. Such penalty shall be applied in the same manner, and under the same procedure, as those penalties under section 109 of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. 819).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 131. (a) Any order or decision issued by the Administrator under sections 111 and 117 of this Act shall be subject to judicial review in the same manner, following the same procedure, as a decision of the Ad-

ministrator is subject to judicial review under section 106 of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. 816). The commencement of a proceeding under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the order or decision of the Administrator.

(b) All notices, orders, and decisions of the Administrator under this title shall be posted in the same manner, under the same procedure, to assure complete access to them by the workers in such mine, as notices, orders, and decisions of the Secretary of the Interior are posted under section 107 of such Act (30 U.S.C. 817).

STATE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 132. (a) Nothing in this title shall preclude or deny the right of any State or political subdivision thereof to adopt and enforce standards or regulations relating to the conduct of surface and underground coal mining operations and stabilization, except such State or political subdivision may not adopt or enforce any such standard which is less stringent than the corresponding Federal standard or regulation then being enforced under this title in such State by the Administrator, and except further that if any State regulation or standard is more stringent than a corresponding Federal standard or regulation established by or under this title, such State standard or regulation shall not be repealed or changed to conform to the Federal standard or regulation.

(b) The Secretary shall report to the Congress each year on the effectiveness of State legislation with respect to coal mining operations subject to this title.

FALSE STATEMENTS

SEC. 133. Any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any application, record, report, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained under this Act or who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring device or method required to be maintained under this Act, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both.

STUDY OF MINING REGULATIONS OR CONTROLS

SEC. 134. The Administrator shall conduct a full and complete study and investigation of regulations or controls that are necessary and appropriate to assure that all mining activities, whether surface mining or below surface mining, of all natural resources in the United States can be carried on efficiently with the least possible damage to the environment in the area affected by such mining operations. He shall report to the Congress the results of such study and investigation, together with any recommendations of the appropriate administrative or legislative actions that should be taken based on his findings, as soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, but in no case later than the end of the eighteen-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 135. This Act shall take effect six months after its date of enactment, except that the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor shall begin immediately after enactment to prepare and carry out any function which will facilitate prompt and effective administration and enforcement of this Act and funds shall be made available for this purpose.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 136. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this title in addition to the

sums authorized to be appropriated under section 106 of this title.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE TO WORKERS

AUTHORITY

SEC. 201. The Secretary of Labor shall determine whether applicants are entitled to receive assistance under this title and shall pay or provide such assistance to applicants who are so entitled.

PART A—READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 210. (a) Payment of a readjustment allowance shall be made to an adversely affected worker who applies for such allowance for any week of unemployment which begins after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to the requirements of subsections (b) and (c).

(b) Total or partial separation shall have occurred—

(1) after the date of the enactment of this Act,

(2) before the expiration of the two-year period beginning on the day on which an individual becomes an "adversely affected worker" as defined in section 247(1).

(c) Such worker shall have had in the one hundred and fifty-six weeks immediately preceding such total or partial separation, at least fifty-two weeks of employment in a coal mine at wages of \$15 or more a week, or if data with respect to weeks of employment are not available, equivalent amounts of employment computed under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

WEEKLY AMOUNTS

SEC. 211. (a) Subject to the other provisions of this section, the readjustment allowance payable to an adversely affected worker for a week of unemployment shall be an amount equal to 90 per centum of his average weekly wage or to 90 per centum of the average weekly manufacturing wage, whichever is greater.

(b) Any adversely affected worker who is entitled to readjustment allowances and who is undergoing training approved by the Secretary of Labor, including on-the-job training, shall receive for each week in which he is undergoing any such training, a readjustment allowance in an amount (computed for each week) equal to the amount computed under subsection (a) or (if greater) the amount of any weekly allowance for such training to which he would be entitled under any other Federal law for the training of workers, if he applied for such allowance. Such readjustment allowance shall be paid in lieu of any training allowance to which the worker would be entitled under such other Federal law.

(c) The amount of readjustment allowance payable to an adversely affected worker under subsection (a) or (b) for any week shall be reduced by any amount of unemployment insurance which he has received with respect to such work.

(d) If unemployment insurance, or a training allowance under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 or the Area Redevelopment Act, is paid to an adversely affected worker for any week of unemployment with respect to which he would be entitled (determined without regard to subsection (c) or (e) or to any disqualification under section 221) to a readjustment allowance if he applied for such allowance, each such week shall be deducted from the total number of weeks of readjustment allowance otherwise payable to him under section 212(a) when he applies for a readjustment allowance and is determined to be entitled to such allowance. If the unemployment insurance or the training allowance paid to such worker for any week of unemployment is less than the amount of the readjustment allowance to which he would be entitled if

he applied for such allowance, he shall receive, when he applies for a readjustment allowance and is determined to be entitled to such allowance, a readjustment allowance for such week equal to such difference.

(e) Whenever, with respect to any week of unemployment, the total amount payable to an adversely affected worker as remuneration for services performed during such week, as unemployment insurance, as a training allowance referred to in subsection (a), and as a readjustment allowance would exceed 85 per centum of his average weekly wage, his readjustment allowance for such week shall be reduced by the amount of such excess.

(f) The amount of any weekly payment to be made under this section which is not a whole dollar amount shall be rounded upward to the next higher whole dollar amount.

(g) (1) If unemployment insurance is paid under a State law to an adversely affected worker for a week for which—

(A) he receives a readjustment allowance, or

(B) he makes application for a readjustment allowance and would be entitled (determined without regard to subsection (c) or (e)) to receive such allowance, the State agency making such payment shall, unless it has been reimbursed for such payment under other Federal law, be reimbursed from funds appropriated pursuant to section 246, to the extent such payment does not exceed the amount of the readjustment allowance which such worker would have received, or would have been entitled to receive, as the case may be, if he had not received the State payment. The amount of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the State agency.

(2) In any case in which a State agency is reimbursed under paragraph (1) for payments of unemployment insurance made to an adversely affected worker, such payments, and the period of unemployment of such worker for which such payments were made, may be disregarded under the State law (and for purposes of applying section 3303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) in determining whether or not an employer is entitled to a reduced rate of contributions permitted by the State law.

TIME LIMITATIONS ON READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

SEC. 212. (a) Payment of readjustment allowances shall not be made to an adversely affected worker for more than one hundred and four weeks, except that, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor—

(1) such payments may be made for not more than twenty-six additional weeks to an adversely affected worker to assist him to complete training approved by the Secretary of Labor, or

(2) such payments shall be made for not more than thirteen additional weeks to an adversely affected worker who had reached his sixtieth birthday on or before the date of total or partial separation.

(b) Except for a payment made for an additional week specified in subsection (a), a readjustment allowance shall not be paid for a week of unemployment beginning more than three years after the beginning of the appropriate week. A readjustment allowance shall not be paid for any additional week specified in subsection (a) if such week begins more than four years after the beginning of the appropriate week. The appropriate week for a totally separated worker is the week of his most recent separation. The appropriate week for a partially separated worker is the week in respect of which he first receives a readjustment allowance following his most recent partial separation.

APPLICATION OF STATE LAWS

SEC. 213. Except where inconsistent with the provisions of this title and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, the availability and disqualification provisions of the State law—

(1) under which an adversely affected worker is entitled to unemployment insurance (whether or not he has filed a claim for such insurance), or

(2) if he is not so entitled to unemployment insurance, of the State in which he was totally or partially separated,

shall apply to any such worker who files a claim for readjustment allowances. The State law so determined with respect to a separation of a worker shall remain applicable, for purposes of the preceding sentence, with respect to such separation until such worker becomes entitled to unemployment insurance under another State law (whether or not he has filed a claim for such insurance).

PART B—TRAINING

IN GENERAL

SEC. 220. (a) To assure that the readjustment of adversely affected workers shall occur as quickly and effectively as possible, with minimum reliance upon readjustment allowances under this title, every effort shall be made to prepare each such worker for full employment in accordance with his capabilities and prospective employment opportunities. To this end, and subject to this title, adversely affected workers shall be afforded, where appropriate, the testing, counseling, training, and placement services provided for under any Federal law. Such workers shall also be afforded supplemental assistance necessary to defray transportation and subsistence expenses for separate maintenance when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular place of residence. The Secretary of Labor in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding \$10 a day; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expense exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile.

(b) To the extent practicable, before adversely affected workers are referred to training, the Secretary of Labor shall consult with such workers' firm and their certified or recognized union or other duly authorized representative and develop a worker retraining plan which provides for training such workers to meet the manpower needs of such firm in order to preserve or restore the employment relationship between the workers and the firm.

(c) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to transfer funds appropriated to carry out this title to other appropriation accounts to be used to defray the costs of providing testing, counseling, training, and placement services under other Federal laws, as authorized by subsection (a).

PART C—RELOCATION ALLOWANCES

RELOCATION ALLOWANCES AFFORDED

SEC. 230. Any adversely affected worker who is the head of a family as defined in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor and who has been totally separated may file an application for a relocation allowance, subject to the terms and conditions of this part.

QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 231. (a) A relocation allowance may be granted only to assist an adversely affected worker in relocating within the United States and only if the Secretary of Labor determines that such worker cannot reasonably be expected to secure suitable employment in the commuting area in which he resides and that such worker—

(1) has obtained suitable employment affording a reasonable expectation of long-term duration in the area in which he wishes to relocate, or

(2) has obtained a bona fide officer of such employment.

(b) A relocation allowance shall not be granted to such worker unless—

(1) for the week in which the application for such allowance is filed, he is entitled (determined without regard to section 211 (c) and (e)), to a readjustment allowance or would be so entitled (determined without regard to whether he filed application therefor) but for the fact that he has obtained the employment referred to in subsection (a) (1), and

(2) such relocation occurs within a reasonable period after the filing of such application or (in the case of a worker who has been referred to training by the Secretary of Labor) within a reasonable period after the conclusion of such training.

RELOCATION ALLOWANCE DEFINED

SEC. 232. For purposes of this subchapter, the term, "relocation allowance" means—

(1) the reasonable and necessary expenses, as specified in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, incurred in transporting a worker and his family and their household effects, and

(2) a lump sum equivalent to three and one-half times the average weekly manufacturing wage.

PART D—GENERAL PROVISIONS

AGREEMENTS WITH STATES

SEC. 240. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with any State agency. Under such an agreement, the State agency (1) as agent of the United States, will receive applications for, and will provide, assistance on the basis provided in this title, (2) where appropriate, will afford adversely affected workers who apply for assistance under this title testing, counseling, referral to training, and placement services, and (3) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary of Labor and with other State and Federal agencies in providing assistance under this title.

(b) Each agreement under this part shall provide the terms and conditions upon which the agreement may be amended, suspended, or terminated.

(c) Each agreement under this part shall provide that unemployment insurance otherwise payable to any adversely affected worker will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any right to allowances under this title.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 241. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which has entered into an agreement under section 240(1) the sums necessary to enable such State as agent of the United States to make payments of allowances provided for by this title, and (2) the sums reimbursable to a State pursuant to section 211(g). The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds for carrying out the purposes of this chapter. Sums reimbursable to a State pursuant to section 211(g) shall be credited to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund and shall be used only for the payment of cash benefits to individuals with respect to their unemployment, exclusive of expenses of administration.

(b) All money paid a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the

agreement under this part, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this section may be made.

(c) Any agreement under this part may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds under the agreement, or otherwise participating in the performance of the agreement, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary of Labor may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

LIABILITIES OF CERTIFYING AND DISBURSING OFFICERS

SEC. 242. (a) No person designated by the Secretary of Labor, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this part, as a certifying officer, shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (a).

RECOVERY OF OVERPAYMENTS

SEC. 243. (a) If a State agency or the Secretary of Labor, or a court of competent jurisdiction finds that any person—

(1) has made, or has caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or has knowingly failed or caused another to fail to disclose a material fact; and

(2) as a result of such action has received any payment of allowances under this title to which he was not entitled,

such person shall be liable to repay such amount to the State agency or the Secretary of Labor, as the case may be, or either may recover such amounts by deductions from any allowance payable to such person under this title. Any such finding by a State agency or the Secretary of Labor may be made only after an opportunity for a fair hearing.

(b) Any amount repaid to a State agency under this section shall be deposited into the fund from which payment was made. Any amount repaid to the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current applicable appropriation, fund, or account from which payment was made.

REVIEW

SEC. 244. Except as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor to carry out his functions under this title, determinations under this title as to the entitlement of individuals for adjustment assistance shall be final and conclusive for all purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer. To the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the purposes of this title, such regulations shall provide that such determinations by a State agency will be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State law.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 245. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Labor such sums as may be necessary from time to time to carry out his functions under this title in connection with furnishing adjustment assistance to workers, which sums are authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 246. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "adversely affected worker" means an individual who the Secretary

determines, by reason of the requirements of title I, has been totally or partially separated from employment in a surface or underground coal mining operation.

(2) The term "average weekly manufacturing wage" means the national gross average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries for the latest calendar year (as officially published annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor) most recently published before the period for which the assistance under this title is furnished.

(3) The term "average weekly wage" means one-half of the total wages paid to an individual in the high quarter. For purposes of this computation, the high quarter shall be that quarter in which the individual's total wages were highest among the first four of the last five completed calendar quarters immediately before the quarter in which occurs the week with respect to which the computation is made. Such week shall be the week in which total separation occurred, or, in cases where partial separation is claimed, an appropriate week, as defined in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

(4) The term "average weekly hours" means the average hours worked by the individual (excluding overtime) in the employment from which he has been or claims to have been separated in the fifty-two weeks (excluding weeks during which the individual was sick or on vacation) preceding the week specified in the last sentence of paragraph (3).

(5) The term "partial separation" means, with respect to an individual who has not been totally separated, that he has had his hours of work reduced to 60 per centum or less of his average weekly hours in employment and his wages reduced to 75 per centum or less of his average weekly wage in such employment.

(6) The term "remuneration" means wages and net earnings derived from services performed as a self-employed individual.

(7) The term "State agency" means the agency of the State which administers the State law.

(8) The term "State law" means the unemployment insurance law of the State approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 3304 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(9) The term "total separation" means the layoff or severance of an individual from employment.

(10) The term "unemployment insurance" means the unemployment insurance payable to an individual under any State law or Federal unemployment insurance law, including title XV of the Social Security Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961.

(11) The term "week" means a week or defined in the applicable State law.

(12) The term "week of unemployment" means with respect to an individual any week for which his remuneration for services performed during such week is less than 75 per centum of his average weekly wage and in which, because of lack of work—

(A) if he has been totally separated, he worked less than the full-time week (excluding overtime) in his current occupation, or

(B) if he has been partially separated, he worked 80 per centum or less of his average weekly hours.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1973 (To ABOLISH STRIP MINING OF COAL IN THE UNITED STATES)

H.R. 1000, H.R. 2251, H.R. 2677.

Conspounder by States, February 2, 1973

CALIFORNIA

Rep. Glenn M. Anderson (D).
Rep. George E. Brown, Jr. (D).

Rep. James C. Corman (D).
Rep. George E. Danielson (D).
Rep. Ronald V. Dellums (D).
Rep. Don Edwards (D).
Rep. Robert L. Leggett (D).
Rep. Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (R).
Rep. John E. Moss (D).
Rep. Thomas M. Rees (D).
Rep. Edward R. Roybal (D).
Rep. Fortney H. Stark (D).
Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin (D).
Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D).

CONNECTICUT

Rep. William R. Cotter (D).
Rep. Ella T. Grasso (D).

FLORIDA

Rep. Dante B. Fascell (D).
Rep. William Lehman (D).

GEORGIA

Rep. John W. Davis (D).

HAWAII

Rep. Patsy T. Mink (D).
Rep. Ralph H. Metcalfe (D).
Rep. Sidney R. Yates (D).

ILLINOIS

Rep. John Brademas (D).
Rep. J. Edward Roush (D).

INDIANA

Rep. Peter N. Kyros (D).
Rep. Clarence D. Long (D).
Rep. Parren J. Mitchell (D).
Rep. Paul S. Sarbanes (D).

MAINE

Rep. James A. Burke (D).
Rep. Silvio O. Conte (R).
Rep. Harold D. Donohue (D).
Rep. Robert F. Drinan (D).
Rep. Michael Harrington (D).
Rep. Margaret M. Heckler (R).
Rep. John Moakley (D).
Rep. Gerry E. Studds (D).

MARYLAND

Rep. William D. Ford (D).
Rep. Lucien N. Nedzi (D).
Rep. Don W. Riegle, Jr. (D).

MINNESTOA

Rep. Donald M. Fraser (D).
Rep. Joseph E. Karth (D).

NEW JERSEY

Rep. Henry Helstoski (D).
Rep. Charles W. Sandman, Jr. (R).

NEW YORK

Rep. Bella S. Abzug (D).
Rep. Joseph P. Addabbo (D).
Rep. Herman Badillo (D).
Rep. Jonathan B. Bingham (D).
Rep. Shirley Chisholm (D).
Rep. Edward I. Koch (D).
Rep. Norman F. Lent (R).
Rep. Peter A. Poyer (R).
Rep. Otis G. Pike (D).
Rep. Bertram L. Podell (D).
Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D).
Rep. Ogden R. Reid (D).
Rep. Angelo D. Roncallo (R).
Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D).
Rep. Lester L. Wolff (D).

NORTH CAROLINA

Rep. Richardson Preyer (D).

OHIO

Rep. Thomas L. Ashley (D).
Rep. Charles A. Mosher (R).
Rep. John F. Seiberling (D).
Rep. Louis Stokes (D).
Rep. Charles A. Vanik (D).
Rep. Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (D).

PENNSYLVANIA

Rep. William A. Barrett (D).
Rep. Edward G. Blester, Jr. (R).
Rep. Joshua Elberg (D).

Rep. William J. Green (D).
 Rep. William S. Moorhead (D).
 Rep. Robert N. C. Nix (D).
 Rep. Lawrence G. Williams (R).

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rep. James R. Mann (D).

TENNESSEE

Rep. Richard H. Fulton (D).

TEXAS

Rep. Bob Eckhardt (D).

Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez (D).

WEST VIRGINIA

Rep. Ken Hechler (D).

WISCONSIN

Rep. Les Aspin (D).

Rep. David R. Obey (D).

Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D).

HOUSEHOLD TRASH RECYCLING PROGRAM

(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, it was announced recently that a household trash recycling program would be instituted in the St. Louis metropolitan area. One of the major participants in the program is the Granite City Steel Co., Granite City, Ill.

Under the program, Granite City Steel will purchase scrap metal and cans which will be charged into the company's two blast furnaces and made into new steel. This process represents the first on-going program of using cans in the blast furnaces.

Because of the widespread interest in the potential environmental benefits of recycling I include at this point in the RECORD the article in the March 12 edition of the Granite City Press Record concerning this program:

HOUSEHOLD TRASH RECYCLING PROGRAM
 (By Gary Schneider)

Granite City Steel Co. has agreed to become one of the major participants in a program for the recycling of household trash from the St. Louis metropolitan area. H. M. "Pete" Love, president of Granite City Steel Co., announced at a press conference in St. Louis Thursday.

Under the program, the steel company will purchase scrap steel and cans from the St. Louis municipal incinerator and will use them to replace a portion of the iron ore normally charged in the two blast furnaces.

Although scrap cans have been used before in the basic oxygen furnace, the program will mark the first "on-going" program of using cans in the blast furnaces," Love said. "This will not only save land on which the cans would have to be buried, but will conserve iron ore, a natural resource," he added.

The Granite City Steel participation is only one step in the household trash recycling project announced Thursday. Union Electric Co. in St. Louis is the other major commercial participant.

After the ferrous metals have been removed from the trash, Union Electric will take remaining shredded trash and will burn 10 to 20 tons per day in power plant boilers to produce electricity. The program to "convert our trash to kilowatts" has been operated at Union Electric on an experimental basis since April 1972.

Expansion of the experiment into a full-fledged pilot program was made possible by

\$520,000 in grants announced yesterday which will add two new pieces of equipment to the process, making both the burnable trash and the ferrous metals easier to recycle for both participating commercial companies.

The two new pieces of equipment are an air classifier which will remove the larger nonburnable pieces from the trash and either a shredder will further process magnetically separated steel cans to meet the size, density and cleanliness requirements for remelting in the Granite City Co. blast furnaces.

Both will be placed in operation at St. Louis' municipal incinerator where the trash is collected, sorted, the metal is shredded for recycling.

The trash is hauled by truck 18 miles to the Union Electric plant and the cans will be brought to Granite City, either by truck or by rail, whichever plan is found to be the most economically feasible.

Under the pilot program, 200 to 300 tons per day of scrap metal and cans will be fed into the blast furnaces by Granite City Steel Co. "We can take more than the tons being provided in the first phase if it is economical," Love said.

"If you could give us 100% of all cans in the St. Louis metropolitan area, we could handle them," he added.

Love told the Press-Record that the company expects to make less profit on steel produced using the cans than using iron ore but it has not been determined how much less. He said the cans are called "contaminated scrap" because they contain tin, mercury and other metals which reduce the refractory life of the company's blast furnaces.

"At present our blast furnaces have a life of about four years, then they cost \$10 million to \$12 million each to reline," Love indicated. The big question is how much will the use of cans instead of iron ore reduce the life of the furnaces, he said.

"As cans go more to tin free, this will open up the outer limits of what we can do, but either way, we will turn these cans into the finest pieces of Tiffany Steel that we make.

"We think we are going to put out more money than we make from the cans to help the environment. Another reason we are involved is the 'ban the can' legislation now being considered by many states. We feel we have a better way," Love stated.

Participants in Thursday's news conference, besides Love, were Victor Ziegler of Region VII of the Federal Environmental Protection Agency; Richard E. Paret, assistant vice-president of the American Iron and Steel Institute; G. Wayne Sutterfield, City of St. Louis refuse commissioner, and J. F. McLaughlin, vice-president-power operations for Union Electric Co.

The grants for the new equipment are provided by the EPA, \$347,000; the City of St. Louis, \$148,000, and the American Iron and Steel Institute, \$25,000. St. Louis has agreed to repay a portion of the EPA and AISI funds with revenues generated by the sale of the reclaimed steel cans.

Of the funds provided for the initial phases of the program, the EPA supplied \$1,800,000, the city provided \$450,000 and Union Electric Co. spent \$550,000 on equipment.

Although Mayor A. J. Cervantes of St. Louis was unable to attend, a statement by him was presented to those participating in the program. The statement follows.

"This latest action by government and business working together has importance not only to the people of St. Louis, but to Americans everywhere and to people beyond our borders."

"Perhaps as significant as the pioneering approaches is the fact that the solutions we are creating come from the common concerns and efforts of both the public and the private sectors of our society. The City of St. Louis is pleased that these endeavors are making an

important contribution in creating a better environment and in conserving scarce resources.

"We are anxious to share what we are doing and learning—just as we are equally desirous of benefiting from the progress being made by business and government in other parts of the nation in these critical areas that demand the best efforts of everyone."

BOB HARDY, VETERAN NEWS-CASTER, PLEADS FOR RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP

(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, my good friend Bob Hardy, news director of KMOX radio, the CBS-affiliate in St. Louis, was the speaker at the annual McKendree College Appreciation Dinner held on February 17 in Lebanon, Ill.

While I could not attend the dinner, Dr. Eric N. Rackham, president of McKendree College, furnished me with a copy of Bob Hardy's address. Having read it I heartily commend to the Members of the House. It is one of the best statements I have seen on what this country has experienced in the last 10 years and what this country ought to do in the 1970's.

I include Bob Hardy's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF BOB HARDY

The end of an era is upon us.

We have enjoyed . . . or hated, as the case may be . . . a decade of almost total irresponsibility. And the end is nigh. We have played with our destiny, our fate, like little children playing with toys . . . like a continuous game of hide and seek . . . with each of us taking a turn at being "it". We've acted as kids on a spree, no limits, no guidelines, no bedtime, no nothing. We've been as drunks on a binge, with money to blow, and booze to buy. But it's time now to grow up . . . it's time now to pay the piper, it's time now to stand up and be counted. It's no longer sufficient, to us personally or us collectively as a society, to sit back and take pleasure in being of the "silent majority". It's no longer acceptable to take and take and take and not put a little something back. The end of an era is upon us.

We have experienced what historians may well describe in some future time, as the making . . . or—depending on what we do now—the breaking . . . of the American people. These past ten years, the decade of the Sick Sixties and their impact into the 70's, have been a melange of broken traditions, of smashed and trampled pride, of glorified permissiveness. These have been the years of arrogance, or lawlessness, of to-hell-with-everything attitudes. This has been the decade of intimidation . . . usually excused with a peer group acceptance of "doing one's thing." These have been the years of militancy, of carelessness, of irresponsibility, and of "if it feels good, do it". No matter who or what that may hurt. Yes, the end of an era is upon us.

How do you degrade a nation . . . and its people? Or do they do it themselves? That may also be a chore of future historians to decide. For we are degraded, not only in the eyes of our global neighbors but frankly, in our own eyes. I care not one iota what the "modernists" say . . . and I'm too young to be old-fashioned. But I do yearn for those aspects of a time gone by when good manners and respect for others were part of our national fabric. Don't tell me I'm not "with it", because I cringe at conversations laced

with dirty four-letter words. Don't tell me I'm repressing myself and therefore causing myself great emotional anxiety because I don't and won't use that locker-room language in public. Don't tell me I'm not "hip" because I don't use drugs, or because I get a lump in my throat when I see our POWs salute our flag as they finally reach American soil. And don't tell me I'm some kind of right-wing Nazi nut, because I react angrily to those who say our draft dodgers and deserters ought to be given amnesty, and told to come home—that all is forgiven. And please . . . for God's sake, please . . . don't tell me that the whole problem centers on white racism . . . that if we could only solve that problem, we'd be in Utopia. That's a cheap shot, a "big-lie" generalization, and you know it as well as I do, and yet we let it go on and on . . . soaking it in, revelling in the pity and self-righteousness it brings . . . seeking the goat . . . blaming the problem on someone else . . . the mayor, the governor, the president, the government. Blaming . . . somebody. Yes, the end of an era is upon us.

The time has come, ladies and gentlemen, to be citizens again. Not puppets on string, not the manipulated, propagandized masses of non-capable thinkers we are so often taken for, by the so-called intellectuals of our society . . . but citizens . . . with all the rights . . . and *all the responsibilities* . . . that entails. And that's the word I've been reaching for . . . responsibility. The responsibility that goes with being a citizen. It doesn't mean leaving the decisions to someone else . . . it doesn't mean letting George do it . . . it doesn't mean "if it feels good, do it." It means what it's always meant, fulfilling *your* part of the bargain of a civilized society . . . rights, yes . . . but responsibility, absolutely. Freedom, yes . . . but responsibility, definitely.

Freedom. God, how we have heard of freedom in this past decade. Freedom to do one's thing . . . that, after all, we are told is a God-given right. But I submit to you that there are some personally-accepted responsibilities that go along with those God-given rights. And those responsibilities are the basis of law, the basis of an ordered society. Like it or not, we live in an ordered society, and there simply are certain rules by which we must live if we are to continue as a society. We have to know the limits of our so-called freedoms, simply because our freedoms interlock, and neither of us is more free than the other. . . . The time has come to put a little something back; the end of an era is upon us.

We have been bombarded by the destroyer of our ideals, our traditions. We have succumbed to his propaganda, his mind-molding techniques. We have listened, first with shock and anger, then with dismay, then confusion and self-doubt, then with parroted phrases. We've listened to the big lie so often in this decade, we not only believed it . . . we've repeated it . . . and torn ourselves apart in the process. To what do I refer? The best example I can give you is perhaps the all-encompassing example: The main line, as it were, from which all anti-American, anti-tradition, anti-everything we ever were . . . seems to come. The "shared guilt" complex with which we have all been imbued. The one that says John Kennedy was killed, not by a person, but by our blood-thirsty society. That Martin Luther King was murdered, not by a man, but by our racist society. That the Vietnam War existed not by treaty commitments, but because of our imperialistic society. That crime is high today, not because of new permissive attitudes toward criminals, but because of our violent society. Notice the repetition of the words "our society". And honestly now, how many times have you heard that over and over again? *Why* the criticism of "our society"? Why the criticism of our form of government, our laws, the

things which we hold to be tradition and honorable? Why indeed?

Well, perhaps Richard Evans had the right idea. In one of his "Thought for the Day" broadcasts on KMOX Radio he wrote:

"It is a puzzling paradox that often those who enjoy the fruits of freedom work against the very freedom which has given them privilege and protection. Why should it be so?

"There may be many answers. And one answer may be that some people really don't know when they are well off. They are the chronic malcontents. It wouldn't matter what way of life they were privileged to partake of, they would always be dissatisfied and against whatever is. There are people like that, and it doesn't appear that anyone has ever been able to account for them.

"Then there are those who are sincerely deceived, those who accept the false assumptions of others, who haven't seen the whole picture, who haven't projected the pattern to its ultimate conclusion. Then there is another class of people who advocate the abolition of freedom, and who are not to be taken lightly.

"When they speak of leveling and regimenting men, they never see themselves as being leveled or regimented. They see themselves in preferential positions, as the leaders of movements. They see themselves not as of the mass of men, but as movers of the masses; not as being controlled, but as those who do the controlling.

"They may be sincere in believing that the failure of freedom would be a good thing, because, as they see it, it would not be their freedom that would be forfeited, but the freedom of others. They may reason that they have little to lose. If they win they will be masters. But if they fall in their fight against freedom, they will claim the privileges and protection of freedom. And free men in a free land will be lenient with them—or so they suppose."

Now it's true that this may be sheer conjecture . . . that we're battling windmills with this kind of theory. But frankly, I doubt it. I think we've been so negative for so long, that it's become a way of life. I think we've wallowed in faddist theology so much that we've begun to believe every contradiction that comes along . . . simply because it is a contradiction. I think we grab on to every cause that comes down the pike, because that's what we believe our society expects of us. And I believe that the reasons for our actions have been replaced by excuses for our actions. Abortions, birth control devices for kids, methadone maintenance for addicts, legalized marijuana, anti-hero worship. "Yes, yes", we cry out in great tumult. "It is our right—our civil right—our social right—our Constitutional right." Why doesn't someone cry out just as loudly . . . just once . . . "Bull"?! Why doesn't somebody, just once, challenge all this rhetoric? Why doesn't somebody, just once, label it for what it is . . . a copout? Let's face it. It's easier to break the law than to live within it. It's easier to break tradition than it is to live up to it. It's easier to be irresponsible, crude and ill-mannered, than it is to live up to our human potential. And it's easier to find excuses for all this, than it is to stand up for what we believe in. That's why all this is a cop-out . . . it's easier. And the lack of discipline as we see it today is a self-fulfilling prophecy. It feeds on itself . . . to the point where today we don't know whether lack of discipline is the cause . . . or the effect of our so-called progressive way of life. Are we more cynical and pessimistic today because society expects that of us, or is our society the negative environment it is, because we are more cynical and pessimistic. No matter, the net result is the same. Our kids rebel with drugs, beards, long hair, mouths and minds of filth . . . all geared to shock. We adults respond in much the same way with

our own rebellion. Against laws and concepts and beliefs. We play with abortion, women's lib, religion, the occult, astrology . . . yes, play with it because change, we are told, is necessary. And change, translated to today's society, means breaking up, tearing down, anything that gives real meaning and depth to our lives. Replace, we are told . . . and I ask you, replace with what? Another fad, another answer that will last only until the next contradiction comes along? Do we really want to continue this way? Or has the end of an era really come?

We've been told over and over again that all the sickness of the 1960's has been attributed to the Vietnam War. The unholy war, the inhumane war, the undeclared war, the unjust war, the immoral war. Our great national discontent with that war was, we were told over and over again, the basis for everything we found wrong with the country. Well, the war is over. And the end of an era is here. Or is it? Is it really? Have we been so negative for so long that we no longer need a reason, for our sick cynicism? Or will the dissidents, to whom we give honor and glory, come up with a new excuse for villifying this country and its people . . . and will we accept that too? I have heard and seen and read news stories for months now, about the returning POW's, about how they would speak out against the war, about how they would criticize our involvement in Vietnam, about how they would be coming home, quitting the military, and joining the forces for change within our country, speaking out eloquently about how rotten and sick our nation has become. Well, it hasn't happened, and it looks like the media and the Jane Fondas are going to have to get a new approach. They will, I can guarantee that . . . but what worries me most is, will we—the citizens of this nation—rise to the bait again? Will we again look for excuses to dismiss our own inadequacies, rather than attempting to grow to something better? Will we again undermine our basic principles, rather than restore those beliefs of our lineage, and build on them? The end of an era poses some difficult questions. And I have some thoughts I'd like to share with you. I think it's time for an honest re-evaluation. And by that I mean a *personal* re-evaluation. I think it's time we all . . . each and everyone in a quiet and reflective way . . . looked deep inside ourselves and determined once and for all what it is we *really* believe. Not what some TV news analyst says we believe, not what some newspaper columnist says we believe, not what some wild-eyed radical says we believe, not what the propagandists and mind-molders, and cause-oriented headline grabbers say we believe . . . but what we, personally, believe.

And with that thought in mind, some resolutions if you will. Let's from this point on, de-emphasize the negative aspects of our lives . . . as fashionable as it may seem to be these days to be critical of everything. Let's take the glamour out of being a dissenter; let's take the floodlights and cameras and tape recorders away from the agitators. We've *always* had agitators, but by God, we've never given them so much prime-time publicity as we have in recent years. Let's resolve to talk up instead of down. Granted, let's retain the right to criticize, to point up our own shortcomings, but let's stop this constant carping about every little thing that comes along. Let's stop this self-flagellation, this shared-guilt concept with which we've all been apparently brainwashed. By God, we must be doing something right. We have the highest productivity in the world, the greatest wealth, the most opportunities of any country in the world—past, present, or in the foreseeable future. Let's resolve to help the lowest up, rather than pull the highest down. Standards can be raised as well as lowered, you know. Let's be positive for a change. Let's concentrate for

a change on what we are . . . rather than what some few misguided misfits say we are, and let's stop apologizing for it. Let's begin to recognize intimidation for what it is, a cheap threat designed to induce fear. And let's begin to recognize the source of that intimidation for what it is: the sick pronouncements of some self-appointed, anti-social malcontent who looks for excuses to justify his existence, and followers to give image and credence to his cause. We've played that game for a decade, we've copped out, we've allowed ourselves to be had, and in the course of it all, we've almost destroyed ourselves. And now, the era is passed.

Now it's time for one last, major decision. Our decision, to be made personally, and collectively: This is either the end of an era, or as I see it, the beginning of the end of a great nation. No more excuses; no more reasons, real or imagined. It's decision time, and we can't have it both ways.

Thank you.

FEDERAL LIBRARY AID

(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, among the proposed budgetary victims of the Nixon administration is Federal aid to public libraries. I am taking this opportunity of bringing to my colleagues' attention the March 7 editorial that appeared in the Edwardsville, Ill., Intelligencer pointing out the deficiencies in the administration's justification for this action:

FEDERAL LIBRARY AID IS IMPORTANT

One of the areas President Nixon would have his budgetary axe fall is on federal aid to public libraries.

That amounts to about \$140 million a year. That averages about seven percent of the annual budget of U.S. libraries.

If Congress accepts President Nixon's proposal there would be no library aid appropriation beginning July 1.

About \$100 million has been appropriated for library aid but not yet distributed.

The administration says libraries no longer need federal aid. According to the administration, libraries are not a federal concern and libraries willing to lobby for local federal revenue-sharing funds can still obtain federal aid.

Effective arguments against these contentions build a good case for a continuing of federal aid to libraries.

First, it is not true that federal aid—as a stimulus to state and local library aid—has brought libraries within the reach of all Americans.

Rural Americans can testify to that fact. An American Library Association survey indicates 20 million Americans do not have library facilities in their communities.

One obvious reply to that point is that many of those communities are not large enough to support a library. That is true. But expanding library book loan services or increasing the number of mobile book libraries can solve that problem.

However, such activities conflict with many libraries' taxing and service boundaries. That relates to the second argument that the federal government has no role in supporting libraries.

Most librarians point out that the majority of patrons' calls are for about 10 per cent of the books.

Development of more regional systems to circulate the other 90 per cent of books, rather than have each library attempt to stock them would be a more efficient and economic use of library resources.

Efforts such as that are obviously beyond

the capacities of local and sometimes even state governments. It is a fertile area for the federal government.

Another point to consider is that federal aid to libraries, while averaging only about seven per cent of the library's annual budget, is a crucial amount of money.

Local library funding, heavily dependent on property taxes, usually is for the bare minimum cost of operation and stocking books everyone might want to read.

The federal money often goes for services that local government are often wary of funding—such as controversial books, services for non-readers and ghetto areas.

Most libraries cannot compete with other institutions for revenue-sharing funds.

Libraries are not usually thought of as "priority" funding areas alongside police and fire protection, tax relief and street and sewer repair—at least not until an individual needs information.

OEO HAS TO GO

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that OEO funds during the last Presidential election were used for political purposes in violation of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended.

The Mercer County, Ohio, Community Action Commission's acting director, Mr. Lee Cass, has stated that he approved a "turn out the voter" program last November 7. He stated that employees would transport voters to the polls in their private automobiles, and his OEO-funded agency would reimburse each employee for mileage.

Such a proposal on the surface appears to be in the great American tradition of democracy and the open election.

The employees of the Mercer County Community Action Commission, however, are governed by the rules of their employer during working hours. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 therefore governs their actions. This act prohibits the expenditures of public money for political purposes.

To quote the act under title VI, part A, section 603(b)—

Programs assisted under this Act shall not be carried on in a manner involving the use of program funds. The provision of services, or the employment of assignment of personnel in a manner supporting or resulting in the identification of such programs with any partisan or non-partisan political activity or any other political activity associated with a candidate or contending partisan group, in an election for public or party office (2) any activity to provide voters or prospective voters with transportation to the polls or similar assistance in connection with any such election.

The act therefore clearly states that no employee of OEO can provide transportation in any form to voters during an election.

This situation is just one more example of how employees of OEO used public funds for their own individual and particular political adventures. Such activities took funds away from the poor and directed them toward political causes which had very little, if any, effect on the day-to-day living conditions of the poor.

Situations such as this greatly support the President's program to restructure OEO.

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. BRINKLEY), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. O'NEILL, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD, today, for 30 minutes.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRASER, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCFALL, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL, on March 20, for 60 minutes.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, on March 21, for 60 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DENHOLM, for 60 minutes, March 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SYMMS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SYMMS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VEYSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABDNOR, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROSENTHAL, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter in the body of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$3,230.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter in the body of the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,252.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNT), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in four instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HUNT in three instances.

Mr. SYMMS in two instances.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

Mr. WHITEHURST.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SYMMS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. COCHRAN.

Mr. RAILSBACK in five instances.

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. HUBER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. ROSE in six instances.

Mr. MOAKLEY in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. FAUNTRY in 10 instances.

Mr. ROY.

Mr. MANN in 10 instances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. MCKAY in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. EILBERG in 10 instances.

Mr. DRINAN in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. COTTER.

Mr. DENT.

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in five instances.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

ENROLLED BILLS 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. 4278. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act to assure that Federal financial assistance to the child nutrition programs is maintained at the level budgeted for fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Naoyo Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 89. An act for the relief of Kuay Ten Chang (Guay Hong Chang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 278. An act for the relief of Manuela C. Bonito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 280. An act for the relief of Leonor Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 464. An act for the relief of Guido Belalca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 502. An act to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 537. An act for the relief of Mary Danos Nayak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 666. An act for the relief of Slobodan Babic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 11. Joint resolution to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1973; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate hearings on the sudden infant death syndrome; to the Committee on Home Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 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:

589. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report of independent research and development and bid and proposal costs covering fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 203(c) of Public Law 91-441 (10 U.S.C. 2358, note); to the Committee on Armed Services.

590. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a supplement to the report of independent research and development and bid and proposal costs for fiscal year 1972; to the Committee on Armed Services.

591. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to strengthen education by consolidating certain elementary and secondary education grant programs through the provision of a share of the revenues of the United States to the States and to local educational agencies for the purpose of assisting them in carrying out education programs reflecting areas of national concern; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

592. A letter from the Acting Director of ACTION, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for ACTION, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

593. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend acts entitled "An Act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States and Territories for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians, and for other purposes", and "To transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes" and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

594. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Water Resources Council, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to provide for continuing authorization for appropriations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

595. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

596. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on intercity rail passenger service, pursuant to section 806 of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended (45 U.S.C. 645); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

597. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a map entitled "Principal Electric Facilities in the United States, 1972"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

598. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled "Statistics of Privately Owned Electric Utilities in the United States, 1971"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

599. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of January 31, 1973, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

600. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting a list of members designated to serve on the Commission on Revision of the Federal Court Appellate System of the United States in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 92-489; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

601. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1154(d)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

602. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1972, pursuant to section 208 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

603. A letter from the Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize further appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

604. A letter from the Norfolk District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting a copy of the final environmental impact statement for the Gathright Lake project in Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

605. A letter from the Chairman, Technology Assessment Board, Congress of the United States, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, pursuant to section 11 of Public Law 92-484; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

606. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a report on cases involving administrative error in which equitable relief was granted during calendar year 1972, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 210(c) (3) (B); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

607. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to provide the same eligibility criteria for automobiles and adaptive equipment for Vietnam era veterans as are applicable to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

608. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on the impact of extending unemployment insurance coverage to agricultural labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

609. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of reports issued or released by the General Accounting Office during February 1973, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1174; to the Committee on Government Operations.

610. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report on U.S. interests and activities in Nepal; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4, of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. ABZUG:

H.R. 5768. A bill to add a new title XX to the Social Security Act to provide for a minimum annual income of \$3,750 in the case of single individuals and \$5,000 in the case of married couples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. St. GERMAIN, and Mr. REES):

H.R. 5769. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969, to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and commodities and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 5770. A bill to provide for election reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5771. A bill to provide for the restoration of medical and dental care to military widows whose remarriage has been terminated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5772. A bill to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. FREY, Mr. HALEY, Mr. SIKES, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. FASCELL):

H.R. 5773. A bill to establish the Spessard L. Holland National Seashore in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5774. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may disapprove the President's action and require him to cease such impounding; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. FASCELL):

H.R. 5775. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to continue to operate and maintain the hospitals and other health care delivery facilities of the Public Health Service to assure that persons entitled to care and treatment at such facilities will continue to receive care and treatment there; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNING (for himself, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. ECKHARDT):

H.R. 5776. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to expand the mission of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and to change the name of the Academy to reflect the expanded mission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 5777. A bill to protect hobbyists against the reproduction or manufacture of certain imitation hobby items and to provide additional protections for American hobbyists; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 5778. A bill to provide for extra compensations to members of the Armed Forces of the United States who have been held as prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies and shareholders in such companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 5780. A bill to provide for the study of certain lands to determine their suitability for designation as wilderness in accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5781. A bill to further the purposes of the Wilderness Act of 1964 by designating certain lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5782. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the proceeds of National Service Life Insurance and U.S. Government Life Insurance be paid, under certain circumstances, to the estate of the insured if payment thereof to the estate of the beneficiary would escheat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5783. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide educational assistance thereunder to war orphans and widows for farm cooperative training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5784. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve up to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself,

Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss JORDAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. NEDZI):

H.R. 5785. A bill to provide for accelerated research and development in the care and treatment of autistic children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself,

Mr. OWENS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 5786. A bill to provide for accelerated research and development in the care and treatment of autistic children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 5787. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the shipment at Government expense of motor vehicles owned by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 5788. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to extend coverage under the flood insurance program to include losses from the erosion and undermining of shorelines by waves or currents of water; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5789. 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. HUTCHINSON (for himself and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 5790. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan to hold court at Muskegon, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KETCHUM (for himself and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 5791. A bill to provide that certain meetings of each Government agency and each congressional committee shall be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KETCHUM (for himself and Mr. COLLIER):

H.R. 5792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts paid to certain related individuals shall be allowable as a deduction under the provision permitting a deduction for dependent care service necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ANUNZIO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HOLFIELD, Mrs. HOLT, and Mr. HUNGATE):

H.R. 5793. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. McCOLLISTER, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. STEELE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 5794. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 5795. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to provide that Army and Air Force National Guard technicians shall not be required to wear the military uniform while performing their duties in a civilian status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5796. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H.R. 5797. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension of \$125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5798. A bill to provide for project grants for the development and demonstration of programs for rehabilitative and habilitative care of the aged, blind, and disabled patients of long-term health care facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 5799. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1970; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 5800. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the

parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 5801. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit Federal judges from receiving compensation other than for the performance of their judicial duties, except in certain instances, and to provide for the disclosure of certain financial information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. WARE, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FULTON, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROSE, and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 5802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5803. A bill to stabilize prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 5804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the licensing of, and for certain other regulations with respect to, persons in the business of preparing tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 5805. A bill to amend Public Law 91-508 to limit the disclosure of bank records by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5806. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges for the Southern District of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5807. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to provide that in the case of maritime service on American vessels unemployment compensation shall be computed and paid under the laws of the State in which the individual resides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 5808. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to establish a program to assist municipalities and businesses in urban industrial development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. JARMAN, and Mr. McSPADDEN):

H.R. 5809. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5810. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5811. A bill to provide that respect for an individual's right not to participate in abortions contrary to conscience be a requirement for hospital eligibility for Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, over a 3-year period, the corporate surtax exemption from \$25,000 to \$100,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. McDade, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr.

WON PAT, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H.R. 5813. A bill to provide postservice educational benefits for those who have participated in community service programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SYMMS:

H.R. 5814. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to remove the St. Joe River in the State of Idaho from consideration for designation as a wild and scenic river; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THORNTON:

H.R. 5815. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Camden, Ark., for airport purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VEYSEY:

H.R. 5816. A bill to amend section 142 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to urban highway public transportation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H.R. 5817. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance under the veterans' pension and compensation programs or any other Federal or federally assisted program) will not have the amount of such aid or assistance reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 5818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 1,000 additional hearings entitled "Corrections, Federal and State Parole Systems", parts VII-A and VII-B, Serial 15, 92d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TREEN:

H. Con. Res. 157; a resolution relating to the U.S. fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. RARICK, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri):

H. Res. 314. Resolution to authorize the sale of U.S. gold to American citizens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

85. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to a Federal forestry incentives program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

86. Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to Americans who fought in Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

87. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to a full accounting of prisoners of war and persons missing in action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

88. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the pub-

lic indebtedness of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

89. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the content of television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

90. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to restrictions on sale of certain ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

91. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reaffirming the right of the various States to regulate abortions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

92. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, requesting Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

93. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to voluntary prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

94. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, withdrawing its ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, relative to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Federal highway trust funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

97. Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to size and weight limitations on trucks on the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 5819. A bill for the relief of Basilia Bravo Gigante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 5820. A bill for the relief of Lucie Stein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Congress of Micronesia, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to granting the Congress of Micronesia a role in the selection of the High Commissioner of Micronesia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

66. Also, petition of Steny H. Hoyer and 32 other members of the Maryland State Senate, Annapolis, Md., relative to school busing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

67. Also, petition of Ernest L. Fulford, Pawtucket, R.I., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers sued for damages in Federal court resulting from the performance of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

68. Also, petition of S. Leon Levy, Washington, D.C., relative to amending the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

69. Also, petition of the council of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to protection of Hawaiian pineapple production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 97th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the

Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

REGISTRATIONS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1972:

(Note.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19----- <

REPORT
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
- (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
 - (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House".—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. <

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

A. Randolph H. Aires, 12, Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.

A. American Academy of Family Physicians, 215 Volker Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. 64112.

A. American Physicists Association, P.O. Box 19343, Washington, D.C. 20036.

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.

A. Nicholas R. Bach, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Paint and Coatings Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Donald Baldwin, Donald Baldwin Associates, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Berl Bernhard, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

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.

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, 400 First Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Robert D. Buehler, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 929, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio 44318

A. Business-Consumer Protection Bureau, 624 Market Street, McKeesport, Pa.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1106, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.

A. The Coca-Cola Bottlers' Association, 166 16th Street NW., Atlanta, Ga. 30318.

A. R. Michael Cole, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Charles F. Cook, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Uniroyal, Inc., Naugatuck, Conn., Converse Rubber Co., Malden, Mass.

A. Council for the Advancement of the Psychological Professions & Sciences, 1100 17th Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. David H. Dabney, 724 14th Street NW., Apt. No. 338, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Mass Participation Lobbyists Association, 724 14th Street NW., Apt. No. 338, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Thomas A. Daly, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Importers Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Marcia K. Docter, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Leo J. Donahue, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Norman E. 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.

A. J. Frederick Durr, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va. 22202.

B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va. 22202.

A. Russell G. Ernest, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Apt. No. 1014, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Exxon Corp., 1251 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020.

A. Penelope S. Farthing, 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Martin E. Firestone, Finkelstein & Firestone, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 703, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Carl J. Fleps, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Greyhound Corp., Greyhound Tower, Phoenix, Ariz. 85077.

A. John David Hancock, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. National Council To Repeal the Draft, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Barbara W. Harris, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Otto R. Harrison, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Sidney G. Hawkes, 800 17th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Mead Corp., 118 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio 45402.

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.

A. Richard P. Hunt, 7618 Hanley Road, Tampa, Fla. 33614.

A. Investment Counsel Association of America, Inc., 127 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Janice C. Johnson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Allan R. Jones, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.

B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Patricia Keefer, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. John G. Keller, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. John S. Knox, Jr., 166 16th Street NW., Atlanta, Ga. 30318.

B. The Coca-Cola Bottlers' Association, 166 16th Street NW., Atlanta, Ga., 30318.

A. Martha Krouss, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Norman G. Kurland, 2027 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Nick L. Laird, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Shell Oil Co., Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Robert W. Lee, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Apt. 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass. 02178.

A. Charles R. Lewis, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va. 25321.

B. West Virginia Railroad Association.

A. Harrison Lewis, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Lewis.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

A. Frances Lilienfeld, 734 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

B. A. Curtis Kelley, Real Estate, 11501 Boulevard, Haven Beach, N.J.; Max X Sacks, Hotel Irvington, Lakewood, N.J.

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, 400 First Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. D. E. Marable.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, District No. 1, Pacific Coast District, 400 First Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Barry D. Matsumoto, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. George G. Mead, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. A. S. Mike Monroney, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Osage Tribal Council, Pawhuska, Okla. 74056.

A. John R. Murray, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George E. Myers, 1730 Rhode Island NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. National Council to Repeal the Draft, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

A. Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Navajo Nation, Ariz. 86515.

A. J. T. Nelson, Gibson Island, Md. 21056.

B. Household Finance Corp., Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. Richard Ney, Watergate South, 700 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. American Academy of Family Physicians, 215 Volker Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. 64112.

A. Dallin H. Oaks, Provo, Utah 84601.

B. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84601.

A. W. Brice O'Brien, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

B. Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

A. Daphne Philos, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.

B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Investment Counsel Association of America, Inc., 127 E. 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. William H. Press, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. David J. Reedy, 6S430 Huntington Circle, Naperville, Ill. 60540.

B. National Advertising Co., 6850 Harlem Avenue, Argo, Ill. 60501.

A. Valerie G. Schulte, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Common Fund, 635 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

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.

A. Charles W. Shaeffer, 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. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

B. Inter-County Title Co., 451 Main St., Placerville, Calif. Title Insurance Co., 164 St. Francis Street, Mobile, Ala.; Independent Metropolitan Title Agents of Texas, Inc., 701 Elm Street, Dallas, Tex.

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.

A. Donald E. Smiley, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Exxon Co., U.S.A., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Society of American Florists, 901 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

A. Southern Furniture Manufacturers Association, Post Office Box 951, High Point, N.C. 27261.

A. Henry Stoner, 406 South Pershing Avenue, York, Pa. 17403.

A. Glenn A. Swanson, 818 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn. 56378.

A. Thomas C. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Football League, 410 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Basketball Association, 1700 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

QUARTERLY REPORTS*

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1972:

(NOTE.—The form used for report is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration") : To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19-----		REPORT				
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT						
		QUARTER				
		P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)						

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

- (i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
- (ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
- (b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
 - (i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
 - (ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated,

place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the specific legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value*. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) *IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.*—(1) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of \$500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) *IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.*—(1) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of \$500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to \$500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. \$ _____ Dues and assessments
2. \$ _____ Gifts of money or anything of value
3. \$ _____ Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. \$ _____ Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. \$ _____ Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. \$ _____ TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. \$ _____ Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. \$ _____ TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. \$ _____ TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. \$ _____ Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. \$ _____ Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. \$ _____ "Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of \$500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total \$500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	Name and Address of Contributor
("Period" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)	
\$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
\$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
\$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. John G. Adams, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Midland Enterprises, Inc.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$9,547.60. E. (9) \$9,547.60.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, P.O. Box 5800, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Alderson, Catherwood, Ondov & Leonard, 105 East Oakland Avenue, Austin, Minn. 55912.
B. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912.
D. (6) \$665. E. (9) \$47.94.

A. Willis W. Alexander, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.

B. National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
D. (6) \$1,040. E. (9) \$1,555.27.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, National Capital Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., No. 403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
D. (6) \$1,677.55. E. (9) \$1,677.55.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) \$919.95. E. (9) \$919.95.

A. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$4,592.16. E. (9) \$4,592.16.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill. 60068.
D. (6) \$40,500. E. (9) \$40,500.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$55,698.69.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$3,905.97. E. (9) \$1,886.65.

A. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$69,654.17. E. (9) \$500.79.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) \$2,719.25. E. (9) \$3,346.80.

A. American Humane Association, 5351 Roslyn Street, Post Office Box 1266, Englewood, Colo.
E. (9) \$1,500.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$2,428.35.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$4,708.26. E. (9) \$3,172.16.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md. 21054.
D. (6) \$2. E. (9) \$2.

A. American Land Title Association, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$825.73.

A. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) \$602.20.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
E. (9) \$400.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.
E. (9) \$11,853.70.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
E. (9) \$2,760.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.
E. (9) \$1,346.20.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$2,957.35. E. (9) \$12,062.83.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$3,154. E. (9) \$9,512.

A. American Physical Therapy Association, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$7,191.28. E. (9) \$7,191.28.

A. American Postal Workers Union AFL-CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,208,814.03. E. (9) \$48,881.91.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 620, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$696.03. E. (9) \$1,318.04.

A. American Surveys, Embassy Square, Suite 901, 2000 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Customs Brokers & Forwarders Association of America, Inc., One World Trade Center, Suite 1109, New York, N.Y. 10048.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$106.37.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$52.59.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.
D. (6) \$17,279.62. E. (9) \$17,279.62.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$10,290.06. E. (9) \$35,348.13.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Suite 828, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$81,802.66. E. (9) \$3,522.

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. George W. Apperson, 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 1403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union Local Division 689, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 1403, Washington, D.C. 20001.

A. Clarence A. Arata, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$12,500.

A. John C. Archer, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.
E. (9) \$300.

A. Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin & Kahn, 1815 H Street NW., Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$1.

A. Arkansas Railroads, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp., 464 Ellis Street, Mountain View, Calif. 94040.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Floor Covering Group, 919 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Puerto Rican Government, Economic Development Administration, G.P.O. Box 2350, San Juan, P.R. 00936.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$41.25.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Suite 607, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.

A. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Association for the Advancement of Invention & Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
D. (6) \$1,775. E. (9) \$4,087.94.

A. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$4,354.20. E. (9) \$4,345.20.

A. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$305.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) \$1,000.

A. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
E. (9) \$300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$25.90.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Optometric Association, in care of Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$301.

A. Donald L. Badders, 910 South Michigan, Room 530, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Carl E. Bagge, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$2,375.06.

A. John C. Bagwell, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

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.

A. George F. Bailey, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. James F. Bailey, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$5,850. E. (9) \$537.45.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) \$20.43. E. (9) \$2.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

A. Thomas H. Barksdale, Jr., 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,925. E. (9) \$203.

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. 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. Arthur R. Barnett, 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) \$165.50.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) \$3,600.

A. David S. Barrows, 214 Century Building, Portland, Oreg. 97205.

B. Association of Oregon and California Land Grant Counties, Douglas County Court House, Roseburg, Oreg. 97470.
D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$557.48.

A. Weldon Barton.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$3,507.84. E. (9) \$105.72.

A. Ross Bass Associates, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

B. Record Industry Association of America, 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$6,250.

A. Lucius D. Battle, 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

B. Communications Satellite Corporation, 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20024.

A. Batzell & Nunn, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Independent Terminal Operators Association, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. David Baumhart, Post Office Box 553, Lorain, Ohio 44052.

B. Green Olive Trade Association, 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$14.53.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) \$1,504.48. E. (9) \$68.62.

A. John H. Beidler, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) \$3,013.60. E. (9) \$196.33.

A. Thomas S. Belford, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) \$175.

A. Winston Everett Bell, P.O. Box 1718, Las Vegas, Nev. 89101.

A. Thomas P. Bennett, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$3,607.48.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Apt. 1004, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass. 02178.

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) \$1,200. E. (9) \$101.06.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,722. E. (9) \$401.80.

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. Lydia Bitter, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1201, Washington, D.C. 20006.

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) \$5.70.

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) \$170.

A. Richard W. Bliss, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$475.

A. Jerald Blizn, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, 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. Becky Bogard, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$35.

A. Frederick C. Bond III, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

D. (6) \$10.90. E. (9) \$11.10.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.

D. (6) \$916.66. E. (9) \$20.03.

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) \$763.79.

A. Edward L. Bowley, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO.
 D. (6) \$7,040.28. E. (9) \$632.60.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.
 B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 325 Pioneer Building, Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Joseph M. Bowman and Richard C. O'Hare 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Merger Committee, National Basketball Association, 2 Pennsylvania Plaza, New York, N.Y.; Merger Committee, American Basketball Association, 1700 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

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) \$814.38. E. (9) \$261.88.

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. 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) \$384.62. E. (9) \$27.85.

A. Edward J. Brenner, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.
 B. Association for the Advancement of Invention & Innovation, Suite 1007, Crystal Plaza I, 2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Va. 22202.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, The Madison Building, 115 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. David A. Brody, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
 D. (6) \$350.

A. 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. William J. Brooks, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
 B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

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) \$280.

A. J. D. Brown, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$300.

A. Brown, Vlassis & Bain, 222 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. 85004.
 B. Navajo Tribe, Window Rock, Ariz. 86515.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Council of Housing Producers, 10920 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 308, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Franchise Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Brownstein, Zeldman & Schomer, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp., 600 Marine Plaza, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Bryant Associates, Inc., Suite 907, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. St. Paul Title Insurance Corp., 1650 West Big Beaver Road, Troy, Mich. 48084.
 D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$38.66.

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.
 D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$45.04.

A. Philip N. Buckminster, 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Chrysler Corporation, 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
 D. (6) \$1000. E. (9) \$239.45.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of Mr. Chaco Chace, 109-20 71st Road, Forest Hills, N.Y. 11375.
 E. (9) \$274.81.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.
 D. (6) \$18,360.46. E. (9) \$587.28.

A. George Burnham, IV, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. United States Steel Corp., 600 Grant Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
 D. (6) \$266. E. (9) \$287.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$975. E. (9) \$281.36.

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) \$34.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Dolyestown, Pa. 18901.

A. Busby, Rivkin, Sherman, Levy & Rehm, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Automobile Importers of America, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$3,130.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1106, Los Angeles, Calif., 90067.
 B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Securities Industry Association, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
 D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$1,200.

A. Donald L. Calvin, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
 B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 D. (6) \$50.77.

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) \$188.80.

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. Marvin Caplan.
 B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$3,101. E. (9) \$136.04.

A. Ronald A. Capone, Kirlin, Campbell & Keating, Room 505, The Farragut Building, Washington, DC.
 B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30-32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
 D. (6) \$3,250. E. (9) \$126.88.

A. Michael H. Cardozo, 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. 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) \$1,568.72.

A. Carolinas Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, Post Office Box 2776, Suite 706, Raleigh Building, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.

A. Elizabeth S. Carpenter, 1425 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 502, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$3,125. E. (9) \$120.25.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson.
 B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

A. James B. Cash, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$20.

A. Frank R. Cawley, Wilson Plaza Building, Suite 511, 2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22201.
 B. Agricultural Publishers Association, Inc.

A. Frank R. Cawley.
 B. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Central America Cooperative Federation, Inc., Room 400, 908 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$595.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2300 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20008.
B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Post Office Box 445, Mbahane, Swaziland.
D. (6) \$7,500. E. (9) \$936.46.

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. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$1,411.

A. William C. Chapman, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$2,333.22.

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. Lowell T. Christison, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) \$59.40. E. (9) \$36.85.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$52.50. E. (9) \$4.45.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) \$64,773.67.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) \$825.

A. Richard W. Clark, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$306.92.

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, Pittsburgh, Kans. 66762.

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) \$616.75.

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) \$225.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, 1075 Central Park Avenue, Suite 224, Scarsdale, N.Y. 10583.
D. (6) \$400.

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) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Louisville, Ky. 40201.
E. (9) \$45.

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) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Lorillard, Division of Loews Theatres, Inc., 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) \$45.

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) \$45.

A. Earle S. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. R. J. Reynolds, Inc. (Tobacco Division), Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102.
E. (9) \$45.

A. Earle C. Clements, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Avco Corp., 750 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$60. E. (9) \$12.

A. Clifford, Warnke, Glass, McIlwain & Finney, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Basketball Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Larry D. Cline, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$40.20.

A. Coalition Against Strip Mining, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$989.51.

A. Coalition for a National Population Policy, Suite 1010, Bender Building, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 622, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Tool and 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 and Steel Institute, 50 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$125.

A. Paul G. Collins, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I. 02903.

B. Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, 111 Westminster Street, Providence, R.I. 02903.
D. (6) \$68.75.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, care of Langdon P. Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$6,925. E. (9) \$6,706.75.

A. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) \$946,866.41. E. (9) \$143,050.96.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Academy of Actuaries, 208 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$147.10.

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. 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) \$140. E. (9) \$27.10.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$265.

A. John A. Connor, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

B. National Machine Tool Builders Association, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Va. 22101.

A. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
E. (9) \$2.

A. Consulting Engineers Council/US, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$5,840. E. (9) \$5,840.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

B. American Dental Association, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$2,600.

A. Jack T. Conway, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
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) \$749.37. E. (9) \$358.72.

A. Cook & Franke S.C., 660 East Mason Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Eileen D. Cooke, 110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$270.48.

A. J. Milton Cooper, Suite 401, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Box 1123, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801.
D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$1,314.49.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Council of Forest Industries, 1025 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, Canada.
D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Footwear Division, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) \$6,000. E. (9) \$11.50.

A. Cooperative League of the USA, 1828 L Street NW., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$725.

A. Darrell Coover, 1625 I Street NW., Apartment 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) \$238.

A. James T. Corcoran, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 308, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$925. E. (9) \$87.50.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, care of Langdon Cook, 23 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1800 K Street NW., Fourth Floor, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$60.

A. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, 1511 K Street NW., Suite 1120, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Lee, McCarthy & DeRosa, 102 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$100.

A. Allan D. Cors, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y. 14830.

A. Robert M. Coulter, Suite 508, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 10006.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$310.53. E. (9) \$310.53.

A. Raymond L. Courage, 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. Paul L. Courtney, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Roger C. Courtney, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.
D. (6) \$126. E. (9) \$157.60.

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. 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. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Cox, Langford & Brown, 21 Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Midland Building, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.
D. (6) \$660.

A. Roger M. Craver, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) \$147.79.

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) \$10,000.03. E. (9) \$459.20.

A. W. J. Crawford, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Hubert M. Crean, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$2,253. E. (9) \$215.

A. H. C. Crotty, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.

A. J. A. Crowder, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Culbertson, Pendleton & Pendleton, 1 Farragut Square South, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Canned & Cooked Meat Importers' Association, % Deltac International, Ltd., 2801 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Coral Gables, Fla. 33134.

D. (6) \$975. E. (9) \$183.13.

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) \$506. E. (9) \$4,286.

A. Dan Curlee, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$6,411.70.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL-CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$8,250. E. (9) \$3,828.29.

A. Thomas A. Daly, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Japan Lumber Importers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

D. (6) \$1,850.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Office Machine Dealers Association, 2510 Dempster Street, Des Plaines, Ill. 60016.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Jean Daugherty, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Philip J. Daugherty.

B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$2,910.50. E. (9) \$61.05.

A. John B. Davenport, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$160.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$210.96.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Bankers Life and Casualty Co., 4444 Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60630.

D. (6) \$337.50. E. (9) \$44.95.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.

E. (9) \$184.32.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. The Myron Stratton Home, P.O. Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.

D. (6) \$4,800. E. (9) \$1,022.21.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Northwest Industries, Inc., 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

D. (6) \$620. E. (9) \$125.84.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Home Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.

D. (6) \$17,650. E. (9) \$20.

A. Charles W. Davis, One First National Plaza, No. 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. Trans Union Corp., 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

D. (6) \$337.50. E. (9) \$54.95.

A. Fred E. Davis.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$486.

A. R. Hilton Davis, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Charles W. Day, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

D. (6) \$325. E. (9) \$218.

A. Tony T. Dechant.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, P.O. Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$58.24.

A. Richard A. Bell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$150.

A. Ray Denison, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,580. E. (9) \$264.96.

A. Claude J. Desautels Associates, Suite 711, RCA Building, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, One Lincoln Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10023.

D. (6) \$6,000.

A. R. Daniel Devlin, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1109, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 77 Beale Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94106.

D. (6) \$615. E. (9) \$23.20.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Department of Water Resources, P.O. Box 388, Sacramento, Calif. 95802.

D. (6) \$2,321.76. E. (9) \$161.76.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Marysville Dam Committee, Post Office Box 1550, Marysville, Calif.

E. (9) \$2.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, Post Office Box 815, West Sacramento, Calif.

D. (6) \$1,042.91. E. (9) \$52.91.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Spring, Ky. 41076.

D. (6) \$42,242.96. E. (9) \$42,242.96.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$3,660.

A. Steven P. Doehler, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,000. E. (9) \$23.50.

A. James F. Doherty.

B. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,125. E. (9) \$4,243.27.

A. Patrice M. Doherty, Suite 1001, 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. 28202.

D. (6) \$600. E. (9) \$125.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$253. E. (9) \$191.39.

A. Leo J. Donahue, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. James C. Donald, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$3,777.44.

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) \$67.75.

A. James A. Dorsch, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. L. Dorson, Room 1128, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Room 1128, Warner Building, 501 13th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20004.

D. (6) \$3,427.34. E. (9) \$270.

A. Mitchell Dorson, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$600.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Advance Schools, Inc., 5900 Northwest Highway, Chicago Ill.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, David R. Bradley, News Press & Gazette Co., 9th and Edmond Streets, St. Joseph, Mo.

A. F. Raymond Downs, 1801 K Street NW, Suite 1104, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

A. Harry J. Doyle, 1730 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

D. (6) \$174.44. E. (9) \$138.90.

A. Robert H. Doyle, 2029 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$3,693.05.

A. Dean W. Drullas, 1730 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Optometric Association, care of Jack A. Potter, 820 First National Bank Building, Peoria, Ill. 61602.

D. (6) \$36. E. (9) \$61.29.

A. Franklin B. Dryden.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$4,004. E. (9) \$1,573.45.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.

D. (6) \$1,475. E. (9) \$100.

A. 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. Pauline B. Dunckel, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Suite 900, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

D. (6) \$904.

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) \$904.

A. Bruce Dunton, 1126 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.

D. (6) \$3,285. E. (9) \$100.

A. 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) \$305.

A. J. Frederick Durr, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va. 22202.

B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Crystal City, Arlington, Va. 22202.

E. (9) \$28.75.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,075.

A. Robert E. Early, 30 F Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Roy W. Easley, 1735 DeSales Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Arthur B. Edgeworth, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 11 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$437.50.

A. Hallett D. Edson, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.

B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.

D. (6) \$1,400.

A. E. Neel Edwards, Jr., 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$4,250. E. (9) \$974.14.

A. Macon T. Edwards, Ring Building, Room 610, 1200 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

A. Charles Ehrhart, 1800 K Street NW, No. 924, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B.Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo. 63186.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$121.

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. Harmon L. Elder, 1900 L Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 1900 L Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$55.41.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.

D. (6) \$443. E. (9) \$269.50.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20016.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20016.

D. (6) \$8,499. E. (9) \$185.

A. Ruth Bowdery Elliott, 5500 Quincy Street, Hyattsville, Md. 20784.

D. (6) \$2,160. E. (9) \$2,700.09.

A. Roy Elson, 1771 N Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,200. E. (9) \$263.08.

A. Emergency Committee for American Trade, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$982.

A. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.

E. (9) \$625.

A. Gertrude Engel, 2450 Virginia Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Bob Hoffman, York Barbell Co., York, Pa. 17405.

D. (6) \$1,625. E. (9) \$234.90.

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) \$690.

A. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$7,026.10. E. (9) \$7,047.42.

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) \$200. E. (9) \$550.

A. Russell G. Ernest, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, No. 1014, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 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 U.S. D. (6) \$2,575. E. (9) \$22.

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.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,377.

A. Joseph A. Fanelli, 1511 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

E. (9) \$189.77.

A. The Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$55,687.62. E. (9) \$24,324.93.

A. Federation of American Hospitals, 1101 17th Street NW, Suite 810, Washington, D.C. 20036.

E. (9) \$4,500.

A. Federation of American Scientists, 203 C Street NE, Washington, D.C. 20002.

D. (6) \$32,235. E. (9) \$7,209.55.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1500 Guinness Tower, 1055 West Hastings Street, Vancouver 1, B.C., Canada.

D. (6) \$8,499. E. (9) \$185.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Joint Committee of Printing and Publishing Industries of Canada, Fourth floor, 117 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto 12, Canada.
D. (6) \$999.99. E. (9) \$56.

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) \$4,920.37.

A. Matthew P. Fink, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Investment Co. Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Thomas Fink, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

D. (6) \$180. E. (9) \$23.

A. James W. Finley, 1015 18th Street NW., Suite 303, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Crown Zellerbach Corp., One Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.

D. (6) \$6,725.63. E. (9) \$125.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Post Office Box 89, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.

D. (6) \$660.31. E. (9) \$660.31.

A. Florida Citrus Production Managers Association, c/o C. D. Kime, Jr., Waverly, Fla. 33877.

D. (6) \$152.10. E. (9) 152.10.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 20155, Orlando, Fla. 32814.

D. (6) \$152.09. E. (9) \$152.09.

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) \$687.50. E. (9) \$263.32.

A. Gordon Forbes, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn. 55101.

B. Minnesota Railroads Association.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$563.80.

A. James W. Forstel, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

D. (6) \$781.25. E. (9) \$229.87.

A. William C. Foster, Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand, & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Alyeska Pipeline Service Corp., Post Office Box 576, Bellevue, Wash.

D. (6) \$2,221.25. E. (9) \$751.78.

A. William C. Foster, Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand, & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Ralston Purina Co., Checkerboard Square, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) \$750.

A. John G. Fox, 2000 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association of American Publishers, Inc., 1826 Jefferson Place, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

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) \$4,750.

A. James O. Freeman, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 1111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,125.

A. Benjamin W. Fridge, 1900 South Eads Street, Arlington, Va. 22202.

B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,375. E. (9) \$1,155.03.

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) \$53.85.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$4.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$70,782. E. (9) \$14,677.

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) \$2,571.17.

A. Frank W. Frisk, Jr., 2800 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$100.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Council of Independent Laboratories, Inc., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Gadsby & Hannah, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Professional Services Firms in Free Enterprise, 1100 Glendon Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$30.97.

A. James E. Gaffigan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Hotel and Motel Association, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

D. (6) \$184.60. E. (9) \$34.40.

A. Robert E. Gallimore, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$1,518.75.

A. Nicole Gara, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. William B. Gardiner, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky.

D. (6) \$5,934.37.

A. John W. Gardner, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

E. (9) \$1,728.68.

A. Edward V. Garlich, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$150.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

E. (9) \$870.

A. George W. Gephart, Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

B. Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., Gas & Electric Building, Baltimore, Md. 21203.

A. Walter Gerson, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,428. E. \$425.

A. Wayne Gibbens, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 620, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 1111 Thompson Building, Tulsa, Okla. 74103.

D. (6) \$750. E. \$171.94.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

A. Dave Givens, 916 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn. 37201.

B. Class I Railroad, Tennessee.

A. Henry H. Glassie, Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson, and William B. Beebe, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$5. E. (9) \$2.02.

A. Henry H. Glassie, Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson, and William B. Beebe, 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) \$250. E. (9) \$7.76.

A. James M. Goldberg, 1616 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,250. E. \$350.

A. Don A. Goodall, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 614, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Cyanamid Co., Wayne, N.J. 07470.

D. (6) \$88. E. (9) \$39.

A. Vance V. Goodfellow, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.

D. (6) \$5,625.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48226.

A. Government Employee Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$13,383.14. E. (9) \$5,839.80.

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.

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.
 E. (9) \$28.57.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho 83702.
 B. Union Pacific Railroad, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

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. 20006.

A. Group Health Association of America, Inc., 1717 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$9,268.27.

A. James J. Gudinas, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Kenneth J. Guido, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
 D. (6) \$825.

A. R. William Habel, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2,880. E. (9) \$135.23.

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) \$500. E. (9) \$100.

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) \$2,052.45.

A. Keith Halliday, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$300.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Labor Law Study Committee, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National School Supply & Equipment Association, 79 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. 60603.

A. Hamel, Park, McCabe, & Saunders, 888 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. United Student Aid Funds, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Transportation Association of America. D. (6) \$156.75. E. (9) \$90.

A. Robert B. Harding, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, Calif. 91770.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$81.86.

A. William E. Hardman, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.
 B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

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) \$796.33.

A. Andrew E. Hare, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 E. (9) \$18.60.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
 D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$306.16.

A. Thomas E. Harman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$250.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
 D. (6) \$320. E. (9) \$74.25.

A. John H. Harper, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$132. E. (9) \$500.

A. Barbara W. Harris, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 D. (6) \$3,423.06.

A. Otto R. Harrison, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Rita M. Hartz, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$5,913.60. E. (9) \$800.

A. Clifford J. Harvison, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$3,880.50. E. (9) \$781.92.

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) \$163.13. E. (9) \$81.34.

A. Hays & Hays, Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
 B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. D. (6) \$4,934.03. E. (9) \$4,934.03.

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) \$26.10.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
 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) \$4,125.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$1,152.23.

A. Phil D. Helmig, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Atlantic Richfield Co., 515 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif. 90071.
 D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$150.

A. Leslie P. Henry, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Henneges, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill. D. (6) \$2,933. E. (9) \$31.21.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
 B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$333.75.

A. Andrew I. Hickey, Jr., 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. Federal National Mortgage Association, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$8,875. E. (9) \$342.08.

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) \$526.13.

A. J. Eldred Hill, Jr., 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C. 20004.
 B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
 D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$2,000.

A. James J. Hill, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
 B. Amalgamated Transit Union AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Harry R. Hinton, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610. D. (6) \$662.50. E. (9) \$290.91.

A. James D. Hittle, 1800 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Pan American World Airways, Pan Am Building, New York, N.Y. 10017. E. (9) \$97.56.

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) \$220.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1801 K Street NW., Ninth Floor, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222. D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$195.

A. Leo D. Hochstetter.

B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Forest Products Association.

A. Thomas W. Holland, 1629 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022. D. (6) \$923.12. E. (9) \$160.25.

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. Lee B. Holmes, 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 1125 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. D. (6) \$3,178. E. (9) \$17,819.

A. John W. Holton, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$1750. E. (9) \$31.75.

A. The Hormel Foundation, Austin, Minn. 55912. E. (9) \$712.94.

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.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Allstate Enterprises, Inc., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Joe L. Howell, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Allstate Insurance Companies, Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Power Tool Institute, 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill. D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$400.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1221 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 3725 Alexandria Pike, Cold Springs, Ky. D. (6) \$8,703.75. E. (9) \$491.27.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., Apt. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Ashland Oil, Inc., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1660 L Street NW., Apt. 205, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Improvement Association, Inc.

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) \$225.63.

A. David J. Humphreys, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Recreational Vehicle Institute, Inc., 2720 Des Plaines Avenue, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018. D. (6) \$11,250. E. (9) \$62.70.

A. Richard M. Hunt, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.

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) \$6,207.86. E. (9) \$892.97.

A. Philip A. Hutchinson, Jr., East Benning Road, Galesville, Md. 20765.

B. Committee on Federal Procurement of A/E Services, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$500.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C. 20013. D. (6) \$5.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C. 20013.

B. Daniel Smith, Washington, D.C. E. (9) \$211.

A. Lester S. Hyman, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Midland Enterprises, Inc.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005. D. (6) \$312.50. E. (9) \$38.97.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. D. (6) \$7,645.34. E. (9) \$7,645.34.

A. Institute for Rapid Transit, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. E. (9) \$9,349.43.

A. International Brotherhood of Painters & Allied Trades, 1750 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C., 20006. E. (9) \$4,306.80.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001. E. (9) \$21,283.96.

A. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006. E. (9) \$595.37.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 1500 First National Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minn. 55101. D. (6) \$5,090.74. E. (9) \$10,045.20.

A. Ronald A. Jacks, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Reinsurance Association of America, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Chas. E. Jackson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1112, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C. D. (6) \$2,750. E. (9) \$39.91.

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, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115. E. (9) \$500.

A. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue at Punch Bowl Road, Morris town, N.J. 07960. E. (9) \$650.

A. H. Bradley Johnson, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$975.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 514 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 514 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

A. Jess Johnson, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Shell Oil Co., One Shell Plaza Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001. D. (6) \$500.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, Post Office Box 2251, Denver, Colo. D. (6) \$4,430.59. E. (9) \$29.97.

A. Charles N. Jolly, 1775 K Street NW., Suite 315, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Miles Laboratories, Inc., 1127 Myrtle Street, Elkhart, Ind. 46514. D. (6) \$142. E. (9) \$46.10.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036. D. (6) \$285. E. (9) \$75.

A. 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., 28202. D. (6) \$90. 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) \$4.88.

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) \$8,836.

A. Carl D. Jordan, 408 East Maple Street, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
B. Gerber Products Co., 445 State Street, Fremont, Mich. 49412.
E. (9) \$50.

A. Francis M. Judge, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Mrs. Fritz R. Kahn, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
E. (9) \$23.25.

A. Carleton R. Kear, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$170.

A. William J. Keating, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain & Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Howard B. Keck, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
E. (9) \$300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite, 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1110, Los Angeles, Calif. 90067.
E. (9) \$275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. John G. Keller, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co. (a Delaware corp.), Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. 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.

A. Francis A. Kelly, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Harold V. Kelly, 720 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$1,000.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. George Kelm, One First National Plaza, Suite 5200, Chicago, Ill. 60670.

B. The Myron Stratton Home, Post Office Box 1178, Colorado Springs, Colo. 80901.
D. (6) \$4,800. E. (9) \$1,022.21.

A. R. G. Kendall, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.

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) \$374.20.

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) \$30.84.

A. Thomas P. Kester, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$150.

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) \$638.79.

A. Charles L. King, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$48.

A. Gibson Kingren, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.
D. (6) \$1,125. E. (9) \$577.75.

A. John M. Kinnaird, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,344.88. E. (9) \$724.89.

A. Ernest A. Kistler, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa. 18101.
D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$345.32.

A. James D. Kittelton, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$725.

A. Ralph W. Kittle.
B. International Paper Co., Room 700, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$100.

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. Keith R. Knoblock, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$575.

A. Martha Knous, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

A. Philip M. Knox, Jr., 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$25.

A. Bradley R. Koch, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) \$125.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1315 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$62.

A. Horace R. Kornegay, 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Paul A. Korody, Jr., 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$300.

A. June Kysliko Kraeft, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) \$144.50.

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. Germaine Krettek, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Suite 101, Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$535.

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) \$1,000.

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) \$7,631.50. (9) \$1,820.40.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$4,964. E. (9) \$4,275.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, AFL-CIO, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$13,953.29.

A. A. M. Lampl, 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) \$150.

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) \$210.27.

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.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. District of Columbia Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Robert B. Laurents, 7205 Reservoir Road, Springfield, Va. 22150.

B. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.

D. (6) \$950.

A. Donald F. Lavanty, 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) \$1,175.58. E. (9) \$781.35.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. American Gas Association, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va. 22209.

D. (6) \$440. E. (9) \$125.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 230 Southern Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Lee, McCarthy and DeRosa, 102 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10005.

E. (9) \$850.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$18. E. (9) \$228.

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. Midland Enterprises, Inc.

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) \$923.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1620 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Association of American Railroads, American Railroads Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Harry LeVine, Jr., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles R. Lewis, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va. 25321.

B. West Virginia Railroad Association.

D. (6) \$3,333.34.

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) \$2,912.

A. Herbert Liebenson, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$4,500. E. (9) \$1,200.

A. Bella L. Linden, 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.

E. (9) \$628.95.

A. Lester W. Lindow, Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 S.W. Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

B. Master Contracting Stevedore Association of the Pacific Coast, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lindsay, Nahstoll, Hart, Duncan, Dafoe & Krause, 1331 S.W. Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

B. National Maritime Compensation Committee, 1331 S.W. Broadway, Portland, Oreg. 97201.

D. (6) \$500.

A. John E. Linster, 200 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.

B. Employers Insurance of Wausau, 2000 Westwood Drive, Wausau, Wis. 54401.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Electric Cos.

D. (6) \$200. E. (9) \$117.04.

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 Furnishing Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.

D. (6) \$200.

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) \$300.

A. James F. Lovett, 1801 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Westinghouse Building, Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.

D. (6) \$700. E. (9) \$200.

A. Otto Lowe, 888 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,050.

A. 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. Cominco American Inc., West 818 Riverside, Spokane, Wash. 99201.

A. Lund, Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Jersey Central Power & Light Co., Madison Avenue, Morristown, N.J. 07960.

D. (6) \$650.

A. Lund, Levin & O'Brien, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

D. (6) \$133.75. E. (9) \$0.89.

A. William George Lunsford, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$1,764.

A. 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) \$1,231.

A. Thomas J. Mader, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Robert L. Maier, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Andre Maisondieu, 666 11th Street, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

E. (9) \$505.

A. Elizabeth Mallory, Box 718, Union Station, Endicott, N.Y. 13760.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$211,811.83. E. (9) \$638.79.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va. 22101.

B. National Coal Association, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$6,875. E. (9) \$105.55.

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) \$46,03. E. (9) \$261.50.

A. Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 1150 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$285. E. (9) \$75.

A. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$5,000. E. (9) \$3,000.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

A. Ralph J. Marlatt, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 640 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) \$1,290.

A. William J. Marschalk, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$24.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$24.

A. J. Paul 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) \$59.61. E. (9) \$280.

A. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

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) \$549.68. E. (9) \$691.85.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$5,500.27. E. (9) \$670.

A. P. H. Mathews, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$329.25. E. (9) \$326.03.

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. 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) \$4,200. E. (9) \$180.67.

A. Charles E. Mattingly, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$4,200. E. (9) \$180.67.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. Brass and Bronze Ingot Institute, 300 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. Georgia Power Co., 270 Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Albert E. May, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$88.50. E. (9) \$13.90.

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) \$5,675. E. (9) \$260.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1636 Champa Street, Denver, Colo. 80201.

D. (6) \$2,035. E. (9) \$227.50.

A. 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.

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. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$3,350.30.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga. 30301.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Gulf & Western Industries, Inc., One Gulf & Western Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10023.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Magnavox Co., 1700 Magnavox Way, Fort Wayne, Ind. 46804.

D. (6) \$2,860.31. E. (9) \$73.30.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Mobil Oil Corp., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Montgomery Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., North Perry & Jefferson Streets, Montgomery, Ala. 36103.

D. (6) \$1,635. E. (9) \$9.74.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$300.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Alfred P. Sloaner, 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1100 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Tidewater Marine Service, Inc., 3308 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La. 70110.

D. (6) \$513.13. E. (9) \$19.85.

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) \$417.10. E. (9) \$167.15.

A. J. Patrick McElroy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$575.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. 59701.

B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont. 59701.

E. (9) \$35.67.

A. Barbara D. McGarry, 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Raymond McGlaughlin, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48203.

D. (6) \$7,080.

A. Marshall C. McGrath.

B. International Paper Co., 1620 I Street NW., Room 700, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$660. E. (9) \$95.56.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,580. E. (9) \$355.39.

A. Clarence M. McIntosh, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Railway Labor Executives Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$2,067.63.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 933 North Kenmore Street, Suite 317, Arlington, Va. 22201.

B. National Headquarters, Marine Corps League, 933 North Kenmore Street, Suite 317, Arlington, Va. 22201.

A. C. A. Mack McKinney, 1200 North Courthouse Road, Box G4, Arlington, Va. 22201.

B. Noncommissioned Officers Association of U.S.A., Post Office Box 2268, San Antonio, Tex. 78298.

D. (6) \$1,890. E. (9) \$1,385.30.

A. John S. McLees, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$230.

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) \$300. E. (9) \$180.40.

A. C. W. McMillan, Suite 1015, National Press Building, 14th and F Street, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 1001 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo. 80202.

D. (6) \$1,200.

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) \$3,241.45.

A. McNutt, Dudley, Easterwood & Losch, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Dredging Co., 12 South Twelfth St., Philadelphia, Pa., Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Dunbar & Sullivan Dredging Co., 22720 Michigan Ave., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$5,150. E. (9) \$1,822.43.

A. Harry C. McPherson, Jr., Suite 1100, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Montgomery Ward, Inc., 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.

D. (6) \$500.

A. George G. Mead, 621 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md. 20910.

B. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$787.50. E. (9) \$271.36.

A. Medical-Surgical Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

E. (9) \$1,772.97.

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) \$7,580.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,878.50. E. (9) \$298.50.

A. William A. Meissner, Jr., 6200 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

B. Rudolph Wolff & Co., 80 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.

D. (6) \$3,500. E. (9) \$294.56.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va. 22209.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Stewart Title Guaranty Co., P.O. Box 2029, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1129 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

OXIX—541—Part 7

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, 777 14th Street, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Federated Department Stores, Inc., 222 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

D. (6) \$500.

A. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.

D. (6) \$100.

A. 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) \$138.10.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.

D. (6) \$195. E. (9) \$77.80.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, Houston, Texas.

D. (6) \$262.50. E. (9) \$11.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Texas Gulf, Inc., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$135.06.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

B. Nebraska Railroad Legislative Committee, 1815 Capitol Avenue, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

D. (6) \$6,049.98.

A. Joe D. Miller, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. 60610.

D. (6) \$291.67.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1612 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Hormel Co., National Parking Association, Northern Retail Association.

D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Luman G. Miller, 620 Southwest Fifth Avenue Building, Suite 912, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

B. Oregon Railroad Association, 620 Southwest Fifth Avenue Building, Suite 912, Portland, Oreg. 97204.

A. Jack Mills, 1776 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Arnold C. Johnson.

B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, Post Office Box 829, Boise, Idaho 83701.

A. Michael Monrone, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

D. (6) \$200.

A. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Suite 1001, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., Post Office Box 8339, Chicago, Ill. 60680.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$650.

A. G. Merrill Moody, Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$17.51. E. (9) \$13.63.

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) \$1,011.38.

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.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. The American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo. 80201.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Committee for Civil Airlift.

A. Morison, Murphy, Abrams & Haddock, Suite 900, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. James M. Morris, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$2,255.21.

A. James G. Morton, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$100.

A. Jack Moskowitz, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$5,625. E. (9) \$193.83.

A. Lynn E. Mote, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. John J. Motley.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$278.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

E. (9) \$100.

A. John J. Murphy, 416 Shoreham Building, 806 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Customs Service Association.

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) \$400.

A. D. Michael Murray, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$414.37. E. (9) \$714.37.

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. John J. Nangle, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 812 Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Independent Insurers, 2600 River Road, Des Plaines, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$586.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.

B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J. 07102.
D. (6) \$41.25.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. National Air Carrier Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$875. E. (9) \$875.

A. National Association for Uniformed Services, 956 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. 22201.
D. (6) \$20,120.50. E. (9) \$9,233.

A. National Association of Electric Co's., 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,085.32. E. (9) \$8,093.97.

A. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va. 22202.
D. (6) \$1,431.54. E. (9) \$1,431.54.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$500.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
E. (9) \$13,817.19.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$677,358.45. E. (9) \$31,190.52.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1202, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$30.

A. National Association of Mutual Insurance Co's., 2511 East 46th Street, Suite H, Indianapolis, Ind. 46205.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Bank, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$2,791.75. E. (9) \$2,791.75.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$5,192. E. (9) \$5,192.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 9150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22030.
D. (6) \$9,377.28. E. (9) \$8,593.11.

A. NBA Players Association, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y. 10023.
D. (6) \$2,096.04. E. (9) \$2,096.04.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$300. E. (9) \$300.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$681,334. E. (9) \$4,229.77.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$394,267.86. E. (9) \$3,551.30.

A. National Commission Against Repressive Legislation, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90004.
D. (6) \$1,555.27. E. (9) \$1,555.27.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$211,811.83. E. (9) \$638.79.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) \$12,728.82. E. (9) \$12,728.82.

A. National Counsel Association, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Cenco Instruments Corp., 2600 South Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,475. E. (9) \$383.93.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$555.55. E. (9) \$204.29.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

B. ELBA Systems Corp., 5909 East 38th Ave., Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$79.93.

A. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,678.50. E. (9) \$15.

A. National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, 3379 Peachtree Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30326.
E. (9) \$752.76.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 7315 Wisconsin Ave., 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) \$261,012.47. E. (9) \$21,777.97.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920-922 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,991.92. E. (9) \$9,991.92.

A. National Grain & Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$134,102.10. E. (9) \$11,220.

A. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$134,102.10. E. (9) \$11,220.

A. National Home Furnishings Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill. 60654.
E. (9) \$200.

A. National Institute of Locker & Freezer Provisioners, 224 East High Street, Elizabethtown, Pa. 17022.
D. (6) \$1,090.25. E. (9) \$88.61.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$31,661.80. E. (9) \$31,661.80.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, Inc., 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr. 68107.
D. (6) \$2,132.21. E. (9) \$2,132.21.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$4,569.58. E. (9) \$4,569.58.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$20,593. E. (9) \$1,391.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y. 10001.

A. National Right to Work Committee, 1990 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
E. (9) \$1,866.18.

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) \$13,478.93.

A. National Soft Drink Association, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$19,693.92.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$274. E. (9) \$274.

A. The Nation-Wide Committee on Import Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Suite 711, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$11,875. E. (9) \$9,742.35.

A. Navajo Tribe, c/o Controller, Window Rock, Ariz. 86515.

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) \$1,290.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1801 K Street NW., Suite 1041, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 800, Rosemead, Calif. 91770.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$60.68.

A. Allen Neece, Jr., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$300.

A. Frances E. Neely, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,934.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$138.86.

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. 20005.
D. (6) \$750.

A. Louis H. Nevins, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$1,656.25. E. (9) \$234.47.

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. Charles E. Nicholas, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$975. E. (9) \$699.20.

A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa. 18332.
B. Northern Helex Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) \$2,025. E. (9) \$643.66.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$7,600.45. E. (9) \$647.50.

A. NL Industries, Inc., 111 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006.

A. Stanley D. Noble, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Cos., 512 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$435.94.

A. Robert D. Nordstrom, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$100.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. 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) \$251.22.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters & Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Transit Association, 465 L'Enfant Plaza West SW., Suite 2900, Washington, D.C. 20024.
D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$147.50.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters and Kelly, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Suite 1303, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Suite 2900, IDS Tower, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas, Walters and 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) 134.99.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 716, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$300.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Philippine Sugar Institute.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$250.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) \$4,269.98. E. (9) \$1,306.62.

A. Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Harness Tracks of America, 333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. National Grain and Feed Association, 725 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. Edward W. Oliver, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20016.

A. Roy E. Olson, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.
B. American Paper Institute, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 1315 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$59.75.

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) \$243.91.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,375.

A. 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) \$5,641.01. E. (9) \$1,018.86.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.
B. Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

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) \$178.27.

A. Kenton H. Pattie, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22303.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va. 22303.
D. (6) \$1,138.70.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) \$400.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Boating Industry Association, 401 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60601; National Association of Engine & Boat Manufacturers, 537 Steamboat Road, Greenwich, Conn. 06830.
D. (6) \$1,800.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Fort Belknap Assiniboine Treaty Committee, Post Office Box 1475, Harlem, Mont. 59526.
D. (6) \$937.50.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Snowmobile Industry Association, 5100 Edina Industrial Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn. 55435.
D. (6) \$3,200.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Nestle Co., 100 Bloomingdale Road, White Plains, N.Y. 10605.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570.
D. (6) \$2,000.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 707, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

A. John J. Pecoraro, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. International Brotherhood of Painters & Allied Trades, 1750 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$2,294.86.

A. Pennzoll Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
E. (9) \$1,285.70.

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. Carter Perkins, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Shell Oil Co., One Shell Plaza, Houston, Tex. 77002.
D. (6) \$1,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Sr., Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla. 33802.
D. (6) \$964.50. E. (9) \$10.21.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$5,978.00. E. (9) \$306.30.

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. Walter T. Phair, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Kaiser Industries Corp., 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$150. E. (9) \$200.

A. Roger J. Phaneuf, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) \$800. E. (9) \$93.

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) \$1,125.

A. Franklin A. Pickens, P.O. Box 1552, Odessa, Tex. 79760.
B. Texas Railroads.
D. (6) \$1,140. E. (9) \$315.64.

A. John K. Pickens, 201 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. 22313.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 607, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$900.

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) \$99.23.

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) \$810.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex. 79401.
D. (6) \$4,564.39. E. (9) \$1,350.

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) \$375.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Association for Broadcast Engineering Standards, Inc., 1730 M Street NW., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. International Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

A. William I. Powell, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$2.10.

A. Carlton H. Power, 1918 North Parkway, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
D. (6) \$338.94. E. (9) \$45.79.

A. William C. Prather, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) \$475.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 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) \$296.35.

A. The Proprietary Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$753.73. E. (9) \$753.73.

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) \$572. E. (9) \$160.16.

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) \$292.30.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$1,996.80.

A. Alex Radin, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
B. American Public Power Association, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) \$42.18.

A. Raymond Raedy, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$8,692. E. (9) \$8,692.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$450.

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) \$90. E. (9) \$47.47.

A. G. J. Rauschenbach.
B. Communications Satellite Corp., 950 L'Enfant Plaza South SW., Washington, D.C. 20224.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$710.

A. Thomas D. Ray.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$2,450. E. (9) \$219.35.

A. Dwight C. Reed, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Soft Drink Association.
D. (6) \$23.43. E. (9) \$5.

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) \$900.

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 T. Reggits, Jr., 95 Boonton Avenue, R.D. No. 2 Boonton, N.J. 07005

A. Barbara Reid, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Environmental Policy Center, 324 C Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$345.

A. John A. Reilly, 59 Maiden Lane, New York, N.Y. 10038.
B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz., Emma Giambald, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz., George Hallingby, 4104 Chestnut Drive East, Forest Hills, Holiday, Fla.
E. (9) \$25.

A. W. W. Renfroe, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky. 40507.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky. 40507.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$7,892.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, Warner Building, Suite 1128, 13th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
D. (6) \$13,587.35. E. (9) \$8,678.19.

A. James J. Reynolds, 1625 I Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$394.

A. Austin T. Rhoads.
B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$350. E. (9) \$277.36.

A. Thomas J. Rice, 1130 17th Street NW., No. 430, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Continental Oil Co., High Ridge Park, Stamford, Conn. 06904.

A. Maxwell E. Rich, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$625.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.
B. Louisiana Railroads, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La. 70427.

A. Stark Ritchie, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$3,939. E. (9) \$564.33.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Proprietary Association, 1700 Penn Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 D. (6) \$100.

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) \$55.

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. Thomas G. Roderick, 1101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Consolidated Natural Gas Service Co., Inc., Four Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222.
 E. (9) \$2.

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) \$729.20.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 793, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. 90017.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. Walter E. Rogers, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1660 L Street NW., Suite 601, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,000.

A. John F. Rolph III, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$275.

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) \$3,600. E. (9) \$1,800.98.

A. Robert J. Routier, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, 1730 K Street NW., Suite 1009, Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Associated Press, 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
 D. (6) \$623.75.

A. Royall, Koegel & Wells, Suite 1009, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The Deltona Corp., 3250 Southwest Third Avenue, Miami, Fla. 33129.
 D. (6) \$623.75.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1800 K Street NW., Suite 622, 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) \$343.08. E. (9) \$151.81.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Apt. 514, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60606.
 D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$927.55.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$672.17.

A. Ella Marice Ryan, 1156 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. J. C. Penney Co., Inc., 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019.
 D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$74.25.

A. William H. Ryan, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$2,400. E. (9) \$480.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 500 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz. 85003.
 B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Shell Oil Co., Mobil Oil Corp.

A. Sachs, Greenbaum and Tayler, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. Ontario Corp., 1200 West Jackson Street, Muncie, Ind.
 D. (6) \$460. E. (9) \$72.08.

A. Sachs, Greenbaum and Tayler, 1620 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. York Bag Co., Ltd., 3577 Dundas Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
 E. (9) \$157.60.

A. Raymond L. Schafer, Room 610, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.

A. Allan D. Schlosser, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$300.

A. A. Cleve Schneeberger, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Portland Cement Association, Old Orchard Road, Skokie, Ill. 60076.

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) \$63.55.

A. John W. Scott, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 B. The National Grange, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
 D. (6) \$5,000.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 1209, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Jefferson Pilot Corp., P.O. Box 21008, Greensboro, N.C. 27402.

A. Scribner, Hall, Thornburg & Thompson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co., Chattanooga, Tenn. 37402.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
 D. (6) \$231.25. E. (9) \$33.45.

A. Kay Sealy, 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.
 B. Pennzoll Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

A. Earl W. Sears, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn. 38112.
 D. (6) \$196.50. E. (9) \$10.26.

A. Ronald C. Seeley, 1357 Nicolet Place, Detroit, Mich. 48207.
 B. Estate of Bert N. Adams, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz.; Emma (Adams) Giambaldi, 1461 West 16th Place, Yuma, Ariz.; George Hallingby, 4104 Chestnut Drive East, Forest Hills, Holiday, Fla.
 E. (9) \$115.40.

A. Stanton P. Sender, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 802, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60607.
 D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$15.

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) \$900. E. (9) \$450.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 D. (6) \$16,649.08. E. (9) \$711.67.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 B. Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia, 2125 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sharon, Pierson, Semmes, Crolius & Finley, 1054 31st Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.
 B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., El Paso, Tex.
 E. (9) \$200.

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) \$225. E. (9) \$15.

A. Jane M. O. Sharp, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.
 B. Council for a Livable World.
 D. (6) \$4,500.

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. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
 D. (6) \$1,175.

A. Edward L. Shields, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (9) \$930.

A. Harvey A. Shipman, 1725 K Street NW., Suite 1103, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Penn Central Transportation Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104.

A. Lucien J. Sichel, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

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.

D. (6) \$58. E. (9) \$36.47.

A. Talmadge 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) \$373.39.

A. Talmadge E. Simpkins, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.

D. (6) \$825. E. (9) \$62.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Marcus W. Sisk, Jr., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Carstens Slack, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla. 74004.

A. William L. Slayton, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Stephen Slipper, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$13.

A. Smathers & Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Horse Council, Inc., 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$1,611.55.

A. Smathers & Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$12,500. E. (9) \$43.53.

A. Donald E. Smiley, Suite 1014, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) \$282.09.

A. Arthur J. Smith, 1700 K Street NW., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Shell Oil Co., Post Office Box 2463, Houston, Tex. 77001.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Everard H. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$194.48.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

E. (9) \$22.50.

A. Robert Wm. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

D. (6) \$187. E. (9) \$123.

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) \$350. E. (9) \$234.47.

A. Wayne H. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

D. (6) \$710. E. (9) \$264.20.

A. Arthur V. Smyth, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash. 28401.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1100 17th Street NW, Suite 306, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky. 40501.

D. (6) \$550. E. (9) \$37.28.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$2,102.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. United Transportation Union, 400 First Street NW., Suite 704, Washington, D.C. 20001.

E. (9) \$225.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C. 20007.

D. (6) \$2,234.25. E. (9) \$2,201.46.

A. Carl A. Soderblom, One East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev. 89501.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, One East First Street, Room 803, Reno, Nev. 89501.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$125. E. (9) \$70.

A. Jerome N. Sonosky, Gerald E. Gilbert & Alvin Ezrin, Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Physical Therapy Association, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, O'Hare Office Building, Suite 400, 10400 West Higgins Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$1,125.40.

A. Frederick F. Spalding, Rural Delivery, No. 3, Box 96, Annapolis, Md. 21403.

A. William W. Spear, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60605.

D. (6) \$1,399. E. (9) \$6.93.

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) \$250.

A. Larry N. Spiller, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Consulting Engineers Council United States, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$50.

A. Squibb Corp., 40 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019.

E. (9) \$90.

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) \$525.

A. Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), 1801 K Street NW, Suite 1021, Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$251.22.

A. Melvin L. Stark, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 211, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$350.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$100.

A. David J. Steinberg, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Green Olive Trade Association, Inc., 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.

D. (6) \$500.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wynne A. Stevens, Jr., 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 1901 North Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209.

D. (6) \$870.

A. Travis B. Stewart, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., 340 Kingsland Street, Nutley, N.J. 07110.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$100.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S., 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

D. (6) \$6,039.35. E. (9) \$346.65.

A. William M. Stover, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$100.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) \$5,910. E. (9) \$1,057.09.

A. John Stringer, 666 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$1,325.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Footwear Group, American Importers Association, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt, Hemmendinger & Kennedy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Japan Iron & Steel Exporters' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. 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) \$61.50.

A. Norman Strunk, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
B. U.S. Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.
D. (6) \$2,250.

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. G. Don Sullivan, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Mining Congress, 1100 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$575.

A. Irving W. Swanson, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

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) \$350. E. (9) \$249.70.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Legislative Committee, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Charles C. Talley, 100 Angus Court, Charlottesville, Va. 22901.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

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. William D. Thompson, 1660 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. 48202.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$1,981.20.

A. Cyrus C. Tichenor III, 8607 Queen Elizabeth Boulevard, Annadale, Va. 22003.
B. A. H. Robins Co., Inc., 1407 Cummings Drive, Richmond, Va. 23220.
D. (6) \$5,250. E. (9) \$771.97.

A. Paul J. Tierney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$2,350.

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) \$183.93.

A. David R. Toll, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Electric Company, 1140 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$469.67. E. (9) \$396.54.

A. John P. Tracey.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$50.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$5,625. E. (9) \$2.30.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$792. E. (9) \$583.71.

A. John D. Tyson.
B. International Paper Co., 1620 I Street NW., Room 700, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, 101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) \$9,969.20.

A. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$2,329.36. E. (9) \$2,329.36.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$280.46.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) \$52,610.10.

A. Universal Development Consultants Inc., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America.
D. (6) \$550. E. (9) \$83.20.

A. David E. Ushio, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94115.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Lois Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va. 22302.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

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) \$1,092.50. E. (9) \$932.36.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,400. E. (9) \$480.

A. Ted Van Dyk Associates, Inc., 1720 I Street NW., Suite No. 400, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
E. (9) \$841.78.

A. John W. Vardaman, Jr., 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$6,500. E. (9) \$37.

A. Richard E. Verner, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Life Convention, 211 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$127. E. (9) \$32.95.

A. Veterans of World War I of the USA, Inc., 916 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.
D. (6) \$140,305.10. E. (9) \$139,879.71.

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) \$210.

A. Walter D. Vinyard, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. American Insurance Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 515, Blake Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$250.

A. Bruce E. Vogelsinger, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Consulting Engineers Council/US, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$50.

A. Donn L. Waage, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$157.25. E. (9) \$56.25.

A. Paul A. Wagner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) \$1,065.80. E. (9) \$64.13.

A. E. F. Waldrop, Jr., Suite 212, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Association of American Railroads, 1920 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

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, 1126 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.
D. (6) \$1,345.40. E. (9) \$372.68.

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, 1126 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48214.

D. (6) \$2,573.46. E. (9) \$149.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 G Street NW, Suite 1032, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Occupational Therapy Association, 6000 Executive Boulevard, Suite 200, Rockville, Md. 20852.

D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$340.

A. Washington Consulting Service, 1435 C Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago, 401 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$850.

A. George B. Watts, 1155 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Ray Wax, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va. 22202.

B. National Association of Farmer Elected Committeemen, 1900 South Eads Street, Box 836, Arlington, Va. 22202.

E. (9) \$48.90.

A. Herman Webb, 400 First Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, O'Hare Office Building, Suite 400, 10400 West Higgins Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$525.

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) \$9,999.99.

A. F. Paul Weiss, 1825 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.

D. (6) \$850. E. (9) \$94.

A. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md. 20015.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., Suite 1200, 1776 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Fred M. Wertheimer, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

B. Common Cause, 2100 M Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20037.

D. (6) \$6,600. E. (9) \$143.

A. Terrell M. Wertz, 1608 K Street NW, Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$3,750. E. (9) \$114.97.

A. West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association, Post Office Box 848, Nogales, Ariz. 85621.
E. (9) \$500.

A. Wheeler, Van Sickle, Day & Anderson, 25 West Main Street, Madison, Wis. 53703.

B. Marshall & Ilsley Bank, 770 North Water Street, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

A. Clyde A. Wheeler, Jr., 1800 K Street NW, Suite 820, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Sun Oil Co., 240 Radnor Chester Road, St. Davids, Pa. 19087.
D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$1,725.

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.
D. (6) \$102.21. E. (9) 160.20.

A. John S. White, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio 45840.
E. (9) \$472.48.

A. John C. White, Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., Room 1008, 1101 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

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. 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. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
E. (9) \$466.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) \$56.84.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Bonneville International Corp., 136 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) \$70.43.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
E. (9) \$3.95.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. College Placement Council, Inc., 65 East Elizabeth Street, Bethlehem, Pa.
E. (9) \$2.23.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) \$168.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, Pierre Agency, Pierre, S.Dak.
E. (9) \$17.20.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Estate of Albert W. Small, c/o Mrs. Albert W. Small, 5803 Green Tree Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. (9) \$23.99.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Hoopa Valley Tribe, Post Office Box 817, Hoopa, Calif.
E. (9) \$32.94.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Quinault Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) \$49.96.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, New Town, N. Dak.
E. (9) \$36.83.

A. Williams, Connolly & Califano, 839 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$6,500. E. (9) \$37.

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.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. C. Brewer & Co., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. International Utilities Corp., 1500 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19102.
E. (9) \$400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Council for Health Care Services, 407 N Street SW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,000. E. (9) \$400.

A. Williams & Jensen, 1130 17th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Ward Industries, Inc., P.O. Box 849, Conway, Ark. 72032.
E. (9) \$400.

A. Francis G. Williams.

B. American Frozen Food Institute, 919 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$3.

A. Harding de C. Williams, 1825 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Del Monte Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94119.
D. (6) \$500. E. \$50.

A. Harry D. Williams, 1660 L Street NW, Suite 204-05, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Ashland Oil, Inc., Post Office Box 391, Ashland, Ky. 41101.
D. (6) \$250.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1825 K Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. United Air Lines, Post Office Box 66100, Chicago, Ill. 60666.
D. (6) \$1,250. E. (9) \$252.71.

A. Thomas C. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Football League, 410 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$15.50.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$8,000. E. (6) 17.80.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Oil Investment Institute, 2500 Dunstan, Suite 605, Houston, Tex. 77005.

A. W. E. Wilson, 623 Ockley Drive, Shreveport, La. 71106.

B. Pennzoil Co., 900 Southwest Tower, Houston, Tex. 77002.

D. (6) \$1,200. E. (9) \$85.70.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo. 80202.

B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Bldg., Denver, Colo. 80202.

A. Peter L. Wolff, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Association of American Law Schools, Suite 370, One Dupont Circle NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$9,245.60. E. (9) \$620.83.

A. William E. Woods, 440 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004.

B. National Association of Retail Drugists, One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60601.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$150.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Signal Companies, Inc. 9665 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif. 90212.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Flying Tiger Line Inc., Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Perry W. Woofter, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1801 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$413.

A. George M. Worden, 1425 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

A. Gerald L. Wykoff, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20014.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc., 1675 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. 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. Association of Motion Picture & TV Producers, 8480 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif., Hollywood A.F.L. Film Council 7715 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif., Screen Actors Guild, 7750 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.

A. Wyman, Bautzer, Rothman, & Kuchel, 1211 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Merger Committee NBA, c/o Abe Pollin, 6101 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C., Merger Committee ABA, c/o H. Wendell Cherry, 601 Portland Federal Building, 200 West Broadway, Louisville, Ky.

D. (6) \$100.

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) \$227.95.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) \$6,944. E. (9) \$264.10.

A. Albert H. Zinkand, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Getty Oil Co., 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A. Charles O. Zuver, 120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$86.47.

*All alphanumeric characters and monetary amounts refer to receipts and expenditures on page 2, paragraphs D and E of the Quarterly Report Form.

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1972 were received too late to be included or were not included in the published reports for the third quarter.

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19----- <

REPORT
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

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. Air Transport Association of America, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$10,058.09. E. (9) \$10,058.09.

A. Paul W. Airey, 4517 Sunset Drive, Panama City, Fla. 32401.

B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

A. Nicholas E. Allen, 444 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$450. E. (9) \$154.72.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, 22 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
D. (6) \$24,487.20. E. (9) \$24,487.20.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
D. (6) \$3,799.50. E. (9) \$3,258.53.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$8,523.34. E. (9) \$8,523.34.

A. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$2,382.09.

A. American Insurance Association, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y. 10038.
D. (6) \$27,419.75. E. (9) \$27,419.75.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.
D. (6) \$31,607.88. E. (9) \$31,607.88.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$7.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 1522 K Street NW., Suite 828, Washington, D.C. 20005.

E. (9) \$225.

A. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,450. E. (9) \$1,444.

A. William C. Anderson, 425 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$2,175. E. (9) \$23.13.

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) \$93.27.

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) \$188. E. (9) \$8.

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) \$210. E. (9) \$26.72.

A. John C. Bagwell, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

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) \$2,575. E. (9) \$118.88.

A. Davis M. Batson, 1155 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Ethyl Corporation, 1155 15th Street NW., No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$300.

A. C. Thomas Bendorf, 1620 I Street NW., Suite 505, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Trial Lawyers Association, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$150.

A. Arthur A. Benson II, 1024 Commerce Tower, Kansas City, Mo. 64105.

B. Save Our Soil, Inc., Pattonsburg, Mo. 64670.

D. (6) \$1,552.50. E. (9) \$1,403.99.

A. Max N. Berry, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. The Austrian Trade Delegate in the United States, 845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

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.

D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$59.47.

A. William Blum, Jr., 700 Federal Bar Bldg., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, Care of William A. Geoghegan, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$833.33. E. (9) \$163.05.

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. George E. Bradley, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of USDA, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$420. E. (9) \$25.

A. Cyril F. Brickley, 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) \$35.30.

A. Brotherhood of Railway Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$24,395.91. E. (9) \$24,395.91.

A. W. F. Broxterman, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison.

D. (6) \$1,615.43. E. (9) \$41.10.

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) \$580.45.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, care of Chaco Chase, 109-20 71 Road, Forest Hills, N.Y. 11375.

E. (9) \$5.57.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. American Vocational Association, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$940.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa., 18901.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, AFL-CIO, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

D. (6) \$1947.34. E. (9) \$1125.65.

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) \$2,250.

A. Albert T. Church, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$62.50. E. (9) \$1.34.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 712, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$5,900. E. (9) \$7,567.88.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.

D. (6) \$825. E. (9) \$158.81.

A. Coalition Against Strip Mining, 324 C Street SE, Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$2,700. E. (9) \$2,069.47.

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) \$6,562.49. E. (9) \$1,128.55.

A. Robert E. Cole, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. 48202.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Collier, Shannon, Rill & Edwards, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Cylinder Manufacturers Committee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$50.

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. T. Neal Combs, 1822 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Sand Springs Home, c/o E. J. Doerner, 1200 Atlas Life Building, Tulsa, Okla.

E. (9) \$5.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 1000 Ring Building, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$7,243.16.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1100 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chrysler Corp., 12000 Oakland Avenue, Highland Park, Mich. 48231.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$335.

A. Consulting Engineers Council/U.S., 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$5,840. E. (9) \$5,840.

A. John A. Couture, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$4,406.27. E. (9) \$172.24.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$5,102.86. E. (9) \$576.12.

A. C. Richard Crockett, 1501 Tower Building, Little Rock, Ark. 72201.
B. Association of General Merchandise Chains, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$10,309.72.

A. Daniels & Houlihan, 1819 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. National Office Machine Dealers Association, 2510 Dempster Street, Des Plaines, Ill. 60016.

D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$24.50.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,375. E. (9) \$21.84.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$6,000.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Guild of Prescription Opticians, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Association of Plaintiffs Trial Attorneys of Metropolitan Washington, D.C., Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Dawson, Quinn, Riddell, Taylor & Davis, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

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. Vincent A. Demo, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
B. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) \$6,875. E. (9) \$3,080.

A. Franklin W. Denius, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex. 78767.

B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex.; Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex.
E. (9) \$913.51.

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) \$495.

A. C. H. DeVaney, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,175. E. (9) \$97.98.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Advance Schools, Inc., 5900 Northwest Highway, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,035.

A. Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Newspaper Committee for Cablevision, News Press & Gazette Co., Ninth and Edmond Streets, St. Joseph, Mo.

A. William DuChessi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) \$1,475. E. (9) \$100.

A. Bruce Dunton, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y. 10003.
D. (6) \$900. E. (9) \$100.

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) \$24,487.20. E. (9) \$24,487.20.

A. Harmon L. Elder, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$57.70.

A. D. A. Ellsworth, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) \$5,514. E. (9) \$1,594.14.

A. Glenn R. Erickson, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$750.

A. Ethyl Corp., 1155 15th Street NW., Apt. No. 611, Washington, D.C. 20005.
E. (9) \$300.

A. Edward R. Fellows, Jr., 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) \$820. E. (9) \$108.60.

A. Francis C. Fini, 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

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 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$1,775. E. (9) \$65.28.

A. Forest Farmers Association, 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.
D. (6) \$5,600.

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) \$1,238.48. E. (9) \$110.

A. Owen V. Frisby, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. The Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10015.
D. (6) \$765. E. (9) \$2,983.64.

A. Gas Supply Committee, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$40,500. E. (9) \$2,036.03.

A. Leo J. Gehrig, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$1,597.08. E. (9) \$235.58.

A. Walter Gerson, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,428. E. (9) \$425.

A. The Glenmede Trust Co., 1529 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) \$63,543.08.

A. James M. Goldberg, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$750.

A. John Goldsum, Post Office Box 1148, Austin, Tex. 78767.
B. Texas Electric Service Co., Post Office Box 970, Fort Worth, Tex., Dallas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas, Tex.
E. (9) 3,009.05.

A. Vance V. Goodfellow, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.
B. Crop Quality Council, 828 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55401.
D. (6) \$5,625.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash. 98104.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash. 98014.

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.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
E. (9) \$53.20.

A. John F. Hall, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$883.53.

A. Franklin Hardinge, Jr., 1444 Wentworth Ave., P.O. Box R, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.
B. California Savings and Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Ave., P.O. Box R, Pasadena, Calif. 91109.
D. (6) \$1,800.

A. William E. Hardman, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.
B. National Tool, Die and Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

A. Donald L. Harlow, 310 Riley Street, Falls Church, Va. 22046.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association Inc., 1501 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

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) \$5,068.80. E. (9) \$364.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,133. E. (9) \$46.90.

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. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr., 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Forest Products Association.

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. Valerie Howard, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$495.48.

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 Cos., Allstate Plaza, Northbrook, Ill. 60062.

A. Howrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, 1730 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Power Tool Institute, 604 Davis Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$250. E. (9) \$250.

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) \$825.50.

A. Gerald W. Hyland, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

D. (6) \$1,152.31. E. (9) \$143.67.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

D. (6) \$312.50.

A. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) \$50.

A. Investment Co. Institute, 1775 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

E. (9) \$1,750.70.

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. Kennedy, Jr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$5,294.40. E. (9) \$1,360.

A. Peter M. Kirby, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Air Transport Association.

D. (6) \$750. E. (9) \$806.30.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 409 LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., West Higgins Road, Hoffman Estates, Ill. 60172.

D. (6) \$416.67. E. (9) \$122.16.

A. James D. Klink, Suite 500, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$43.85.

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) \$56.70.

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. Charles W. Lee, Room 211, Congressional Hotel, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$75. E. (9) \$50.

A. Legislation for Animal Wards, 2225 Observatory Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

D. (6) \$698. E. (9) \$858.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

D. (6) \$14,959.82. E. (9) \$17,625.75.

A. J. Patrick Logue, 100 935 North Van Dorn, Alexandria, Va.

B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2420 Pershing Road, Kansas City, Mo. 64108.

D. (6) \$8,203.06.

A. Zel E. Lipsen, Suite 809, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Joseph V. Machugh, 225 A Street NE., Washington, D.C. 20002.

B. Menswear Retailers of America, Room 990, National Press Building, 14th and F Streets NW., Washington, D.C. 20004.

A. Ben J. Man, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

D. (6) \$1,008.06. E. (9) \$212.37.

A. Elizabeth Mallory, Box 718, Union Station, Endicott, N.Y. 13760.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$34,739.50. E. (9) \$475.84.

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. Albert E. May, 1625 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. American Institute of Merchant Shipping, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

D. (6) \$88.50. E. (9) \$1.75.

A. Anthony Mazzocchi, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union, 1636 Champa Street, Denver, Colo. 80201.

D. (6) \$2,035. E. (9) \$227.50.

A. 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. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Peter E. McGuire, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.

D. (6) \$2,036. E. (9) \$1,491.79.

A. Clifford G. McIntire, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.

D. (6) \$2,750.

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) \$219.

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) \$700. E. (9) \$420.

A. George G. Mead, 621 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md. 20910.

B. The American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 645 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

D. (6) \$746.65. E. (9) \$406.28.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

D. (6) \$2,083. E. (9) \$68.90.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Stewart Title Guaranty Co., Post Office Box 2029, Houston, Tex. 77001.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Maytag Co., Northern Textile Association, National Parking Association.

D. (6) \$4,000. E. (9) \$400.

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) \$436. E. (9) \$12.

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. A. S. Mike Monroney, 1701 K Street NW., Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Boothe Airside Systems, Inc., 555 East City Line, Bala Cynwyd, Pa. 19004.
D. (6) \$100. E. (9) \$71.70.

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) \$24,487.20. E. (9) \$24,487.20.

A. John Morgan, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$532.82.

A. Lynn E. Mote, 1133 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) \$2,000.

A. David J. Muchow, Smathers & Merriam, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$2,083. E. (9) \$68.90.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.

A. Walter Myers, Jr., 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.

B. Forest Farmers Association, 4 Executive Park East NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30329.

A. National Association of Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,035.40. E. (9) \$1,072.03.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.
D. (6) \$15,466.77.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$93,518.68. E. (9) \$34,213.99.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$1,956.16. E. (9) \$1,956.16.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
D. (6) \$34,739.50. E. (9) \$475.84.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
D. (6) \$280,749.73. E. (9) \$19,950.21.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$7,056. E. (9) \$2,437.18.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
E. (9) \$2,279.12.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$9,321. E. (9) \$4,670.

A. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$4,081.36. E. (9) \$3,813.46.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$4,057.64. E. (9) \$6,085.04.

A. Navajo Tribe, c/o Controller, Window Rock, Ariz. 86515.

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) \$260.

A. New York Committee of International Committee of Passenger Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10004.
D. (6) \$42,500. E. (9) \$14,546.

A. F. Clayton Nicholson, Box 15, Route 1, Henryville, Pa. 18332.

B. Northern Helex Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. 68102.
D. (6) \$1,875. E. (9) \$464.42.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$100.

A. Robert D. Nordstrom, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Canners Association, 1130 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$100.

A. Claude E. Olmstead, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$440. E. (9) \$16.

A. Layton Olson, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.

B. National Student Lobby, 413 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D.C. 20003.
D. (6) \$250.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,843.76. E. (9) 1,125.43.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa. 19035.

B. Campbell Soup Co., Campbell Place, Camden, N.J. 08101.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

B. Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans. 66117.

A. Patton, Boggs, Blow, Verrill, Brand & May, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Fort Belknap Assiniboine Treaty Committee, Post Office Box 1475, Harlem, Mont. 59526.
E. (9) \$11.86.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 707, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 9300 Livingston Road, Washington, D.C. 20022.

A. Peabody, Rivlin, Gore, Cladouhos & Lambert, 1730 M Street NW., Suite 707, Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc., 2055 West 190th Street, Torrance, Calif. 90504.

A. Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. The Glenmede Trust Co., 1529 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$61,000. E. (9) \$1,646.13.

A. Harold Peterson, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.

B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 715 Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minn. 55402.
D. (6) \$2,500. E. (9) \$1,709.17.

A. Franklin A. Pickens, Post Office Box 1552, Odessa, Tex. 79760.

B. Texas Railroads.
D. (6) \$1,140. E. (9) \$366.35.

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) \$60.58.

A. Political Action Committee for Engineers and Scientists, Suite 809, 1140 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Frederick T. Poole, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$458. E. (9) \$62.93.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
E. (9) \$311.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Atkins, Kroll & Co., Ltd., 417 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$0.30.

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. Island Equipment Co., 3300 Northeast Yeon Avenue, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$0.30.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., the Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) \$900.

A. 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) \$408. E. (9) \$13.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.

B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, 6815 Prestonshire, Dallas, Tex. 75225.
D. (6) \$150.

A. Recording Industry Association of America, Inc., One East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022.
D. (6) \$9,116.19. E. (9) \$25,797.35.

A. John T. Reggits, Jr., R.D. No. 2, Boonton Avenue, Boonton, N.J. 07005.

A. Research To Prevent Blindness Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) \$2,500.

A. William L. Reynolds, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$680. E. (9) \$60.

A. Mark Richardson, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.

B. American Footwear Industries Association, Inc., 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) \$270. E. (9) \$250.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. The Kellogg Co., Battle Creek, Mich.

A. James W. Riddell, 723 Washington Building, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Volume Footwear Retailers of America, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10013.

A. John Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$703.12. E. (9) \$98.57.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) \$185.

A. James A. Rock, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$203. E. (9) \$1.21.

A. Nathaniel H. Rogg, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$2,250. E. (9) \$60.78.

A. John F. Ralph III, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. The American Bankers Association, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$500. E. (9) \$150.

A. Ross, Marsh & Foster, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,887.50.

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) \$24,487.20. E. (9) \$24,487.20.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Liquor Stores Association, Inc., Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$225. E. (9) \$45.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington D.C. Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., Suite 304, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) \$555. E. (9) \$80.

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) \$675.40. E. (9) \$47.83.

A. Leo Seybold, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) \$1,479. E. (9) \$182.33.

A. Norman R. Sherlock, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Air Transport Association.
D. (6) \$865. E. (9) \$745.10.

A. Dale Sherwin, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,000. E. (9) \$45.38.

A. A. Z. Shows, Suite 904, 2600 Virginia Avenue NW., Watergate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20037.
D. (6) \$3,000. E. (9) \$3,121.28.

A. Talmadge 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) \$76.01.

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) \$5,001.

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) \$3,011.87.

A. Carstens Slack, 1825 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla. 74004.

A. Smathers & Merrigan, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, 1000 Connecticut Ave. NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$6,250. E. (9) \$83.80.

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) \$2,040.10. E. (9) \$2,169.29.

A. Larry N. Spiller, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Consulting Engineers Council/U.S., 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,500. E. (9) \$50.

A. J. Gilbert Stallings, 1776 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) \$50. E. (9) \$50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. Green Olive Trade Association, Inc., 82 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y. 10005.
D. (6) \$500.

A. Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, 1200 Faragut Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Estate of Margaret Solomon, c/o Franklin C. Latcham, One Post Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94104.

A. Ivan Swift, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.

B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20006.
E. (9) \$1,287.92.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., 734 15th Street NW., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Hart Metals, Inc., Tamaqua, Pa. 18252.
D. (6) \$2,250.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas Associates, Inc., Suite 600, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. REA Express Inc., 219 E. 42d Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.
D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
E. (9) \$2,374.

A. Patrick F. Tobin, 1341 G Street NW., Room 304, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) \$3,645.

A. John P. Tracey.

B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
D. (6) \$400. E. (9) \$50.

A. J. P. Trainor, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.

B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
D. (6) \$3,132. E. (9) \$1,404.38.

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) \$156.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 225 West Touhy Avenue, Park Ridge, Ill.
D. (6) \$2,525. E. (9) \$33.97.

A. Bruce E. Vogelsinger, 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.

B. Consulting Engineers Council/U.S., 1155 15th Street NW., Suite 713, Washington, D.C. 20005.
D. (6) \$1,350. E. (9) \$50.

A. Wald, Harkrader & Ross, 1320 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

B. INA Corp., 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101.

A. DeMelt E. Walker, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) \$796.64. E. (9) \$21.35.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. National Association of Retired Federal Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) \$2,884.62. E. (9) \$6,005.63.

A. Richard D. Warden, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

B. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.
D. (6) \$4,516.65.

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) \$150.

A. Washington Research Project Action Council, 1763 R Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

E. (9) \$9,628.55.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A. George D. Webster, 1822 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Sand Springs Home, c/o E. J. Doerner, 1200 Atlas Life Building, Tulsa, Okla.
 D. (6) \$5,600. E. (9) \$4.95.

A. Fred W. Wegner, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. American Association of Retired Persons/National Retired Teachers Association, 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. 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) \$133.76.

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.
 D. (6) \$65.24. E. (9) \$172.32.

A. Bryan K. Whitehead, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20001.
 B. Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, 6300 River Road, Rosemont, Ill. 60018.
 E. (9) \$568.39.

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) \$7,924.80. E. (9) \$947.16.

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) \$4,968.77. E. (9) \$846.

A. Jack Yelverton, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.
 B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

A. John L. Zorack, 1709 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
 B. Air Transport Association.
 D. (6) \$1,415. E. (9) \$185.53.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I was given the great honor and privilege to present a resolution of commendation to the Honorable George P. Miller on behalf of the Alameda County, Calif., Board of Education. This resolution pays tribute to our former colleague for his many years of service and dedication to the citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of California.

Those of us who have known George Miller during his career in the House of Representatives are very pleased to see this recognition given to his many achievements.

As chairman of the House Committee on Science and Aeronautics, he is, of course, remembered for his skillful leadership in promoting legislation to support this country's space exploration efforts. But perhaps his most significant accomplishments were the result of his unique understanding of the increasing role that scientific and technical information would come to play in solving many of our problems here on earth. Because of this belief, he was unequalled in his efforts to secure the passage of major scientific and education legislation.

I believe that the resolution adopted by the Alameda County Board of Education summarizes quite well the many contributions of one of our most distinguished legislators, and I include the text of this resolution for the RECORD:

ALAMEDA COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. MILLER

Whereas, the Honorable George P. Miller has served the people of the 8th Congressional District of California since 1945 as a member of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas, under his leadership as the Chairman of the Committee on Science and Aeronautics, this Nation has achieved world leadership in space exploration; and

Whereas, Congressman Miller has served as the special Congressional Advisor to the United States Ambassador to the United Nations for peaceful uses of outer space; and

Whereas, Congressman Miller has con-

sistently authored, worked for, and supported legislation which has had a profound effect upon public education in this Nation; and

Whereas, his devotion to service, his foresighted leadership and interest in education, space exploration, and science has brought great credit to this Nation; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Alameda County Board of Education do and they hereby join in commending the Honorable George P. Miller for his leadership and devoted service to this Nation and to the County of Alameda in particular.

Passed and adopted by called vote this fourth day of January, nineteen hundred and seventy-three:

ROBERT CLAYWORTH,
President.

REGULATION OF SURFACE MINING

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1973

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, this week the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on two proposals pertaining to regulation of surface mining. S. 425 introduced by Senator JACKSON and others, and S. 923, the administration's proposal.

Surface mining has been the subject of legislation for several years. Extensive hearings were held in the 92d Congress.

Mr. President, there is great demand for more coal development and the regulation of surface mining has become an urgent national priority. It is my No. 1 legislative priority.

Total coal reserves in the Nation have been estimated to be 1.3 trillion tons, with strippable reserves in Montana calculated to be more than 30 billion tons. The Fort Union formation, much of which lies in Montana, is perhaps the largest coal basin in the world, containing 40 percent of the U.S. reserves.

The Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology indicates that 1973 coal production in Montana will be about 16 million tons and will be expanded to more than 20 million tons annually by 1975. By 1980, 7 short years, coal production in Montana may be 75 to 80 million tons.

Mr. President, there are many unan-

swered questions about surface mining and the possible adverse effects on our air, water, and land. These questions which affect our social, economic, and environmental areas must be answered in order to properly control coal mining.

The people of Montana want and need the best surface mining reclamation law possible. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressman JOHN MELCHER of Montana's Eastern Congressional District, and I will do everything we can to insure early enactment of such legislation.

In Montana, Gov. Tom Judge has provided active leadership for the enactment of the strongest State surface mining reclamation law in the history of the Nation and a power facility siting law. He has proposed legislation to establish a resource indemnity trust fund and to increase the tax on coal so that Montana can conduct the planning and research necessary to have proper and acceptable methods of coal development. I commend the Governor and the Montana Legislature for their hard work and successful efforts toward the enactment of legislation to solve the problems associated with surface mining.

Mr. President, no testimony more eloquently describes the absolute need to enact a strong Federal surface mining reclamation legislation than the statements of three of my fellow Montanans: Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD; Congressman JOHN MELCHER; and Gov. Tom Judge. I wish to associate myself with their remarks and share them with my colleagues in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that their testimony to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD
MINING RECLAMATION LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to be here this morning to testify in behalf of what I consider to be one of the most important pieces of legislation introduced thus far in the 93d Congress—S. 425—a strong Federal surface mine reclamation law which will supplement and support efforts underway in several States. The First Session of the 93d Congress is off to a good start and the legislative process is moving faster than it has for sometime. We have much to do and one of the first matters of concern is the so-called

March 19, 1973