

Any promise of peace is a harbinger not only of hope but of a richer prosperity, for peace is the essential soil for all economic progress. It has been only the periods of peace that have made this Nation strong enough and prosperous enough to survive all its wars and, unlike so many other nations, emerge afterwards still not bankrupt.

It is possible that peace will come to Korea and it is also possible that there will be a decline in business. But any leveling off of business will not come because of the peace. It will come, if it does, because this country has been strong enough, as it has already shown, to take this war in its stride. People have found since June 1950, that no matter how energetically they fought and hoarded they could not strip bare for long the shelves of stores and factories.

War itself is a terrible thing but we find more terrible yet the fact that there are men walking about who talk of peace as if it were terrible.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, April 7, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Arthur S. Flemming, of Ohio, to be Director of Defense Mobilization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and love, who coverest the earth with a tapestry of beauty, hallowed be Thy name. In the midst of the high concerns of public service, in this demanding and confusing day of global change, we are grateful for quiet cloisters of the spirit where in moments

of reverential calm Thou dost restore our souls. In a violent world we seek Thy rest and the refuge of Thy sheltering wing; yet we desire not the rest of those whose hands are folded and whose swords are sheathed, but of those who fight the good fight with all their might.

Grant us, we pray Thee, the peace and poise of the Master Workman who steadfastly faced hate's worst and who, having overcome even death, goes on conquering and to conquer. In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. DWORSHAK were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today on official business as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of last Thursday, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has the floor. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Green
Barrett	Cordon	Griswold
Beall	Daniel	Hayden
Bennett	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Bricker	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Duff	Hill
Bush	Eastland	Holland
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Humphrey
Byrd	Flanders	Ives
Capehart	Frear	Jenner
Carlson	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Case	George	Johnson, Tex.
Clements	Goldwater	Kerr

Kilgore
Knowland
Kuchel
Langer
Lehman
Malone
Mansfield
Martin
Maybank
McCarran
McCarthy
McClellan

Millikin
Morse
Mundt
Murray
Neely
Pastore
Payne
Pottor
Purtell
Robertson
Russell
Schoeppel

Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Taft
Watkins
Welker
Wiley
Williams
Young

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Florida has the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted, without the Senator from Florida losing the floor, to present unanimous consent requests and other routine matters that would be in order during the morning hour, if we had a morning hour, and that the remarks of no Senator may exceed 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, BOULDER CREEK SUPPLY CANAL, COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that

an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be served by the Boulder Creek Supply Canal, Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED TIMBER

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report of investigation by the Office of Investigations, General Accounting Office, covering the sale of Government-owned timber by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SURVEY AND REVIEW OF ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey and review of the Alaska Road Commission, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 21

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass a law granting to the State of Kansas all mineral interests and full mineral ownership in lands owned by the United States or any and all Federal agencies within the boundaries of Kansas

"Whereas there is pending in the United States Congress a bill commonly known as the Holland bill, which the sponsor contends, 'simply recognizes, confirms, establishes, and vests in the States the submerged lands and the natural resources therein'; and

"Whereas similar legislation has been passed by two former Congresses, which bills were vetoed: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and memorialize the Congress of the United States, that in the event they pass legislation granting to the border or coastal States, the mineral rights in and under and mineral deposits, including oil and gas, in the property commonly referred to as the 'tidelands,' whether it be the Holland bill or any other similar bill, that said Congress likewise pass a law granting unto the State of Kansas, all mineral rights owned by the United States, or any agency of the United States, and all mineral interests in and under land owned by the United States, and lying within the borders of the State of Kansas; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to: The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate and to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate, and was adopted by that body March 27, 1953.

"FRED HALL,

"President of the Senate.

"SIDNEY MARGARET GARDINER,

"Secretary of the Senate."

The petition of Emily Soderman Pearson, of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the settlement of the estate of Nels Pearson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation providing support prices for basic farm crops at 100 percent parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the appropriation under Public Law 731, so as to provide and secure a larger allotment of funds for FHA direct farm ownership loans in North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation requiring investigations of Federal income-tax returns to be conducted within 2 years from the time such returns must be filed; and

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to discontinuance of Federal taxation of motor vehicle fuel and to reserve such source of highway revenue to the several States; to the Committee on Finance.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to the return to original landowners mineral rights acquired by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation to require lands from which parcels described by metes and bounds have been condemned or purchased for dam construction to be surveyed and platted to determine descriptions and acreage of remaining tract; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See concurrent resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President, Record of proceedings of April 6, 1953.)

EXTENSION OF POWER TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO DISCONTINUE CERTAIN RAILROAD SERVICES—RESOLUTION OF IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 281) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce. There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, a nonpolitical arm of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, created by legislative act under authority of the Idaho Constitution and vested by said legislature with the duty to supervise and regulate all public utilities operating within the jurisdiction of said Commission as to scope of operation, rates, and condition of service, has taken

note of recent activities of the independent agencies of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the independent agencies of the Federal Government, expressly the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Power Commission, have persistently sought, by projection of legislation, to extend the regulatory powers over public utilities into those areas that Congress has decreed should be left to local State control; and

Whereas the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, as in the case of the *Federal Power Commission v. East Ohio Gas Company* (338 U. S. 464), which upholds the order of the Commission in assuming jurisdiction of a natural-gas company engaging strictly in the distribution and sale of natural gas only within the border of the State of Ohio. This with a recent ruling reading into the 13th section of the Interstate Commerce Act, the power to give weight to the nationwide passenger-train deficit in overruling the order of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission and substituting its own schedule of intrastate rates represents a signboard that indicates the ever-increasing effort to overrun and to make meaningless every vested power of a State right to supervise, control and fix intrastate rates (docket No. 9, October term, Supreme Court, 1952—decision, December 22, 1952); and

Whereas the amendment to section 13 of the act, as proposed in Senate bill 281, would further invade and usurp the police power of the State and completely strip local authority, now vested in the various public service commissions of the respective States, of all jurisdiction and control over matters pertaining to the curtailment of railroad depot and station facilities, sidetracks, passenger- and freight-train services, and, by the adoption of this amendment, deprive the States of the last vestige of power and authority to regulate the railroads on purely intrastate operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such corrective legislation as will accurately define the place where the regulatory agencies of the Federal Government cease to exercise their regulatory powers, and where the States, operating through the designated agency may control, regulate, and fix reasonable rates for commerce which, by the nature of their function, may be predominately an intrastate operation. That the 13th section of the Interstate Commerce Act be amended so as to make effective the policy herein designed, and that Congress may again restate its legislative intent: To leave to the States the enforcement of regulatory control of commerce whose prime functions are by their nature intrastate; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this, a regular session of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, and that the secretary of this commission is hereby directed to mail a copy of this resolution to Senators HERMAN WELKER and HENRY C. DWORSHAK and to Congresswoman GRACE PROST and Congressman HAMER BUDGE.

Done at Boise, Idaho, this 24th day of March 1953.

GEORGE R. JONES,
President.

H. C. ALLEN,
Commissioner.

H. N. BEAMER,
Commissioner.

Attest:

STEPHEN L. GUICE,
Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany; and

S. 1574. A bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartian and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 1575. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Comdr. Wendell H. Froling; the estate of Mrs. Anna C. Froling, and the estate of Margaret A. Froling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1576. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Bouzos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1577. A bill to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1578. A bill relating to the retirement of Government officers and employees whose sons or daughters shall have died while serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 1579. A bill for the relief of Miekio Kristine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1580. A bill for the relief of Dr. David Bethlahmy (Bethlachmy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1581. A bill to exempt lacrosse equipment from the tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1582. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to establish and operate motor vehicle pools and systems, to regulate operators of Government-owned motor vehicles, and to direct the Administrator to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution making available certain unused immigration quota numbers for assignment by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany. It is similar to the bill which I introduced 2 years ago, and authorizes the Government to pay for the German Embassy which was taken over by our Government during the war. It is in the amount of \$300,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1573) for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JIRAIR MAZARTZIAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartian. I want everyone to know that he is a Pakistani.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1574) for the relief of Jirair Mazartian, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF DISCHARGE OF DR. ALLEN V. ASTIN AS DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which proposes an official investigation on the part of the Senate, acting through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any other committee to which the resolution may be properly referred, of the dismissal of Dr. Astin as Director of the Federal Bureau of Standards.

I merely wish to repeat what I said last Thursday. I do not know what the facts are; but I believe that sufficient controversy about the situation has been disclosed by the press and enough conflict evidenced with respect to the representations made by various parties to cause the public to be interested in it. My only interest in the subject is to ascertain—and I think it is only fair to the President to do so—whether officials of the administration are adopting the spoils system in connection with an agency of the Government that I believe should always be kept above the spoils system.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 96), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas it has been suggested to the press that Dr. Allen V. Astin has been removed as Director of the National Bureau of Standards because of political pressure and political considerations, and because of political interference in the Government with respect to scientific analysis of an alleged battery additive which is supposed to rehabilitate or regenerate the strength of batteries; and

Whereas it is imperative, if public confidence in the Government is to be maintained, that the National Bureau of Standards, which is engaged in scientific and objective analysis, be free of politics and political pressure and interference at all times; and

Whereas any substantial allegations tending to show political pressure and interference in this agency should be thoroughly and promptly investigated to determine whether political pressures have in fact influenced the removal of Dr. Astin, or whether the press has erroneously stated the case; and

Whereas if the press has misrepresented the case, the facts should be fully and clearly set forth in order that public confidence in the ability of the Government to perform scientific functions objectively may be restored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the removal of Dr. Allen V. Astin as Director of the National Bureau of Standards with a view to determining whether political pressures or political considerations influenced the removal of Dr. Astin and to what extent such removal impairs or strengthens the performance of essentially scientific and nonpolitical functions by the National Bureau of

Standards. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—PROPOSED DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a request to make, based upon a discussion I had with the majority leader.

I served notice some days ago that I would submit a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from further consideration of Senate Resolution 32, temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare.

I am submitting my resolution today, but, as the majority leader will confirm, I explained to him that it is not my desire to interfere with his responsibilities of leadership on the floor in first disposing of the pending business. Therefore, I have suggested—and he certainly does not disagree—that the resolution lie on the table for a week, with the understanding that if the majority leader wishes to call it up in a shorter period of time he may do so.

I have a further understanding, because I shall be absent from the Senate on Wednesday, that the resolution will not be brought up on that day.

I now submit the resolution to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, and, without objection, will lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare.

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, TO BE DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of Arthur S. Flemming, of Ohio, to be Director of Defense Mobilization. I ask unanimous consent that the biography of Mr. Flemming be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the biography will be printed in the RECORD.

The biography is as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF ARTHUR S. FLEMMING

Mr. Flemming returned to Ohio Wesleyan on September 1, 1948, after 21 years of journalistic, educational, and governmental work in Washington, D. C., with the distinction of being the firm alumnus and the first layman to be elected president of this 108-year-old university.

He was named to the office June 3, 1948, and was inaugurated as Ohio Wesleyan's ninth president June 11, 1949, on the eve of

his 44th birthday. Ex-President Herbert C. Hoover delivered the main address at the inauguration exercises.

Appointed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1939 as the Republican member of the United States Civil Service Commission, Mr. Flemming was placed in charge of the Commission's activities in connection with World War II. Besides his work with the Commission, he served as a member of the War Manpower Commission and was chairman of its Labor-Management Policy Committee.

Mr. Flemming served as a member of the Hoover Commission to study the organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

On February 8, 1951, Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, appointed Mr. Flemming as assistant to the Director in charge of manpower problems and chairman of the Office of Defense Mobilization Manpower Policy Committee, Labor-Management Manpower Policy Committee, and the Committee on Specialized Personnel.

On January 24, 1953, the President appointed Mr. Flemming to be a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, and on February 19, 1953, a member of the Defense Department's Organization Committee.

He is a lay leader of the Ohio conference of the Methodist Church and was formerly lay leader and superintendent of the church school in Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C. He is past treasurer of the Committee on Religious Life in the Nation's Capital, an interfaith group, and served two terms as president of the Washington Federation of Churches.

In the field of journalism Mr. Flemming has been a newspaper writer, editor of Uncle Sam's Diary, a current-events publication, and a member of the editorial staff of the United States Daily (now U. S. News & World Report).

He was an instructor in government at American University, was named director of the school of public affairs there, and later became executive officer of the university. For 6 years he was an alumni trustee of Ohio Wesleyan, and he is presently a trustee of Temple University and of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association.

Born in Kingston, N. Y., in 1905, the son of Judge and Mrs. Harry H. Flemming, he received the bachelor of arts degree from Ohio Wesleyan in 1927, the master of arts degree from American University in 1928, and the bachelor of laws degree from the George Washington University in 1933.

Ohio Wesleyan, American University, Temple, Wesleyan, and Oberlin have conferred doctor of laws degrees upon him.

Mrs. Flemming, the former Bernice V. Moler, is a graduate of the University of Maryland. The Flemmings were married in 1934 and now have 5 children—Elizabeth Ann, 16; Susan Harriet, 13; Harry Sherwood, 12; and twins, Arthur Henry and Thomas Madison, 9.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Jackson Day banquet address delivered by Senator KERR at Springfield, Mo., on April 4, 1953.

By Mr. YOUNG:

Weekly news release distributed by him to all North Dakota newspapers under date of April 8, 1953, entitled "On Capitol Hill With Senator YOUNG—A Personal Report to the People of North Dakota."

By Mr. MURRAY:

Editorial entitled "Understanding the Commie Menace," published in the Machinist of March 19, 1953.

By Mr. LANGER:

Resolution adopted by the Evangelical Lutheran Church on the subject of social security for ministers, together with covering letter signed by O. H. Hove, general secretary, dated April 1, 1953.

Copy of letter sent to President Eisenhower by the Carter Carburetor Corp., together with an editorial entitled "Political Spending: The Cost of Handouts," published in the New York Journal-American of March 12, 1953, and the covering letter signed by Hugh H. C. Weed, president, Carter Carburetor Corp.

THE RATE OF INTEREST ON THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have undertaken to point out the folly of increasing the rate of interest paid to bankers on the Federal debt.

It was therefore with considerable interest that I noted a letter on this subject by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University, in the New York Times of Sunday, April 5.

Professor Harris points out that the national debt now costs \$1 billion a year more in interest payments than at the end of the war although the size of the debt is roughly the same. He estimates that—

Should the administration continue with its present policies and bring rates back to the level of the twenties, the cost over 25 years may well be \$100 billion.

In the light of the recent action of the Congress in killing the Council of Economic Advisers by failing to provide it with funds, I was particularly interested in the following observation made by Professor Harris:

The Congress is meticulous about appropriations of even \$50,000 for the pay of economists whose task it is to study the \$350-billion economy as a whole. Yet they allow, without any restrictions, full discretion to the managers of the debt even though one policy might cost from 1 to 4 billion dollars a year more than another.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the letter on national debt policy by Professor Harris from which I have just quoted.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor of the New York Times was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEBT POLICY—LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF RISE IN INTEREST RATE EXAMINED

(The writer of the following letter is professor of Economics at Harvard University. He is the author, among other books, of the National Debt and the New Economics.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The new policy of debt management should be scrutinized by top administration, by Congress, and by citizens generally. This is the time to do it. Higher interest rates are crucial not only for management of the debt but the whole economy.

In 1946 the average rate on United States Government long-term bonds was 2.19 percent. Now the market is beginning to anticipate a long-term issue of 3 or 3½ percent, or roughly 1 percent above that of 1946.

(The New York Times, on March 26, reported yield of 2.95 percent on one long-term issue.) Even by late 1952 Treasury bill rates had risen from .351 percent at the end of 1945 to 1.837 percent, and certificates of indebtedness from .875 to 1.890 percent.

Within 9 days of assumption of responsibility the present administration had offered an exchange of 1½-percent certificates of indebtedness for 2¼-percent certificates of indebtedness, and for some other issues. The market awaits still higher rates.

What is behind this new interest-rate policy?

PRICE OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

First, there is the new administration's penchant for the free market. But in the management of the public debt there has been no free market. The price of Government securities depends upon the amount of money outstanding; and the latter in turn is largely determined by monetary authority. It has always been a manipulated market. In fact, many economists hold the theory that control of the interest rate is a price that has to be paid to assure freedom in other markets.

Second, the authorities seem to believe that it is sinful for the banks to hold large amounts of securities. Therefore, they hold, it is necessary to raise rates to a point where the public will be tempted to buy the securities and the banks to dislodge them. But I would remind the authorities that since 1914 purchases of securities by banks have accounted for about two-thirds of all rises in earning assets of banks and have been the most important monetary factor in financing a rise of money income of 8 to 10 times and of real income of 4 to 5 times.

Perhaps the monetary authority will tell us where, in the absence of bank purchases, the money is to come from which will be required over the next 25 years on the conservative assumption that real income would rise by 100 percent and prices by only 50 percent (less than 2 percent a year). For when the banks buy, additional deposits are created.

CONTROLS FOR CREDIT

Third, the new policy is supposed to deal with the problem of inflation. But surely since early 1951 the inflation has been a minimum (less than 3 percent a year in the cost of living, and a decline in wholesale prices) given the task of mobilizing resources for our military economy. Whatever the case for higher rates in earlier years, it is difficult to believe that, in the absence of the extension of war, higher rates are the appropriate policy in the next few years. If some classes of borrowers are abusing use of credit, there are alternative policies to higher rates which do not demoralize the Government bond market.

Defenders of the new policy will tell you that it was the Federal Reserve-Treasury concord of early 1951, with its repudiation of the debt-support policy, that stopped the rise of prices. To this I would reply, What about the reversal in the speculative rise of raw materials? The increase in taxes? What about the cumulative effects of record level of investments (and hence saturation of markets)? What about allocations of materials and price control? What about the excessive speculation in the first 9 months of the Korean war? What about the difficulties of the soft-goods industries? All of these also can account for the flattening of the rise of prices.

The new administration should go slow in reversing the policies of the Roosevelt-Truman administration in this field. Managers of the public debt have learned since 1933 to tailor securities to the needs of different segments of the market, to give enough assurance to the market so that investors could safely hold long-term securities and hence be satisfied with lower rates. Compare the uncertainty today, with investors disposing and waiting until they are

sure they make the best possible bargain. Had rates in the last 20 years been those of the twenties, the cost of the national debt would have increased by more than \$50 billion.

RISE IN COST

I hope that the new administration will be cautious. The national debt now cost \$1 billion per year more than at the end of the war, though the size is roughly the same. Should the administration continue with its present policies and bring rates back to the level of the twenties, the cost over 25 years may well be \$100 billion. I have not heard Senator Byrd say a word about economies in managing the debt.

It is also well to observe that a rise in the rate by 1 percent gives the banks an additional return of \$600 million per year ultimately.

The Congress is meticulous about appropriations of even \$50,000 for the pay of economists whose task it is to study the \$350 billion economy as a whole. Yet they allow, without any restrictions, full discretion to the managers of the debt even though one policy might cost from 1 to 4 billion dollars a year more than another.

Again I urge a careful appraisal of the long-run implications of the new debt and interest rate policy. Not only the tax burden but also the state of our economy is involved.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., March 30, 1953.

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF BATAAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the 11th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, on April 9, serves as a reminder that out of tragedy great rewards can come. There had already grown a close and deep friendship between Americans and Filipinos. But after Bataan, a friendship developed during 50 years of political association was forged anew in common suffering and sacrifice. Out of the sharing of disaster came an affectionate unity unsurpassed between any two other countries in the world. The glory of Bataan is a permanent part of Philippine-American relations.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we are all aware, the Eisenhower administration is confronted by a vast variety of policy questions relating to continuation of a tremendous variety of programs, domestic and foreign.

One of the programs in the international field which the administration is called upon to consider is our future policy with respect to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

As of December 31 of this year, the present United Nations authorization for UNICEF expires, as does United States authorization for our own participation in this program.

So the question of our future United States policy in regard to this work has caused a delay in requesting and granting supplemental funds for UNICEF. As a result, today UNICEF is broke; it is down to its last unallocated \$2,600.

From time to time I have drawn the attention of the Senate to the vital work which has been done by UNICEF through the years.

For a comparative pittance, this great organization has accomplished miracles of aid to tens of millions of youngsters and pregnant mothers in 70 countries.

At this time, I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared relative to the need for stopgap funds to continue UNICEF's work. I append an editorial on this theme which appeared in yesterday's New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

GRANTING UNICEF SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDS

There is right now being considered by the State Department, by the Mutual Security Agency, and by the White House the question of future United States policy toward the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

Because of a tremendous number of factors involved in this complex question, I will not presume at the present time to attempt to offer any definitive conclusion as to the long-range decisions by our Government on this program.

I do state, unequivocally, however, that:

1. UNICEF has done a superlative job.
2. That it should be furnished at least the temporary wherewithal to continue doing that job, and should not be hamstrung in its current operations by the fact that certain long-range policy questions are still to be settled.

Great progress has been made in meeting certain administrative and jurisdictional problems, in integrating the work of UNICEF with the Food and Agriculture Organization and with the World Health Organization. Moreover, certain other problems which have confronted UNICEF have also been met with increasing success.

Now, the immediate problem confronting UNICEF is the need for stop-gap funds.

What is needed on the part of the administration and on the part of the Congress is a sense of genuine urgency which is intrinsically merited by this situation.

In other words, a starving child today cannot wait until January 1, 1954, until we settle high policy questions. The child will be dead by then. What then can allay the grief in the hearts of the child's parents?

A child suffering from yaws, tuberculosis, or malaria today cannot wait until the policy makers of this and other governments decide how the child's health shall ultimately be looked after. The child's little body will suffer permanent injury by then, even if the youngster can hold out at all.

The United States should not let that little child down.

Two days ago we celebrated Easter. Can we forget the words of the Master on the little ones?

Let me say now that it was a source of deep regret to me that at its recent meeting, when the executive board of the fund concluded approval of allocations for 52 new projects of aid to children of 30 countries, that for the first time in UNICEF's history the resources at the disposal of the executive board were solely contributions by countries other than our own.

Since its inception, the United States of America has played a leading role in advancing the great humanitarian work of UNICEF.

Unfortunately, however, the second supplemental appropriations bill for the 83d Congress failed to include a crucial sum of

\$9,814,333. Therefore, Dr. Martha Eliot, the United States delegate at the UNICEF executive board, was not in a position to make a statement concerning the prospects of further specific United States aid to UNICEF.

This was, in spite of the fact that the Congress has long since authorized a total of \$16,481,000. But the Congress has failed to make available specific appropriations for this purpose.

I should like to point out, moreover, that every dollar made available by us or, for that matter, by other participant countries is matched and even exceeded by funds by the assisted countries.

Nations throughout the world have expressed to the United States their deep appreciation for our great previous efforts for UNICEF. I earnestly hope that our fine record of the past will not be marred by a further failure of the United States to take action now.

Surely, if there is any group in all this world well meriting our devoted efforts, it is the innocent youngsters.

They have paid for adult errors of omission and commission in war, and in time of so-called peace, in their suffering from malnutrition, from disease, and hunger. If we would, therefore, build for a peaceful, prosperous tomorrow, we must look after the needs of these little ones today.

During my service at the first session of the Seventh General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, from October to December 1952, it was my pleasure to serve in the work of the Negotiating Committee on Extra-Budgetary Funds. At that time I solicited contributions by other countries to UNICEF and other programs. The very least that I feel I can do, therefore, is to point out to my own country its continuing obligations and this temporary breakdown in the discharge of those obligations.

The Soviet Union, of course, has not contributed a single dime toward humanitarian work of this type; its failure to do so is marked exceedingly closely by the countries of the world.

On the other hand, in my own State of Wisconsin and in other States of the Union a great many civic-minded Americans are working at the grassroots on behalf of the U. N. International Children's Emergency Fund. I have been glad to assure these fine folks that I, for one, would continue my efforts on behalf of this noble work.

I and my staff have discussed the problem over a considerable period of time with Mrs. Oswald Lord, former chairman, the United States Citizens' Committee for UNICEF and now our able representative at the U. N. Human Rights Commission at Geneva. I have reviewed the problem with the United States Government officials involved and with Mr. Maurice Pate, executive director of the fund.

It is quite clear that the United States willingly spends billions for armaments, both in this country and in allied countries. Surely we can spend a few millions for milk for hungry little stomachs and vaccines for diseased little bodies.

Let me note this fact in particular:

Although 40 governments gave their contributions and pledges to UNICEF in the period since last October alone, most of the funds have now been allocated, and there is now left for allocation only the equivalent of \$2,600.

Two thousand six hundred dollars—what advance planning can be accomplished with that?

Two thousand six hundred dollars—what new projects can be undertaken, what new hope can be given?

Let these grim questions be heeded and let constructive action be taken accordingly and promptly now, not next year. I have so urged the State Department, the MSA, and the White House; and I so urge my colleagues in the Congress.

[From the New York Times of April 6, 1953]

THE CHILDREN'S FUND

"I believe it would be a tragic mistake and an appalling setback of America's entire humanitarian record if Congress did not remedy the omission of funds for UNICEF. For a comparative pittance we and like-minded nations have achieved magnificent results for these youngsters and their mothers. * * *

With these blunt words Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, sums up the tragic plight of one United Nations group with whose efforts—to save lives and restore sick and needy youngsters to health—this country has been aligned since its inception. That group, UNICEF, or the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, is about to die for lack of contributions, and, indeed, for lack of leadership and wisdom in this country.

We have always been the mainstay of this fund, and by our leadership encouraged other governments to match our contributions, so that millions of youngsters and their nursing mothers suffering from malnutrition, malaria, tuberculosis, yaws, and tropical diseases, and suffering from war and disasters, might live; above all, might believe that the free and democratic world was in earnest about making this a safe and healthy world for all, not for the few. Yet today the incredible situation confronting UNICEF is this: It is broke. It has \$2,600 left in its treasury. A pittance—\$5,300,000—has been allocated to going programs in some 30 countries. It has been waiting for months for this Government to make good its pledge of \$9,814,000, so that it can get on with advance planning and secure matching contributions from other nations.

"All that remains," Senator WILEY admonishes, "is to find a prompt form of legislation to include an adequate stop-gap appropriation" for UNICEF. The time for that action is now—as it would be now if our own children were the prime sufferers.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has the floor, I should like to state that from now on the Senate will meet every day, from Monday through Friday, and during this week I expect it to sit from 12 to 5:30 in the afternoon. The Senate is now actually down to business, and if we want to get away in the early summer it will be necessary to devote somewhat more attention to the business of the Senate than during the time up to now when there has been very little pressure for action by the Senate.

I hope very much that Senators will refrain from interrupting with irrelevant matters or even with unanimous-consent requests other Senators who are speaking on the question before the Senate, and that Senators who have such other matters to submit will wait until the end of the day or will avail themselves of the opportunity which will be given at the beginning of each session of the Senate. However, we shall take a recess from day to day, and there will be no regular morning hour during this period, until we have completed action on the pending joint resolution.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not expect to move that the consideration of the joint resolution be set aside for any

purpose until a vote on the joint resolution has been obtained.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask a question regarding the procedure of the Senate in connection with the meeting of committees while the Senate is in session. I quite agree with the Senator from Ohio that we should proceed with daily and orderly debate on the submerged lands joint resolution until a final vote is had on it, which I trust will be at a very early date.

I have not reached a final decision as to my course, but I am having great difficulty in reconciling myself to the holding of committee meetings during sessions of the Senate, while there is before it a measure so vitally important as is this joint resolution. If it is of sufficient importance to warrant the holding of the debate which is being had on the joint resolution, I believe it is of such importance that Senators should remain in the Chamber and should listen to the debate which constitutes an essential part of the functioning of the Senate.

I wish to announce very courteously to the majority leader that I am inclining in the direction of insisting that the rules of the Senate be applied in regard to the holding of committee meetings, by not giving my consent to the holding of committee meetings while the Senate is in session during the course of the debate on the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, Mr. President, it is very likely that the time will come when even I might refuse to give my consent to the holding of committee meetings during the afternoons. However, I do not think we have yet reached that point. On the other hand, as we draw nearer to July, it may be necessary to become much more restrictive in that respect, and to object to all such requests.

Of course, Mr. President, any Senator has a right to object to any unanimous-consent request for the meeting of a committee during a session of the Senate.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the outset of this discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 13, so that all Senators may have the benefit of my understanding, at least, of the procedure to be followed during the course of my tenure of the floor, I wish to announce that I shall expect to proceed as expeditiously as I can to conclude my prepared remarks, which, however, fall into 5 or 6 different classifications. I shall expect not to yield with reference to the particular discussion covered by any one classification until I reach the end of my remarks with reference to that classification, at which time I shall be glad to yield gen-

erously to all Senators who have an interest in the subject matter and who wish to ask questions regarding it. However, for the sake of continuity, I believe it best to complete the discussion of each segment of my remarks before I yield for questions regarding that segment.

Mr. President, the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 13 is property, property rights in the submerged lands beneath navigable waters. By way of a brief summary, the general purpose of this measure as reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is to recognize, confirm, establish, and vest in and assign to the respective States the title and ownership of the lands and resources beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries, as well as the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use these lands and resources in accordance with applicable State law. The transfer of property rights in the submerged lands and resources to the several States from the Federal Government is made subject to the exercise by the Federal Government of all its powers of regulation for the purpose of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which powers shall continue to be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership and development. Of course, such lands as the United States itself has acquired in a proprietary capacity by eminent domain procedure, purchase, cession, gift, or otherwise shall remain the property of the Federal Government.

This joint resolution also revokes as to all areas within the boundaries of the States the misconceived and ill-advised action of former President Truman, in his attempt to make a naval petroleum reserve of all the submerged lands within the entire Continental Shelf. It is unfortunate that Mr. Truman added confusion to this complicated and controversial issue by such action when, as shown by the official departmental memorandum of the Department of Justice, he had been advised that he was not creating a naval reserve within the meaning of the statute on that subject. Attorney General Brownell, when questioned on this matter in the hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, on February 17, 1953, stated that the Executive order signed by Mr. Truman on January 16, 1953—and I now quote Mr. Brownell—"merely transferred the administrative power over these lands from one department to another, and did not set up a naval petroleum reserve within the meaning of the statute." Attorney General Brownell further stated in a letter dated February 13, 1953, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, that "it was also clear that the then Attorney General, Judge McGranery, approved the order, as finally drafted and issued, on the understanding that it did not intend to nor did it in fact or in law create a naval petroleum reserve within the meaning of the statute."

It will be noted that this joint resolution provides that nothing therein shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights

of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying outside the boundaries of the respective States, and it confirms the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Government over those natural resources. In other words, this measure clearly emphasizes that nine-tenths of the submerged lands off the coast of the United States is under the control and jurisdiction of the Federal Government and that the other one-tenth, which lies inside the boundaries of the States, and immediately adjoining the coasts of the States, should be owned and controlled by the respective States.

Mr. President, if Senators will give attention for a moment to the map which is placed in the rear of the Chamber, and which I believe reasonably and clearly outlines this situation, they will note that the map has a very narrow, dark line surrounding the entire Nation on the Atlantic frontage and on the Gulf of Mexico frontage and on the Pacific Ocean frontage of the continental United States. That narrow line represents the areas which are covered by the joint resolution, insofar as any grant of offshore lands to States is concerned. Senators will note that on the west coast of the mainland of the State of Florida that narrow belt is about three times as wide as it is all the way down the Atlantic coast, and they will also note that on the entire Texas frontage on the Gulf of Mexico the same situation obtains.

The reason for that is, as has been already stated in the debate on several occasions, that the State of Texas claims for its entire frontage on the Gulf of Mexico a 3-league belt, by reason of the fact that it, as an independent republic, had set its boundary at 3 leagues from its coastline in 1836, long before it came into the Union; and, by reason of the further fact that it was admitted to the Union—or so it claims—with the understanding that it should retain the ownership, control, and jurisdiction over all the lands and water within its boundaries.

As to the State of Florida, the situation is a little more complicated. I went into that matter at some length in the colloquy the other day with my friend, the Senator from Illinois. I stand ready to go further into it, if he or any other Senator desires to do so. But the situation with reference to the mainland coast of Florida on the Gulf of Mexico is that, under the constitution of our State, adopted in 1868, and, as we feel, completely accepted and approved by the Congress of the United States, our boundary is fixed at 3 leagues in the Gulf of Mexico, insofar as the mainland west coast area of our State is concerned.

The same observation does not apply to the north or Gulf fringe of the Keys, which, as Senators will note, juts out southwesterly from the southern end of our State. In other words, briefly to state my understanding at least of the situation of Florida under the law which has been in effect since 1868, our State has a 3-mile boundary on the Atlantic and on the Florida Straits, and a 3-marine-mile boundary on the Gulf of Mex-

ico, insofar as the Keys alone are concerned, but a 3-league boundary upon the Gulf of Mexico, insofar as the mainland of the west coast of the State of Florida is concerned.

Mr. President, I call attention to this map simply because, in my opinion, it shows clearly that what is involved here insofar as any grant of offshore submerged lands to the States is concerned, is nothing more than a narrow shoe-string of land and water immediately adjoining, and, in some sense, strangling our coast on all our outside salt-water frontages, and immediately affecting the local development of all of the coastal communities, all the local coastal area of the States in the most vital way.

As to the areas in white on the map, which lie just outside the narrow belt to which I have referred, they represent the so-called outer Continental Shelf, or that portion of the Continental Shelf which lies beyond the State boundaries. The Continental Shelf may be roughly indicated as that part of the ocean bottom immediately appurtenant to our continent, which extends along the shoulder of the continent until it plunges into the ocean depths, generally at about a 100-fathom, or a 600-foot, depth.

Senators will note that the Continental Shelf in many places goes very much further out from our coastline than does the narrow coastal belt which is claimed by the States, and which, under the pending joint resolution, would be yielded to the States as fully and as effectively as a property may be yielded, by the Congress under the authority it possesses.

Senators will note, for instance, that as to my own State of Florida, on the Gulf frontage, the Continental Shelf extends to a distance of about 175 miles at the widest point. On the Atlantic frontage there is very deep water just off certain portions of the Florida Peninsula on the east, and in that area there is little, if any, Continental Shelf beyond the State boundaries. Generally speaking, there is a narrower belt of Continental Shelf adjoining our State in the Atlantic and in the Straits of Florida than in the Gulf of Mexico.

If Senators will look at the map even casually, I think they will note that on the Pacific coast it is the rule rather than the exception that very deep water comes very close offshore, so that there is very little Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile boundary—3 geographic miles, that is—which is the uniform boundary recognized in the case of the Pacific Coast States, California, Oregon, and Washington.

Mr. President, when I reach the end of this particular portion of my address, I shall be glad to yield on this or any other aspect of what I shall have said.

It is well to note that of the estimated oil deposits in the entire Continental Shelf as estimated by Ralph L. Miller, Chief, Fuels Branch, Geologic Division, United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior—and he is our top nonpartisan professional Federal employee in this field—in his testimony

before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Tuesday, February 24, 1953, only 17 percent will go to the States under this resolution while the remaining 83 percent will be under the complete ownership and control of the Federal Government.

In other words, Mr. President, under the pending joint resolution, some nine-tenths of the area goes to the Federal Government, so far as area is concerned, and a little less than one-tenth to the States.

So far as estimated production of oil and gas is concerned, under the joint resolution, approximately five-sixths, or 83 percent, will be in the area which will remain completely in the control of the Federal Government, whereas approximately one-sixth, or 17 percent, will lie within State boundaries, and will come, when the joint resolution is passed, as we believe it should be passed, exclusively within the jurisdiction and control of the States.

I hope this point is very clear because there are some who have erroneously maintained throughout this controversy that the States advocate State ownership of all offshore resources of the entire Continental Shelf.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that both measures which have been passed on this subject, one in 1946, and one last year, simply provided, as does the pending measure, that as to offshore lands the States should own the property values in the submerged lands out to their State boundaries, and went no farther than that. I also call attention to the fact that that opinion seems to be accepted pretty generally in these days, and I am glad that there has been a great deal of public discussion of this subject matter. For instance, I have noted in three of the local newspapers in Washington approving editorials of this measure, one of which I shall not now refer to, though it is an excellent editorial, but two of which I shall briefly mention at this time.

The first is from the Washington News of last Friday, April 3, under the title "Offshore Flotsam." So pertinent is this editorial that I think I shall read it into the RECORD, rather than merely ask that it be printed. This is what the editorialist says:

OFFSHORE FLOTSAM

As we see it, the issue in the tidelands dispute before Congress is mainly a matter of the proper mechanics.

For many years the States had jurisdiction out to their traditional boundaries—3 miles for most States, 10½ miles in the Gulf for Texas and Florida. The bills before Congress confirm that.

Beyond these limits, the bills give authority to the Federal Government. Policing the waters over the Continental Shelf, as far out as 250 miles, obviously is a practical responsibility of the United States. Not even Texas has a navy.

By fixing firm areas of jurisdiction, Congress isn't giving anything away, authorizing a gigantic grab, or promoting plunder of the public domain, as some of the hysterical partisans in this dispute have alleged.

Neither have the tidelands bills anything to do with forests in Idaho, water rights in New Mexico, grazing rights in Montana, or coal under the ground in Pennsylvania.

Most of the debate has been so much driftwood. The bills before Congress are designed simply to end this nonsense and open the way for the explorers and developers to get at the resources under the sea.

Without seeking to prove anything stated in the editorial with reference to hysteria on the part of anybody, I must say that, as to the remainder of the editorial, it very clearly sets forth what is the obvious fact, that the measures now pending simply give the go-ahead signal for the development of any resources in this coastal area, giving to the States that which, without question, was enjoyed by them for 150 or 160 years, namely, the ownership of everything within State boundaries, and reserving to the Federal Government everything beyond that.

The other editorial appeared in the Washington Star of April 6. It is too long to read into the RECORD in full, but I shall read from it, and any Senator who wishes to read the remainder of it will have access to it at my desk.

The editorial is headed "The House on Offshore Wealth," and reads in part as follows:

The House has done a good day's work in voting, 285 to 108, to quitclaim to the States all submerged lands and resources lying within the historic seaward boundaries. Critics of the measure have attacked it as a give-away and a steal and robbery in broad daylight, but to call it that is to be guilty of gross misrepresentation. Actually, in terms of law, morals, equity, and the like, it is an excellent piece of legislation designed to effect a fair and honest settlement of the longstanding controversy over the Nation's offshore oil and gas deposits.

Under the House bill, this controversy—the misnamed tidelands issue—would be ended by clearly defining and delimiting what should belong to the coastal States and what to the country as a whole. Thus, the bill provides that the States are to have full title to the submerged riches within their historic seaward boundaries, and that the Federal Government, representing the entire Nation, is to be the owner and controller of all the resources in the Continental Shelf beyond those boundaries. The division on that score is not left in doubt in any respect.

I shall not read further from the editorial, Mr. President.

Completing my statement on this point, it seems to me that finally the fact has been understood by most persons—my mail so indicates—that this measure does not propose a grab on the part of the States of submerged resources beyond their seaward limits as States, but, instead, recognizes that the Federal Government does have whatever claim there is in that area and should be recognized as the proprietary owner thereof.

Mr. President, there is nothing which more needs to be understood at the beginning of this discussion than that very fact.

This joint resolution will confirm to the maritime States the rights which they had respectively enjoyed since the founding of our Nation, and up to the date of the decision in the California case, in their offshore lands and waters which lie within their constitutional boundaries.

I have already discussed that point with reference to the coastal States,

and I go to another very important element of jurisdiction in this resolution. It will also confirm to all the States—and that means all 48 States—their full control and property rights in their lands and waters defined as inland waters, and will also confirm to the Great Lakes States—and this is the third grant of jurisdiction—the title and control of the lands and waters lying within their boundaries in the Great Lakes.

As I have already stated, this measure does not deal with the administration and development of that vast portion of the Continental Shelf which lies beyond the States' constitutional boundaries, and control of which is recognized by section 9 as being in the Federal Government. I fully realize that many questions concerning this outer belt must be settled by the Congress very soon in order to allow essential production of oil to get underway, but the consideration of these problems will raise entirely different and more difficult problems than those which will be solved by the passage of the joint resolution before us today.

The total value of oil and gas has been estimated by authorities in this field. The values are not to be compared at all in substance or in size with other values which I shall discuss later in my address, and which have to do with other things which are absolutely needed to be used in order to promote the development of the coastal communities and the coastal industries which depend so tremendously upon property rights and property values in this narrow coastal strip along our shores.

The questions presented by Senate Joint Resolution 13 have been fully considered by Congress several times, and I believe that this proposed legislation, which relates solely to property within the States' boundaries, can and should be speedily passed if left unencumbered by other problems. As to offshore lands confirmed to the States, this measure is confined to those lands which extend out to the 3-mile limit with two exceptions. The State boundary of the west coast of Florida and the boundary of the entire coast of Texas extend 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico under their constitutions, which were approved many years ago by the Congress. The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is approved and confirmed by this measure as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line, and it gives to those States whose boundaries do not formally extend 3 miles distant the opportunity to so extend them. I emphasize the fact that this joint resolution does not extend the boundary of any State beyond the 3-mile limit. If under this resolution Florida and Texas receive property values out to the 3-league limit in the Gulf of Mexico, as I believe they should and will receive them, it will be because they can establish as a fact that Congress approved their 3-league outer boundaries as long ago as 1845 in the case of Texas and 1868 in the case of Florida.

Mr. President, in order clearly to illustrate the limited amount of offshore area affected by this resolution, I ask leave at this time to insert three tables.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPPEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

Approximate areas of submerged lands within State boundaries
(Expressed in acres)

State	Inland waters ¹	Great Lakes ²	Marginal sea ²
Alabama.....	339,840	-----	101,760
Arizona.....	210,560	-----	-----
Arkansas.....	241,280	-----	-----
California.....	1,209,600	-----	2,540,800
Colorado.....	179,200	-----	-----
Connecticut.....	70,400	-----	384,000
Delaware.....	50,560	-----	53,760
Florida.....	2,750,720	-----	4,697,600
Georgia.....	226,120	-----	192,000
Idaho.....	479,360	-----	-----
Illinois.....	289,920	976,640	-----
Indiana.....	55,040	145,920	-----
Iowa.....	188,160	-----	-----
Kansas.....	104,320	-----	-----
Kentucky.....	183,040	-----	-----
Louisiana.....	2,141,440	-----	2,668,160
Maine.....	1,392,000	-----	750,680
Maryland.....	441,600	-----	59,520
Massachusetts.....	224,000	-----	568,640
Michigan.....	764,160	24,613,760	-----
Minnesota.....	2,597,760	1,415,680	-----
Mississippi.....	189,440	-----	136,320
Missouri.....	258,560	-----	-----
Montana.....	526,080	-----	-----
Nebraska.....	373,760	-----	-----
Nevada.....	472,320	-----	-----
New Hampshire.....	179,200	-----	8,960
New Jersey.....	200,960	-----	249,600
New Mexico.....	99,200	-----	-----
New York.....	1,054,080	2,321,280	243,840
North Carolina.....	2,284,800	-----	577,920
North Dakota.....	391,040	-----	-----
Ohio.....	64,000	2,212,480	-----
Oklahoma.....	470,040	-----	-----
Oregon.....	403,840	-----	558,320
Pennsylvania.....	184,320	470,400	-----
Rhode Island.....	99,840	-----	76,800
South Carolina.....	295,040	-----	359,040
South Dakota.....	327,040	-----	-----
Tennessee.....	182,400	-----	-----
Texas.....	2,364,800	-----	2,466,560
Utah.....	1,644,800	-----	-----
Vermont.....	211,840	-----	-----
Virginia.....	586,240	-----	215,040
Washington.....	777,600	-----	300,800
West Virginia.....	58,240	-----	-----
Wisconsin.....	920,960	6,439,680	-----
Wyoming.....	261,120	-----	-----
Total.....	28,960,640	38,595,840	17,029,120

¹ Areas of the United States, 1940, 16th Census of the United States (Government Printing Office, 1942), p. 2, et seq. The figures are very approximate but are absolute minimums.

² World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1947, published by the New York World-Telegram (1947), p. 138; Serial No. 22, Department of Commerce, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, November 1915. In figuring the marginal sea area, only original State boundaries have been used. These coincide with the 3-mile limit for all States except Texas, Louisiana, and Florida gulf coast. In the latter cases, the 3-league limit as established before or at the time of entry into the Union has been used.

Coastline of the United States, July 1943

Locality	Length in statute miles		
	General coast-line	Tidal shore-line, general	Tidal shore-line, detailed
Maine.....	228	676	3,478
New Hampshire.....	13	14	131
Massachusetts.....	192	453	1,519
Rhode Island.....	40	156	384
Connecticut.....	-----	96	618
New York.....	127	470	1,850
New Jersey.....	130	398	1,792
Pennsylvania.....	-----	-----	89
Delaware.....	28	79	381
Maryland.....	31	452	3,190
Virginia.....	112	567	3,315
North Carolina.....	301	1,030	3,375
South Carolina.....	187	758	2,876
Georgia.....	100	603	2,344
Florida:			
Atlantic.....	399	618	3,035
Gulf.....	798	1,658	5,391
Total.....	1,197	2,276	8,426
Alabama.....	53	199	6,027
Mississippi.....	44	155	359
Louisiana.....	397	985	7,721

*Coastline of the United States, July 1948—
Continued*

Locality	Length in statute miles		
	General coast-line	Tidal shore-line, general	Tidal shore-line, detailed
Texas.....	367	1,100	3,359
California.....	840	1,190	3,427
Oregon.....	296	312	1,410
Washington.....	157	908	3,026
Atlantic coast.....	1,888	6,370	28,377
Gulf coast.....	1,659	4,097	17,437
Pacific coast.....	1,293	2,410	7,863
United States.....	4,840	12,877	53,677

The Coast and Geodetic Survey receives numerous requests for data on lengths of coastline and tidal shoreline of the United States and its Territories and possessions. As a result, graphic measurements have been made from time to time on maps of various scales and in units of various lengths. The three types of measurement selected for publication at this time are explained in the following paragraphs.

GENERAL COASTLINE

The figures under this heading are lengths of the general outline of the seacoast. The measurements were made with a unit measure of 30 minutes of latitude on charts as near the scale of 1:1,200,000 as possible. The shoreline of bays and sounds is included to a point where such waters narrow to the width of the unit measure, and the distance across at such point is included.

TIDAL SHORELINE, GENERAL

Measurements under the heading were made with a unit measure of three statute miles on charts of 1:200,000 and 1:400,000 scale when available. The shoreline of bays, sounds, and other bodies of water is included to a point where such waters narrow to a width of 3 statute miles, and the distance across at such point is included.

TIDAL SHORELINE, DETAILED

The figures under this heading were obtained in 1939-40 with a recording measure on the largest scale maps and charts then available. Shoreline of bays, sounds, and other bodies of water is included to the head of tidewater, or to a point where such waters narrow to a width of 100 feet.

*Shoreline, general, Great Lakes, United States
side only*

By States:	
Minnesota.....	165
Wisconsin.....	645
Illinois.....	57
Indiana.....	42
Michigan.....	2,302
Ohio.....	193
New York.....	351
Pennsylvania.....	45
Total.....	3,805
By lakes:	
Ontario.....	255
Niagara River.....	27
Lake Erie.....	336
Lake St. Clair-St. Clair River and Detroit River.....	144
Lake Huron.....	678
Lake Michigan.....	1,309
Lake Superior.....	1,056
Total.....	3,805

These measurements are on the same basis as the center column of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey coastline table, July 1948.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the first table sets out the approximate number of acres of submerged land

within State boundaries, divided into inland waters, Great Lakes, and the marginal sea.

The compilation has already been placed in the RECORD, but in order that we may have one terse statement covering the different groups of lands, let me say that in the marginal sea—namely, in the area just off the coast—there are involved a total of 17,029,000 acres of land.

In the area of the Great Lakes there is a much greater acreage involved, being a total of more than 38,595,000 acres.

In the area of the inland waters generally, including, of course, rivers, bays, ports, and harbors, and all the other areas of both salt and fresh water which lie within State boundaries and which are not included in either of the other classifications, there is a total of 28,960,000 acres.

It will thus appear in the very first instance, Mr. President, that though the coastal belt outside the States extending out into the Atlantic Ocean, the gulf, and the Pacific Ocean, has been most discussed and necessarily will be most discussed in the debate, when it comes to the areas affected, that belt contains only 17,000,000 acres, whereas 38,000,000 acres, or more than twice that amount are in the submerged lands of the Great Lakes which belong to the Great Lakes States, and there is a total of nearly 29,000,000 acres in the inland waters that are not a part of the coastal belt or of the Great Lakes.

The second of the tables which have been inserted simply shows the classification of the coastline around from the Pacific to the gulf and to the Atlantic, a total of 4,840 miles, practically 5,000 miles, on the outside perimeters of our 20 coastal States.

As to the shoreline of the Great Lakes, which is the third belt indicated in one of the tables inserted in the RECORD, it is shown that there are 3,805 miles of shoreline of the Great Lakes, which belong to or comprise the shoreline of the eight Great Lakes States. So it is rather clearly indicated that there is a very large and substantial mileage of frontage, as well as of submerged area, involved in the Great Lakes, as well as on the outside in the coastal belts.

It will be noted that the total marginal sea area involved amounts to approximately one one-hundred-and-fourteenth of the total area of the United States—total area of the United States is 3,022,387 square miles. The second and third tables, which were prepared by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, deal with the shoreline of the United States and the shoreline of the Great Lakes on the United States side.

We all know that the 82d Congress passed a measure last year which was similar to Senate Joint Resolution 13, but it was vetoed. That measure passed the Senate by a vote of 50 to 35, but, including those Senators who declared their position on the record but did not actually vote, the division of the Senate was 57 to 36. The measure was later agreed to by the Senate-House conferees and the conference report was adopted by both Houses. The House

vote on the adoption of this report was 247 to 89, or nearly 3 to 1. I believe that the sentiment for the Senate measure is stronger in both Houses this year than it was last, and the public statements of President Eisenhower leave no doubt that he supports the principles embodied in the pending joint resolution.

Incidentally, in the House action of a few days ago, approving a House measure on this subject, the vote for the measure was a little heavier and the vote against it a little lighter than was the case with respect to similar votes in the last Congress upon the House measure which was passed at that time.

In 1946 the Congress recognized the States' claim to the tidelands by passing a joint resolution similar to Senate Joint Resolution 13, which was also vetoed by President Truman.

As a matter of fact, Congress has held some type of hearing on the question of title to submerged lands on 16 occasions in the last 15 years, and there have been 7,162 printed pages of evidentiary material presented for the consideration of the various committees.

The point I make now is that this matter has been so thoroughly considered on so many occasions by the Congress that it should be unnecessary to spend valuable time in extensive debate when so many issues of national importance require our attention.

As Senators know, there are 40 cosponsors of the proposed legislation, and we find our support coming from every section of the country and including many nationwide organizations whose dignity and patriotism cannot be questioned. In order to conserve time, I should like to insert as part of my remarks a partial list of these supporting organizations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED LEGISLATION RESTORING STATE OWNERSHIP OF SUBMERGED LANDS

The Council of State Governments; the Governors' Conference; National Association of Attorneys General; National Association of Public Land Officials; National Association of County Officials; National Conference of Mayors; American Association of Port Authorities; the American Bar Association; American Title Association; United States Chamber of Commerce; United States Junior Chamber of Commerce; National Water Conservation Conference; American Municipal Association (representing 10,150 municipalities); National Institute of Municipal Law Officers; National Association of Secretaries of State; National Reclamation Associations; State Bar Association of California; State Bar Association of Texas; State Bar Association of Louisiana; State Bar Association of Oklahoma; National Sand and Gravel Association; National Association of Real Estate Boards; National Ready Mix Concrete Association; Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities; Great Lakes Harbor Association; Western States Land Commissioners' Association (12 States); Western States Council (representing chambers of commerce in the 11 Western States); Western Meat Packers' Association; Illinois State Chamber of Commerce; Missouri State Chamber of Commerce; Idaho State Chamber of Commerce; Baltimore Chamber of Commerce; Florida State Chamber of Commerce; United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (Washington, D. C.); Southern States Industrial Council; Board of Public Works of West

Virginia; Public Lands Corporation of West Virginia; Interstate Oil Compact Commission; Department of Conservation of Michigan.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that representatives of State governments from 47 of the 48 States have testified before the various committees of Congress in favor of restoring the submerged lands within State boundaries to the respective States, and that not one witness representing a State government has testified at any time before a committee in opposition to the theory of Senate Joint Resolution 13. I should like at this time to insert as part of my remarks a list of officials of States and their political subdivisions recorded in the hearings held before the committees of Congress between 1938 and 1952 who have testified in favor of State ownership of submerged lands within their boundaries. The list also includes resolutions adopted by various States with respect to this problem. However, it does not include resolutions recently adopted by State legislatures, nor the names of those who testified this year before the Senate and House committees on this matter.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICIALS OF STATES AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS RECORDED IN THE HEARINGS HELD BEFORE THE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS FROM 1938 TO 1952, AND FAVORING STATE OWNERSHIP OF SUBMERGED LANDS

ALABAMA

1939: State legislature, resolution.
1945: William N. McQueen, attorney general; Gessner T. McGorvey, special assistant attorney general.
1948: James E. Folsom, Governor; Kenneth J. Griffith, Governor's legal representative.
1949: James E. Folsom, Governor.
1951: State legislature, resolution.

ARIZONA

1949: Fred O. Wilson, attorney general.
1950: Fred O. Wilson, attorney general.

ARKANSAS

1945: Guy E. Williams, attorney general; Claude A. Rankin, State land commissioner.
1946: Guy E. Williams, attorney general.
1948: Guy E. Williams, attorney general.

CALIFORNIA

1938: Markell C. Baer, port attorney, port of Oakland.
1939: Culbert L. Olsen, Governor; Earl Warren, attorney general; George Trammell, city attorney, Long Beach; Harry R. Johnson, consultant, Long Beach Harbor Commission; Clyde M. Leach, assistant city attorney, city of Los Angeles, and Los Angeles Harbor Commission; Percy Hecendorff, district attorney, Santa Barbara County; Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners; California State Port Authority; board of supervisors, Santa Barbara County; Oakland Board of Port Commissioners.

1945: Robert W. Kenny, attorney general; W. W. Clary, special assistant attorney general; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; Carlyle F. Lynton, executive officer, State lands commission; Arthur Eldridge, harbor commissioner, Los Angeles.

1946: Arthur H. Breed, Jr., State senator; Carlyle F. Lynton, executive officer, State lands commission; Robert W. Kenny, attorney general; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; W. Reginald Jones, port attorney, port of Oakland; Fletcher Bowron, mayor, Los Angeles; board of supervisors, San Joaquin County; port district, Stockton.

1948: Earl Warren, Governor; State legislature, resolution; Arthur H. Breed, Jr., State

senator; Oliver J. Carter, State senator; Fred N. Howser, attorney general; Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; W. Reginald Jones, representing city of Oakland, board of port commissioners, and Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities; Arthur W. Nordstrom, assistant city attorney, Los Angeles; Dion R. Holm, chief counsel, public utilities commission, city and county of San Francisco; J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer, State lands commission; State park commission, resolution; City Council of Long Beach; Harbor Commission, San Diego; Fletcher Bowron, mayor, Los Angeles; Los Angeles City Council, resolution; Clyde A. Dorsey, city manager, Monterey.

1949: State legislature, resolution; Hon. Earl Warren, Governor; Hon. Fred N. Howser, attorney general; E. W. Mattoon, assistant attorney general; J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer, State lands commission; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; Arthur W. Nordstrom, assistant city attorney, Los Angeles City and board of harbor commissioners.

1950: Hon. Earl Warren, Governor; Hon. Fred N. Howser, attorney general; Everett W. Mattoon, assistant attorney general; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; Arthur W. Nordstrom, assistant city attorney, Los Angeles City and board of harbor commissioners; W. Reginald Jones, American Association of Port Authorities and port of Oakland; J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer, State lands commission.

1951: State legislature, resolution; Earl Warren, Governor; Goodwin J. Knight, Lieutenant Governor; Edmund G. Brown, attorney general; Everett W. Mattoon, assistant attorney general; Rufus W. Putnam, executive officer, State lands commission; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach.

COLORADO

1945: H. Lawrence Hinkley, attorney general.
1946: H. Lawrence Hinkley, attorney general.
1948: Lee Knous, Governor; H. Lawrence Hinkley, attorney general.

CONNECTICUT

1945: Francis A. Pallotti, attorney general; Harry L. Brooks, assistant attorney general.
1946: Harry L. Brooks, assistant attorney general.
1948: William L. Hadden, attorney general; Nicholas F. Rago, assistant attorney general.
1949: William L. Hadden, attorney general.

DELAWARE

1945: Clair J. Killoran, attorney general.
1946: Clair J. Killoran, attorney general; Vincent J. Theisen, assistant attorney general.
1948: Albert W. James, attorney general.
1949: Elbert N. Carvel, Governor; Albert W. James, attorney general.
1950: Albert W. James, attorney general.

FLORIDA

1938: Lawrence A. Truett, assistant attorney general; Fred Elliott, engineer for trustees, Florida internal improvement fund.
1939: Lawrence A. Truett, assistant attorney general; Fred Elliott, engineer for trustees, Florida internal improvement fund.
1945: J. Tom Watson, attorney general.
1946: J. Tom Watson, attorney general; Sumter Leitner, assistant attorney general; E. B. Leatherman, clerk, and H. S. Sweering, deputy clerk, Dade County Commissioners.
1948: Millard F. Caldwell, Governor; Sumter Leitner, assistant attorney general; State legislature, resolution.

1949: Richard W. Ervin, attorney general; Ralph Odum, assistant attorney general; State legislature, resolution.

1950: Richard W. Ervin, attorney general.

GEORGIA

1945: T. Grady Head, attorney general.
1948: M. E. Thompson, Governor; Eugene Cook, attorney general.

IDAHO

1945: Frank Langley, attorney general.
1946: Frank Langley, attorney general.

ILLINOIS

1945: George F. Barrett, attorney general.
1946: Dwight H. Green, Governor.
1948: Dwight H. Green, Governor; E. Roy Wells, chief engineer, Illinois Postwar Planning Commission.

INDIANA

1945: James M. Emmert, attorney general.
1946: James M. Emmert, attorney general.
1948: Cleon H. Foust, attorney general.

IOWA

1945: John M. Rankin, attorney general.
1948: Robert D. Blue, Governor; Robert L. Larson, attorney general.
1949: Robert L. Larson, attorney general.

KANSAS

1945: A. E. Mitchell, attorney general.
1948: Frank Carlson, Governor; Edward F. Arn, attorney general.
1949: Harold R. Fatzner, attorney general.
1950: Harold R. Fatzner, attorney general.

KENTUCKY

1945: Eldon S. Dummit, attorney general.
1946: Eldon S. Dummit, attorney general.
1948: A. E. Funk, attorney general.
1949: A. E. Funk, attorney general.
1950: A. E. Funk, attorney general.

LOUISIANA

1938: Gaston L. Porterie, attorney general; Joseph A. Loret, assistant attorney general.
1939: David M. Ellison, attorney general; Joseph A. Loret, special assistant attorney general.

1945: Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general; John L. Madden, assistant attorney general; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office.
1946: J. H. Davis, Governor; Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general; B. A. Hardey, State mineral board; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish.

1948: State legislature, resolution; Kenneth C. Barranger, member of legislature; Henry C. Sevier, member of legislature; James H. Davis, Governor; Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general; John L. Madden, special assistant attorney general; B. A. Hardey, State mineral board; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish.

1949: Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., attorney general; John L. Madden, assistant attorney general; L. H. Perez, special assistant to the attorney general; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; O. G. Collins, chairman, State mineral board; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish; de Lesseps S. Morrison, mayor, New Orleans.

1950: William J. Dodd, Lieutenant Governor; Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., attorney general; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish; James W. Ellis, special attorney, State mineral board.

1951: Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., Attorney General; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish.

MAINE

1945: Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.
1946: Horace Hildreth, Governor; Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.
1948: Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.
1949: Frederick Payne, Governor; Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General; State legislature, resolution.
1950: Frederick Payne, Governor; Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.

MARYLAND

1945: William C. Walsh, Attorney General; Hall Hammond, deputy attorney general; Simon E. Sobeloff, city solicitor, Baltimore.

1946: William Curran, attorney general; George P. Drury, assistant attorney general; Simon E. Sobeloff, city solicitor, Baltimore.

1948: William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor; Hall Hammond, attorney general.

1949: Hall Hammond, attorney general and chairman, submerged lands committee, National Association of Attorneys General; State legislature, resolution.

1950: Hall Hammond, attorney general and chairman, submerged lands committee, National Association of Attorneys General.

1951: Hall Hammond, attorney general.

MASSACHUSETTS

1939: Daniel J. Doherty, assistant attorney general.

1945: Clarence A. Barnes, attorney general; Hirsh Freed, assistant corporation counsel, Boston.

1946: Ernest W. Barnes, department of conservation; George Leary, special assistant, corporation counsel, Boston; Grant E. Morse, Randolph A. Frothingham, and Glenn G. Clark, selectmen of Salisbury.

1948: Nathaniel B. Bidwell, special assistant attorney general; George Leary, special assistant corporation counsel, Boston.

MICHIGAN

1945: John R. Dethmers, attorney general.

1946: Harry F. Kelly, Governor; John R. Dethmers, attorney general.

1948: State legislature, resolution; Kim Sigler, Governor; Maurice M. Moule, assistant attorney general; P. J. Hoffmaster, director, department of conservation.

1949: Stephen J. Roth, attorney general; Nicholas V. Olds, assistant attorney general.

1950: Nicholas V. Olds, assistant attorney general.

MINNESOTA

1945: J. A. A. Burnquist, attorney general.

1946: Ed. J. Thyne, governor, city council St. Paul.

1948: Luther W. Youngdahl, governor; J. A. A. Burnquist, attorney general; John H. Burwell, special assistant to the attorney general.

1949: John E. Burwell, assistant attorney general.

MISSISSIPPI

1938: Greek Rice, attorney general.

1945: Greek Rice, attorney general.

1946: Greek Rice, attorney general.

1948: Greek Rice, attorney general, State legislature, resolution.

MONTANA

1945: R. V. Bottomly, attorney general.

NEBRASKA

1945: Walter R. Johnson, attorney general.

1948: Walter R. Johnson, attorney general and chairman, submerged lands committee, National Association of Attorneys General.

NEVADA

1945: Alan Bible, attorney general.

1946: Alan Bible, attorney general.

1948: Alan Bible, attorney general.

1950: Alan Bible, attorney general and president, National Association of Attorneys General.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1945: Harold K. Davison, attorney general.

1946: Ernest R. D'Amours, assistant attorney general.

1948: Ernest R. D'Amours, attorney general.

1949: Sherman Adams, governor.

NEW JERSEY

1938: Robert Leeward, assistant attorney general.

1939: State legislature, resolution; council, Borough of Stone Harbor, resolution.

1945: Walter D. Van Riper, attorney general.

1946: Walter D. Van Riper, attorney general.

1948: Russell E. Watson, counsel to the governor.

1949: Alfred E. Driscoll, governor; Theodore D. Parsons, attorney general; Robert Peacock, deputy attorney general.

1950: Theodore D. Parsons, attorney general.

NEW MEXICO

1945: Clyde C. McCulloh, attorney general.

1948: Thomas J. Mabry, Governor; Clyde C. McCulloh, attorney general; Hiram M. Dow, Interstate Oil Co. Commission.

NEW YORK

1938: John J. Bennett, Jr., attorney general; Warren H. Gilman, assistant attorney general; Albany Port District Commission, resolution; Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., associate counsel, Port of New York.

1939: John J. Bennett, Jr., attorney general; Warren H. Gilman, assistant attorney general; State Council of Parks, resolution.

1945: Nathaniel L. Goldstein, attorney general; Orrin Judd, solicitor general; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York and representing American Association of Port Authorities.

1946: Orrin Judd, solicitor general; State legislature, resolution; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York.

1948: Thomas E. Dewey, Governor; Nathaniel L. Goldstein, attorney general; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York; William O'Dwyer, mayor, New York City.

1949: Nathaniel L. Goldstein, attorney general; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York.

1951: State legislature, resolution.

NORTH CAROLINA

1945: Harry McMullan, attorney general; Hughes J. Rhodes, assistant attorney general.

1946: Hughes J. Rhodes, assistant attorney general.

1948: R. Gregg Cherry, Governor; Harry McMullan, attorney general.

1949: State legislature, resolution; W. Scott Kerr, Governor; Harry McMullan, attorney general.

NORTH DAKOTA

1945: Nels G. Johnson, attorney general.

1946: Nels G. Johnson, attorney general.

1948: Fred G. Aandahl, Governor; Nels G. Johnson, attorney general.

OHIO

1939: Port commission; City Council, Ashtabula.

1945: Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general.

1946: Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general.

1948: Thomas J. Herbert, Governor; Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general.

OKLAHOMA

1945: Randall S. Cobb, attorney general.

1946: Robert S. Kerr, Governor; Mac Q. Williamson, attorney general; J. Walker Field, assistant attorney general.

1948: Mac Q. Williamson, attorney general; State Land Office Commission, resolution.

OREGON

1939: I. H. Van Winkle, attorney general.

1945: George Neuner, attorney general; John H. Burgard, chairman, commission of public docks, Portland.

1946: George D. LaRoche, general manager, commission of public docks, Portland; Lewis D. Griffith, clerk, State land board.

1948: George Neuner, attorney general.

1949: State legislature, resolution; Douglas McKay, governor; George Neuner, attorney general.

1950: George Neuner, attorney general.

PENNSYLVANIA

1945: James H. Duff, attorney general; Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general; Frank P. Truscott, city solicitor, Philadelphia.

1946: Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general.

1948: Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general.

1949: James H. Duff, governor; T. McKeen Chidsey, attorney general.

1950: Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general.

RHODE ISLAND

1945: John H. Nolan, attorney general; John J. Cooney, assistant attorney general.

1946: John H. Nolan, attorney general.

1948: John O. Pastore, governor; John H. Nolan, attorney general.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1945: John M. Daniel, attorney general.

1946: T. C. Callison, assistant attorney general.

1948: J. Strom Thurmond, governor; John M. Daniel, attorney general.

1949: John M. Daniel, attorney general; T. C. Callison, assistant attorney general.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1945: George T. Mickelson, attorney general.

1946: George T. Mickelson, attorney general.

1918: George T. Mickelson, governor; Sigvard Anderson, attorney general.

TENNESSEE

1945: Roy H. Beeler, attorney general.

1948: Jim N. McCord, governor; Roy H. Beeler, attorney general; William F. Barry, solicitor general.

1949: Jim N. McCord, governor; Roy H. Beeler, attorney general; William F. Barry, solicitor general.

1950: Roy H. Beeler, attorney general.

TEXAS

1938: James V. Allred, governor; William McGraw, attorney general.

1939: Gerald C. Mann, attorney general; R. W. Fairchild, assistant attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office; Homer C. DeWolfe, member, State board of education.

1945: Grover Sellers, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1946: Grover Sellers, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1948: Beauford H. Jester, Governor; Price Daniel, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1949: Allan Shivers, Governor; Price Daniel, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1950: Price Daniel, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office, and chairman, school land board.

1951: Allan Shivers, Governor; Price Daniel, attorney general.

UTAH

1939: Joseph Chez, attorney general.

1945: Grover A. Giles, attorney general.

1948: Herbert B. Maw, Governor.

VERMONT

1945: Alban J. Parker, attorney general.

1946: Mortimer R. Proctor, Governor.

1948: Clifton G. Parker, attorney general.

VIRGINIA

1939: State Port Authority, resolution.

1945: Abram P. Staples, attorney general; Herbert Wade, director, State port authority.

1946: Abram P. Staples, attorney general.

1948: William M. Tuck, Governor.

1950: State legislature resolution.

WASHINGTON

1945: J. J. Underwood, port of Seattle and port of Tacoma; Seattle Port Authority, resolution; G. W. Osgood, port of Tacoma manager; Otto A. Case, commissioner, State department of public lands.

1946: Harold A. Pebbles, chief assistant to the attorney general; Warren D. Lampport, general manager, port of Seattle; Donald Macleay, Tacoma Port Authority.

1948: Frank O. Sether, assistant commissioner of public lands.

1949: Arthur B. Langley, Governor; Smith Troy, attorney general.

1950: Smith Troy, attorney general.

WEST VIRGINIA

1945: Ira J. Partlow, attorney general.

1946: James Kay Thomas, assistant attorney general.

1948: Clarence W. Meadors, Governor; Ira J. Partlow, attorney general.

WISCONSIN

1939: Common Council, city of Milwaukee, resolution.

1945: John E. Martin, attorney general; Harry C. Brockel, port manager, city of Milwaukee; C. W. Babcock, city attorney, Milwaukee.

1946: Walter S. Goodland, Governor; Harry C. Brockel, port manager, city of Milwaukee.

1948: Oscar Rennebohm, Governor; John E. Martin, attorney general; John Bohn, mayor, Milwaukee; Mrs. Walter J. Mattison, city attorney, Milwaukee; Harry C. Brockel, port director, city of Milwaukee; commissioners, city of Milwaukee.

WYOMING

1945: Louis J. O'Marr, attorney general.

1948: Lester C. Hunt, Governor.

WHY INLAND WATERS AND GREAT LAKES ARE INCLUDED

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before concluding my preliminary remarks, and yielding to questions at that time, I shall discuss briefly a question which has been raised by many disinterested people, who really desire to know the facts, as to why inland waters and the waters of the Great Lakes are included within the joint resolution.

In answer to the questions as to our reasons for including in our joint resolution the inland waters and the Great Lakes, I may say that the long recognized rule of law applicable to the inland waters and submerged lands of every State has been seriously undermined, and State and private titles have been badly clouded by the three Supreme Court decisions under which, to quote the majority opinion of Mr. Justice Black in the California case, the States have "a qualified ownership of lands under inland navigable waters." The Federal Government clearly indicated the possibility of future attacks on the inland waters in various comments in its brief in the California case.

I invite particular attention to the compilation of hostile remarks appearing in the brief filed by Federal counsel in the California case. On page 11 of their brief, the Federal attorneys said:

We submit that ownership of submerged lands is not related to sovereignty at all, but that the decision of this Court dealing with the tidelands and lands under inland waters have proceeded upon a false premise.

The board of governors of the American Bar Association has sounded a clear warning on the same subject.

Again, on page 72 of the Government's brief in the California case, the rule with respect to tidelands and inland waters is attacked as being erroneous and unsound. At other places in the brief, the rule is called unsound, erroneous, wrong, patently unsound, fallacy, and a legal fiction—pages 143, 144, 148, 150, and 153.

The values involved in developments located on inland waters are immense. As just one illustration, the Commis-

sioner of Public Works of New York City, Mr. Robert Moses, testified at the hearing this year, page 139, that the value of the 160 city piers and improvements standing on reclaimed lands is \$350 million. He also said that there are approximately the same number of privately owned piers. Taking the Nation as a whole, there are undoubtedly several billion dollars worth of port facilities alone, located on inland waters or on built-up lands which were once inland waters, so that it is easy to understand why the attorneys general, municipal officers, port authorities, and other similar officials, are deeply concerned in this fight and are insistent that the Congress shall effectually release to the States and their grantees all property rights in the inland waters and their beds, saving only to the Federal Government those rights which will enable it to perform its constitutional functions.

I mentioned the grantees of State governments. In my humble judgment, so far as the developed lands in the inland waters are concerned, including, of course, inland salt waters, lands not in the coastal belt, and the developed lands belonging to private grantees, their value will greatly exceed the value of public developments because there are literally tens of thousands of such developments throughout the inland waters of our Nation.

In regard to the Great Lakes, it is enlightening to note what Mr. Perlman, former Solicitor General of the United States, had to say concerning the Great Lakes when testifying before the House Judiciary Committee in 1949 on H. R. 5991 and H. R. 5992. In answer to the question, "Are the Great Lakes construed to be inland waters?" Mr. Perlman stated:

Attorney General Clark testified last year that personally he regards the Great Lakes as inland waters. Do you ask me what the Department of Justice thinks about it now? I think that the Great Lakes are probably inland waters—if I may speak for the Department of Justice on that subject. But I do not think that the decision of that question has any part in this bill, and the question ought not to be attempted to be resolved in this bill, and I want to tell you why. The Great Lakes can be regarded as inland waters. But there is one problem there that ought not to be too hastily settled by legislation. There is an international boundary line that runs through some of these lakes.

I interpolate to say, through all of the Great Lakes except Lake Michigan. I continue the quotation from Mr. Perlman:

The only question that now disturbs us in the matter in which it is sought to settle this thing in a casual, offhand way is the question as to what would happen if something was discovered in the future, in the beds of those lakes, that became vital to the continued existence, either of our country or of the then Canadian Government. We do not know. We do not think that the question as to what should happen in an area in which an international boundary line is drawn should be resolved in this offhand manner. We think the Congress ought to study that question—

Going back for a moment, I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Perlman himself, then serving as Solicitor

General, stated as his reason for unwillingness to put in a quitclaim bill which covered inland waters, the waters and bottoms of the Great Lakes—

the question as to what would happen if something was discovered in the future, in the beds of those lakes, that became vital to the continued existence, either of our country or of the then Canadian Government.

We do not need to have any more red flags hung out than that statement of a distinguished lawyer, then serving as Solicitor General, made to a committee of the Congress of the reasons why he was unwilling to have the beds of the Great Lakes quitclaimed, as were the beds of the inland waters in the measure being discussed, his reason being that he thought probably something of vital importance to our Nation or to Canada might be discovered in the future, and if so, he did not want to make effective any quitclaim deed away from the Federal Government preceding such discovery. The implication is so clear that it is unnecessary to draw it. He wanted the situation to remain such that the same rule asserted with reference to the California, Texas, and Louisiana submerged lands in the cases affecting those States might also be asserted in the matter of the discovery of any vital mineral or other resources in the beds of the Great Lakes.

Before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 82d Congress, while testifying on S. 940, Mr. Perlman said:

We were asked in the previous hearing why we did not include the Great Lakes, and I think I said then that the question had not been considered. There had not been any controversy developed over the Great Lakes and the shores of the Great Lakes, and, as long as there was no controversy, we did not want to be in the position of attempting to resolve that question in advance. It is true that an international boundary line does run through the most of the Great Lakes, and it might be that some time or other the interest of the United States against a foreign country might be involved, but as long as there was no controversy over the bed of those lakes, we did not see any purpose served by attempting to resolve it.

Again, in a different year, in a different appearance, before a different committee, Mr. Perlman made it very clear that he was holding out against quitclaiming the beds of the Great Lakes, because he thought certain things might possibly happen in the future which would make it desirable for the Federal Government to retain ownership or claim of right of ownership in the beds of the Great Lakes.

The language of Mr. Perlman points up the fact that there is doubt as to whether the Great Lakes constitute inland waters and even greater cause for apprehension on the part of States which contain portions of the beds of the Great Lakes than there is in the case of ordinary inland waters. I think that the need for the inclusion of the Great Lakes in this measure is so clearly established that further comment is unnecessary. Certainly the States bordering the Great Lakes are fully entitled to have their rights in the submerged lands under the Great Lakes specifically recognized by the Congress.

The testimony given at the hearing by Attorney General Frank G. Millard, of Michigan; Harry C. Brockel, secretary of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, and municipal port director of Milwaukee; and Herbert H. Neujoks, general counsel of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, showed clearly the great concern of the officials of the Great Lakes States, cities, and ports about this matter, and also established some of the multimillion dollar values which are involved in port and other public developments on filled areas that were formerly a part of the beds of the Great Lakes.

I shall not attempt to quote the various values given in the testimony of those three very fine witnesses, but I remember that one figure, which was given was \$55,000,000, applied to the value of the developments on submerged lands in the city of Milwaukee alone. That figure referred to publicly owned developments.

The deep concern of the inland State officials over the tidelands decisions is best shown by the fact that the governors, attorneys general, and other officials from practically every State of the Union have expressed their opinion that the decisions have clouded the long-asserted titles of the inland States to lands and natural resources below navigable waters within their boundaries.

I now gladly yield for questions on the introductory part of my remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his courtesy. I think the suggestion which he made, that he be permitted to speak uninterruptedly with respect to each major section, and then yield for questions upon each section, was very proper.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what is the precise boundary claimed by the State of Florida on its west coast?

Mr. HOLLAND. The precise boundary claimed by the State of Florida on its west mainland coast is 3 leagues, which is the equivalent of 9 sea miles, or nearly 10½ land miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does Florida also claim a boundary beyond 3 miles on its east coast?

Mr. HOLLAND. It does not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I invite the attention of the Senator from Florida to article I of the Constitution of Florida of 1868, which which he is doubtless familiar. It lays out the boundaries in the following language:

The boundaries of the State of Florida shall be as follows: Commencing at the mouth of the river Perdido * * * thence southwardly along the coast to the edge of the Gulf Stream; thence southwestwardly along the edge of the Gulf Stream.

How far off the east coast of Florida is the edge of the Gulf Stream?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that the courts of our own State have held that the edge of the Gulf Stream is not an invariable or fixed boundary, and therefore cannot be so used. The rule of law governing the boundary of Federal jurisdiction, extending for 3 miles, is applied to our

boundary off that entire coast of our State.

Not only have the courts of our State so ruled, but the legislature of our State, in various measures which have come before it and acts which have been passed by it, has so ruled and held. As a matter of fact, the boundaries of the counties which have been formed on the east coast, which extend out to a boundary in the Atlantic Ocean, in substance read "out to the boundary of the United States," which is understood as being 3 marine miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am somewhat at a loss to understand this matter. If the constitution of 1868 is appealed to as the binding precedent for setting the boundary on the west coast of the mainland of Florida, I cannot see why the constitution of 1868 is rejected so far as the eastern boundary of Florida is concerned. The constitution of 1868 specifically states that the boundary extends out to the Gulf Stream and along the edge of the Gulf Stream, which is certainly beyond a distance of 3 miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. That might be difficult for the distinguished Senator from Illinois to understand; but the courts of our State, the legislature of our State and the citizens of our State have tried to apply to this question what they thought was the rule of law and the rule of reason. They themselves, without asking for any determination of the question by the Federal authorities, have ruled that they do not have jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile line on the east coast of Florida, which I think is commendable of our people, rather than something to be used as a basis for scolding on the part of the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not scolding the Senator from Florida at all. I am merely trying to find out the facts and to understand the provisions of this bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, as applied to those facts. Can the Senator from Florida give assurance that the State of Florida will not in the future seek recognition for eastern boundaries out to the Gulf Stream?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows perfectly well that his State cannot properly make any such claim, because such a boundary is not a fixable boundary. Today it is at one place, and tomorrow it is at another place, depending upon currents, wind, and so forth. The Senator from Florida knows perfectly well that even if his State were sufficiently unwise to make such a claim, the first court it reached would knock the claim down. So I think the State of Florida was commendably wise in having decided, as it did a long time ago, that its boundaries on the east coast went out only to the 3-mile limit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the understanding of the Senator from Illinois correct that Florida's case for a 3-league or 10½-mile limit on the west coast is based first on the constitution of 1868?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct in the statement of his first plank.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Plus, secondly, the act of Congress of the same year which

permitted Florida and five other Southern States to have their Senators and Representatives readmitted to Congress?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is another point in the Senator's statement with which I agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Florida feel somewhat strange in pointing to the State constitution of 1868, when it was adopted by a constitutional convention set up under the first reconstruction act which barred from it those who had served in the Confederate Army, so that the convention was dominated by groups known as recently arrived carpetbaggers from the North and scalawags in the South? I am somewhat surprised at the Senator's pointing to the constitution of 1868 as a primary basis for the present boundary claims of Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that it is that constitution, as approved by Congress, which settles our rights in the matter. At least we think we can make a case of not having drafted the constitution from any unworthy or selfish motive, particularly when the Senator from Illinois makes such a strong case for the fact that the constitution was drafted by newly come citizens from Illinois and other good States throughout the United States who drew up the constitution for us.

Incidentally, Mr. President, that is the only good thing I can think of that happened to Southern States under the whole series of reconstruction acts of the time. I sincerely hope that the Senator from Illinois will not try to deprive that one southern State of the one good result that came out of that unfortunate experience of so many years ago, by questioning the State's right to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was merely somewhat surprised that the Senator from Florida should place such an air of sanctity and authority around the constitutional convention of Florida of 1868. But I pass from that point to another matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before the Senator from Illinois leaves that point, I should like to call his attention to the fact that Illinois figured rather prominently in the congressional debates on this question. As a matter of fact, it was an Illinois man who was not many months located in our State, who was the first presiding officer of the convention. He was chosen by a dozen or more of the first-arrived convention delegates to the constitutional convention. Unfortunately, he did not appeal to the majority of the members as a person who was proper material to head the convention. So later he was ousted, and another chairman was elected.

There was some feeling in Illinois about that action, because when the constitution reached the floor of Congress, Representatives from Illinois were very much disturbed about the mentioned action of the delegates at the constitutional convention, and moved that Florida be returned to territorial status.

Finally, a Representative in Congress, either from New York or from Massachusetts—Representatives from both

States were very friendly to us—rose and called a spade a spade. It will be remembered that Florida was not then represented in Congress and could not be heard on the subject. It was only after a considerable number of Representatives who tried to do right by Florida could be heard in Congress, notably Representatives from New York and Massachusetts, who were kindly disposed toward Florida, that the question was settled. As a matter of fact, those Representatives in Congress called attention to what was actually troubling some other Representatives. The trouble arose from the fact that the carpetbagger from Illinois who had been first elected to head the convention had been summarily fired as such, and the Members of the House did not think that the intemperate attitude of the Representatives from Illinois, based upon that occurrence, should prevail in Congress.

Eventually, the decision reached represented the attitude of Representatives from other States than those from the State of Illinois.

The Senator from Florida hopes that his distinguished friend from Illinois, with his usual generous approach to problems, will not consider it his duty to continue the vendetta of the Representatives from his good State against the State of Florida. Instead, the Senator from Florida hopes that the Senator from Illinois, in his accustomed generous approach to subjects before the Senate, will project his own consideration of the subject along the lines stated by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the carpetbagger from Illinois was a Republican, not a Democrat?

Mr. HOLLAND. On that point the Senator from Florida is unable to reply, because he did not look into the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He was a Republican.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is perfectly willing to concede, if the Senator from Illinois says so, that that is the case. I hope the present Senator from Illinois, a Democrat, has no intention of following or pursuing the hostile approach toward the State of Florida that was then the Republican approach.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; not at all. I believe that the reconstruction program carried through by the Republican Party under Ben Wade, Zach Chandler, and Charles Sumner was a great blot upon the United States, and set back the cause of unity very greatly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not leave out the name of Thaddeus Stevens.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would be willing to say that he was perhaps the most vindictive of them all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Florida to say that Congress recognized the boundaries of Florida when, somewhat later, in 1868, it passed the act admitting Florida and five other States to representation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida will certainly strongly assert that fact. He has read the debates, and he

knows that the very paragraph of the Constitution relating to the boundaries was not contested in the debates, which indicates rather strongly to the Senator from Florida that it was satisfactory.

The Senator from Florida noticed that all sorts of minor subjects did come up for debate; such as the salaries to be paid to constables and justices of the peace, the question as to which county officers were to be elected and which were to be appointed by the Governor, and of those to be appointed by the Governor, which were to be subjected to confirmation by the Senate and which were not to be subjected to confirmation by the Senate, and what the procedure was to be for amendment of the Constitution.

So many matters were debated that I believe it would be completely idle to say that the Constitution was not combed over with a fine-tooth comb. As a matter of fact, in the same debate, as the Senator from Illinois probably has discovered, if he has read the debate, Congress went so much into detail as to require that the State of Georgia, whose new constitution was then being considered, must go back and eliminate from its new constitution the so-called homestead exemption before its Representatives and Senators could be readmitted to their seats.

It is very clear, therefore, from the status of the debates in the Senate, and particularly in the House, as well as from newspaper files of the time, that in minute detail the Congress did go through all the provisions of the various new constitutions of the Southern States and subject them to a very complete sorting process before they were approved.

Mr. President, in closing this point, I may say that I hope the Senator from Illinois will not overlook the fact that Congress had imposed upon itself, by the passage of the act of 1867, under which the constitutions were redrafted, the condition that it must examine and approve the new constitutions before they could become operative. Other conditions, too, were placed in the act, which I do not believe need to be discussed at this time. Congress was so completely determined to prevail in its views of the respective State constitutions that it overrode the veto of President Andrew Johnson, after a very bitter and almost unparalleled debate as to the wisdom of the legislation, as the Senator from Illinois well knows.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the act of June 25, 1868, which granted representation in Congress to six Southern States, including Florida, made no mention whatsoever of boundaries, but merely stated that the constitutions were "republican"? The precise phrase was that these States had "framed constitutions of State government which are republican." Meaning that they had established a republican form of government; and in that connection I point out that the word "republican" is spelled with a small "r."

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, the Senator from Illinois is correct in this much of his statement: that the legislation passed in 1868 was short in its terms. But it was drafted, and so showed by its terms, to comply with the conditions set forth in the act of 1867, one of which

was examination and approval of the State constitutions.

Furthermore, if the Senator from Illinois has read the debates which occurred on that point, he knows that, not once, but several times in the course of the debates, it was stated that the State constitutions were approved and accepted by the congressional committees and by many Members of Congress who participated in the debate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Illinois will consent to my yielding for a moment to the Senator from Texas, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in connection with the same procedure of approving the constitution of the State of New Mexico when it was admitted to the Union, and without any mention of boundaries, the junior Senator from Texas would like to ask if the Supreme Court of the United States did not say that the admission of New Mexico into the Union by the Congress of the United States constituted an approval of the boundaries set up in the constitution of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Texas is completely correct. In the case of *New Mexico v. Texas* (276 U. S. 557) the Supreme Court said:

New Mexico, when admitted as a State in 1912, explicitly declared in its constitution that its boundary ran along said 32d parallel to the Rio Grande. This was confirmed by the United States by admitting New Mexico as a State with the line thus described as its boundary.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois and also to the distinguished Senator from Texas, to whom I am indebted for bringing up this enlightening point at this time, that the debate showed quite clearly that the question of boundaries had not been discussed in the debate which occurred at the time when the State of New Mexico was admitted.

But the admission of the State with a boundary stated in its constitution and the approval of its constitution in general terms was held by the United States Supreme Court as being specific approval of the boundary stated in the constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is a fact that the act of Congress of June 25, 1868, did not refer to boundaries in any way, but merely referred to a republican form of government. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct in that respect; but I believe he would be bound to admit, in fairness, that a perusal of the debate which occurred at that time shows that the discussion covered practically every other provision in the constitution except the boundary provision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very significant point.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, it went into the details of articles which had nothing at all to do with the question of whether the State had set up a

republican form of government. For instance, it dealt with the section which fixed salaries. Of what possible relation to the question of whether a republican form of government was created was the consideration of the long list of salaries which was set forth, beginning with the salary of the Governor, and going down to the salary of justice of the peace and the salary of constable, as those matters were discussed in the active debate which occurred at that time on the floor of the House of Representatives?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the fact that the boundaries were neither mentioned in the act nor mentioned in the debate indicate that Congress did not consider the boundaries? Is there not strong ground to contend, therefore, that Congress did not then in legal effect approve those claimed boundaries? As a matter of fact, the issue at that time, as the Senator from Florida well knows, was whether Negroes were being given the franchise effectively and whether the whites who had been in the Confederate forces were disfranchised. In 1867, Congress, acting in a vindictive spirit, passed the Reconstruction Act, to bar and to disfranchise the former members of the Confederate forces. It was this that the Congress wished to assure itself about, as well as to see that no acts of involuntary servitude would be passed by the States, thus bringing slavery in by the back door. The second point was a very proper one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Illinois is correct in his statement that those points he mentions were vital ones in connection with the procedure. However, the Senator from Illinois would be incorrect if he took the position that the entire constitution had not been submitted to the congressional committees and to both Houses of Congress and he knows that many provisions of the constitution which were not at all applicable to the question of whether the State as newly organized was under a republican form of government, were actually discussed during the course of the debate.

As I have already pointed out, in the same debate Congress went so far as to require as a condition precedent to readmission to representation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, in the case of the State of Georgia, that it strike from its constitution the provision relating to homestead exemption, and not include that provision in its new constitution. Of course, that question would have no possible relation to the fundamental question of whether the government of the State was republican.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that Florida was first admitted into the Union along with Iowa by the act of March 3, 1845?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that in the admission of both Florida and Iowa it was specifically stated that they were admitted on an equal footing with the original States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is again correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since, according to the contention of the Senator from

Florida, but not according to the contention of the Senator from Illinois, the original States could properly claim only a 3-mile boundary, how is it that Florida now can say that she has a 10½-mile boundary? Is it the position of the Senator from Florida that the equal-footing clause of 1845 is superseded by the proceedings of 1868?

Mr. HOLLAND. My contention is that the equal-footing clause has nothing whatever to do with the question of boundaries. As a matter of fact, various States have in their constitutions different kinds of provisions relative to boundaries. For instance, three of them have provisions, and I believe two of them have such provisions in their constitutions, fixing their boundaries at 3 English miles, rather than 3 sea miles; and, as the Senator from Illinois knows, the difference is about one-half a mile, as between the two classifications. There is no contention on the part of anyone that the equal-footing clause prevented any such action on the part of States, and there are many other essential questions of difference.

For instance, if the Senator from Illinois will consider his own State and the other Great Lakes States, he will find that by no means do the boundaries of his State and the boundaries of the other Great Lakes States extend equal distances into the Great Lakes. Instead, they extend to appropriate and convenient distances, to meet the boundaries of other States or to meet the international boundary with Canada.

So I do not believe the Senator from Illinois can properly be heard to say that the question of equal footing has any direct relationship whatever to any requirement that all the States must have identically the same boundaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the Texas case the Supreme Court said that since the Court had rejected the claim of California for ownership of and title to the submerged lands seaward to the 3-mile limit, certainly it could not approve ownership claims beyond 3 miles in the case of Texas, since Texas came in on an equal footing with the other States? Does not the same rule reasonably apply to Florida? Of course, the precise Florida case has never been before the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is incorrect in his reference to the Texas case. The question of equal footing had to do with the question of whether assets within the State boundaries should be the property of the State or the property of the Federal Government. The Supreme Court of the United States did not disturb in the slightest the boundaries of California, which extended only 3 English miles offshore; but the Supreme Court considered that case in reference to those boundaries, and made its finding on that basis. The Court did not disturb in the slightest the boundaries of Texas, which extended 3 leagues offshore. The Court went into the case of Louisiana, and there was some discussion of the 27-mile boundary of Louisiana, which had been fixed or had been attempted to be fixed by State statute. The Court did not even interfere with that.

The equal-footing reference upon which the Senator from Illinois is relying relates in no sense whatever to boundaries. To the contrary, different boundaries prevailed with reference to all three of the States which were involved in the three cases before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The equal-footing clause had to do with the question of whether the Federal Government or the State government owned the various property rights in the coastal belt from mean low water out to the State boundaries, wherever they were.

If the Senator from Illinois will carefully read the three decisions, he will find that the Supreme Court did not in the slightest degree either disturb the actual location or question the existence of State boundaries in any of those three cases, applicable to those three States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, it is true that the issue before the Court was, and the issue before the Senate is, the ownership of and title in the submerged lands out to the State boundaries, wherever they may be. I was interested in exploring the question of what the Court might do in applying this bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, to the facts in the Florida situation and to its boundary claims in the light of the equal-footing clause.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say here that the Supreme Court had no trouble at all accommodating its philosophy to the three different cases, which I state again are the case of California, where the boundary by its constitution was 3 English miles off the coast; the case of Texas, whose boundary, determined long before its admission to the Union, and recognized at the time of its admission to the Union, was 3 leagues offshore; and the case of Louisiana, as to which there is a 3-marine-mile limitation, although the State had endeavored to extend its boundary 27 miles, or 24 additional miles, into the Gulf of Mexico. The Supreme Court had no difficulty at all fitting its philosophy into those 3 completely varying cases as to the question of where the boundaries were.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They were consistent in denying all three States claims, not in accepting them all, as the Senator from Florida has said.

Mr. HOLLAND. They were consistent as to the States of Texas and Louisiana, by not even questioning the jurisdiction of the two States. But, to the contrary, the Senator will find words which seem to approve the jurisdiction, for other purposes, of the two States of Texas and Louisiana. So that the Senator from Illinois has, for once, barked up the wrong tree. The question of equal rights—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Equal footing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Thank you. The question of equal footing relates not at all to the question of boundaries, but to the question of the type of rights granted to the various States, or permitted under Federal law to exist in the various States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota has been very much interested in the discussion, and is interested in the

map which the Senator from Florida has exhibited to the Senate. There is one matter on which I should like to have the Senator comment. The State of Louisiana, of course, was a part of the Louisiana Purchase, which embraced a great area running northward, as shown on the map, and of which my State of South Dakota was a part. What authority cut off the landward side of Louisiana to the north?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Federal Government, of course.

Mr. CASE. If the Federal Government has cut off the landward side of Louisiana to the north, can it not likewise cut off on the landward side of Louisiana seaward?

Mr. HOLLAND. It could have done so. At the time it admitted Louisiana to the Union it did not see fit to do so.

Mr. CASE. If it did not do so, do not the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and the straight area I point out on the map, which was a part of the Louisiana Purchase, have an inherent right to whatever mineral rights or whatever other rights may exist seaward on the coast side of Louisiana?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota would, I think, be able to make a good case for his State, along with other States of the Union, as to areas beyond State boundaries if they had been given away. As to areas within State boundaries, I think the Senator would have no more right to claim property rights there for his State than he would to claim property rights in the waters of the Mississippi River where they flow through Louisiana or property rights in the great swamps of Louisiana which were conveyed to Louisiana under the Swamp and Overflowed Land Act, or property rights in any of the other portions of Louisiana.

Mr. CASE. If the Federal Government can cut off Louisiana to the north, it is difficult for the Senator from South Dakota to understand why it cannot do so to the south.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota has a point there of course. If the Federal Government had been willing to create a State that was not on equal footing with the other States, when it admitted Louisiana it could have specifically refused to grant it any offshore boundary, or any rights to property within that offshore boundary. But the Federal Government did not see fit to do that. The Federal Government granted to Louisiana, under its enabling act, an offshore boundary extending, as I recall, 3 marine miles into the gulf, along with the ownership of islands a considerably greater distance in the gulf. Those matters were within the jurisdiction of Congress, and the Congress acted, and the State of Louisiana was entitled to claim from that moment, all rights arising from that action, and does claim them, I am sure. The Congress of the United States would have no more right to recall a right granted to Louisiana or to any other of the new States at the time of their admission to the Union, or approved for them since that time, than a private person in a contractual relation with another private person would have a right to claim back something which he had given by way

of rights to the other contracting party under the terms of the contract.

Mr. CASE. Then, is it not correct to say that Louisiana has a 27-mile claim to offshore lands, or seeks recognition of a 27-mile claim?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is correct to say that Louisiana has sought by action of its legislature to extend its boundary 24 miles further than the State boundary which was fixed by the act of Congress, and insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, the Senator from Florida questions the right of Louisiana to follow that course. There has never been any doubt about that being the position of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CASE. If that could be done—

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from South Dakota will defer for a moment, if he will look at the map of the State of Florida, he will see that the Continental Shelf outside State boundaries extends off the west coast of Florida to a point about 175 miles, at the farthest, from the mainland of the State, but Florida has not asserted any claim to areas outside its State boundaries. We think that to do so would be *ex parte*. We have never attempted to do that, for we think that the Federal Government has whatever right there is to such areas. That is a completely different question, however, from whether or not the Federal Government can negotiate in its own interest an arrangement with bordering States, whereby it can make use of the legal setup of such States rather than attempt to enact a great body of new laws which are now nonexistent. We have no Federal law other than admiralty law that prevails beyond State boundaries, and admiralty law, of course, does not cover the multitude of personal, private, and public relationships which have taken place and will continue to take place in the development of that outer area. The Senator from Florida has always felt that anything granted to the States by the Federal Government in that great outside area beyond State boundaries will have to be done by the Federal Government anew, and not as a result of something that has been done heretofore, and that it should not grant anything to the States except what it believes is proper compensation for any value it may get from the States. If it feels that it can receive no good value from the States, it should not give to the States anything within that outer area. That is just about as plain as the Senator from Florida can state his position, with which he believes he is in complete accord with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Florida is always able to state his position very plainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I should merely like an opportunity to say, in connection with the so-called assertion by Louisiana of a boundary 27 miles from shore, that nothing in this joint resolution would give to Louisiana anything beyond its boundary as it existed at the time it entered the Union. The 27-mile claim was only asserted within recent times, and

I believe that it is certainly clear, from the presentation made earlier today, that this measure covers nothing beyond the seaward boundary of Louisiana as it existed at the time Louisiana entered the Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], on the floor of the Senate this year, made a similar statement, which I would like to include in the RECORD at this time. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1953, at page 2696, I read:

Mr. LONG. On page 280 of the hearings there appears a portion of the testimony of the attorney general of Louisiana, who makes clear that the act of the Legislature of Louisiana in extending its boundaries 27 miles has no effect insofar as this proposed legislation is concerned, and that Louisiana is limited to its original boundary unless the Federal Government should at a future time see fit to recognize the State boundary as extending beyond the boundary that existed when the State came into the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Let me say, to supplement what the Senator from Texas has said, that I am sure everyone knows that the position of Florida is somewhat different from that of Louisiana and Texas, but I must say, in complete fairness to the Senators from Louisiana and Texas, that not since I have been a Member of the Senate, and, I believe, at no other time, have they claimed in the Senate that their States have property rights extending beyond their legal boundaries. The measures which have been proposed recognize that fact and simply try to work out a participation in the fruits of development of the outer Continental Shelf based on what they consider the fair value of the use of their laws, police powers, facilities, and the like.

I have not agreed with them on some of the provisions which they have placed in their bills, but I know that not since I have been a Member of the Senate has any bill been proposed which would seek to take away from the Federal Government its proprietary interest in the Continental Shelf area. There has been very much loose talk on this question, especially by columnists and commentators, and I think it is well to restate the fact over and over again. Not since I have been a Member of the Senate, for over 6 years, has there been any measure submitted or, to my knowledge, suggested in the Senate which would lay claim on behalf of the States to any areas beyond the State boundaries.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The case cited in the hearings on the Submerged Lands Act—United States against Louisiana, decided June 5, 1950—contains references which would indicate that in that case that issue was at stake before the Supreme Court. There was a decision in the case against Louisiana, which asserted the Federal interest.

Mr. HOLLAND. The State of Louisiana has bowed to that decision insofar as areas beyond its State boundaries are concerned. In fairness, the Senator from Florida desires to state that in the various acts proposed by the Senators from Texas and Louisiana can

well take care of themselves. They have never claimed and do not now claim that the States own beyond their State boundaries, as fixed, in one case, by the Louisiana Enabling Act of Congress, and in the other case by action of the Texas Congress in 1836, later approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Florida what he understands the boundaries of the State of Louisiana to be?

Mr. HOLLAND. The sea boundaries of the State of Louisiana were stated in the enabling act as the Gulf of Mexico. They extend out 3 marine miles by operation of law and include specifically all islands lying within 3 leagues of the coast. Most of the debatable questions which eventually will have to be decided by some court and which relate to the precise location of State boundaries, relate to the State of Louisiana, particularly its southeasterly and easterly shorelines. Those questions do not apply to many other areas of the Nation. On the contrary, in most other places the boundary lines are clearly fixed, and there is no argument about them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida, in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with reference to the pending joint resolution, submitted a table which was largely, I think, identical with the table which he has submitted today. It is printed on page 35 of the hearings. In the footnote to that table the Senator explains the areas of the submerged lands within State boundaries. The last two sentences of the footnote read as follows:

These coexist with the 3-mile limit for all States except Texas, Louisiana, and the Florida Gulf coast. In the latter cases the 3-league limit as established before or at the time of entry into the Union has been used.

Was that a misprint, or does the Senator actually say that in the case of Louisiana, as well as in the cases of Florida and Texas, the 3-league limit or the 10½-land-mile limit is the boundary line?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that all Senators did not have a chance to attend the hearings, because if they had, the Senator from Illinois would have learned that the inclusion of Louisiana in that particular way was stated to be incorrect, and the Senator from Florida, in his testimony, stated in great detail exactly what he has stated on the floor of the Senate today with reference to his understanding as to what constitutes the boundaries of Louisiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, 3 miles?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is 3 marine miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not 3 leagues?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. That particular item is the only item in the table as to which the Senator from Florida discovered any discrepancy with the facts. I should like to make it quite clear that that discrepancy is not carried through in the statement of the areas included within Louisiana, according to my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the contention of Florida that Senate Joint Resolution

13, as applied to the facts in Florida's case, transfers title and ownership of submerged lands, and the right to administer them out 10½ miles on Florida's west coast?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct as to all the proprietary rights covered by the resolution, and always excepting those rights which are necessary for the Federal Government to enforce completely its jurisdiction as to control of navigation, commerce, international affairs, and the common defense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Florida that the resolution gives to Texas the claimed rights, as mentioned by the Senator from Florida, to the 10½-mile limit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think the Senator uses the correct words. This resolution does not give anything to anyone; it simply recognizes the Texas limits, provided Texas can, as I believe it can, show that its limits were 3 leagues out before it was admitted into the Union, and that fact was made known to Congress and Congress approved it. The State of Texas is entitled to claim that right under the law.

To be a little more specific, I have always said, and I now repeat, that the joint resolution extends no State boundaries beyond the 3-geographical-miles limit. It simply leaves the 2 States in the status which they now occupy; and as to the only 2 States which the Senator from Florida knows will have any right beyond 3 miles, the States of Florida and Texas, the cases for Florida and Texas will have to be brought within the provisions of this resolution, based, in the one case, that of Texas, on action taken prior to 1845, on the part of the Republic of Texas, and action taken in 1845 by Congress in admitting Texas into the Union, along with its boundaries; and in the case of Florida, on action taken in 1868, to which the Senator from Illinois has already adverted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I find myself in a difficult position. Apparently, in the hardening up of the Louisiana Purchase, land of North Dakota was cut off from South Dakota. Within the past few years there has been discovered a great body of oil in North Dakota. The oil has been cut off from us to the north, and now, apparently cut off to the south, or it would be if the desires of all the States along the coast were granted. The only way by which the people of South Dakota can ever have any interest in the oil in areas which were a part of the Louisiana Purchase, as South Dakota was, is to establish, somehow, our rights somewhere along the line.

In view of what the Senator has said about Louisiana and its 3-mile belt and its claim to a 24-mile belt beyond the 3 miles, does not the Senator believe that this would be an appropriate time to make a declaration in order to settle ownership of the land on the Continental Shelf, at least beyond the 3-mile limit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that that would be done by the pending joint resolution. Perhaps the Senator has overlooked that fact. Such a provision is

contained in section 9, page 20, of the joint resolution, which I shall read into the RECORD at this time:

SEC. 9. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to affect in anywise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed.

If the Senator from South Dakota had been present earlier in the discussion, he would have learned that, according to the estimates of the best-trained persons we have been able to obtain to make such estimates, one-sixth of the oil and gas to be found in all offshore areas—that is, out to the Continental Shelf—lies within State boundaries, while five-sixths of it lies without State boundaries. Considering the fact that as to California all of the known oil is within State boundaries, it is quite apparent that much more than five-sixths of the total in the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico lies outside the boundaries of the States.

Mr. CASE. By virtue of my reading on the subject, I was aware of that general theory or estimate with respect to the place where oil exists. However, earlier in the discussion this afternoon the Senator from Florida was referring to the Louisiana situation, and I understood him to indicate that he thought that at some time there should be a definition of the area of the 3-mile belt. Is the Senator from Florida saying that that would be taken care of by the joint resolution, so that Louisiana could assert ownership to anything beyond the 3-mile limit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am saying that the joint resolution, if passed, would completely confirm in the Federal Government all jurisdiction and control of every sort outside the State boundaries of not only Louisiana but also every other coastal State.

Mr. CASE. In making his statement, what does the Senator from Florida have in mind with respect to islands?

Mr. HOLLAND. With respect to islands, only those islands which were granted to the States by the Federal Government at the time the States came into the Union, or since, if there be any such instances, could possibly be claimed by the States.

Mr. CASE. Would the 3 miles extend from each island?

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, wrote a long letter to the committees of both the Senate and the House which were hearing this matter, setting forth the understanding which the State Department had on the subject. Secretary Acheson stated that each island had its own 3-mile belt around it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not possible, under the language of Senate Joint Resolution 13 with respect to submerged lands extending out 3 miles from the "coast line," that the coastline may be interpreted as being the outer shores of

islands far off the shores of the mainland, as California has been claiming under a State statute and, I believe, before the master in chancery of the Supreme Court, in which event boundaries and ownership could go out a long distance from the continental land mass?

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that California has no provable case beyond 3 miles from its mainland; and that as to the islands, its provable case would be 3 miles around each of the islands. I so stated in the hearings on this matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a consummation devoutly to be desired, but I am not at all satisfied that that is what the Senator's joint resolution would accomplish, because the coastline is not fully and clearly defined.

Mr. HOLLAND. On that point, all I can say is that, in the first instance, the joint resolution was drafted by representatives of the attorneys general of 44 of the States; was perfected in hearings in both the Senate and the House, with changes made throughout the draft; and was then closely scrutinized many times by the Department of Justice. I know of no opinion on the part of the Department of Justice that holds to the contrary. From the statements of representatives of the Department of Justice, and from private conferences with them, it is our belief that they understand the joint resolution exactly as we understand it. If the Senator from Illinois has an understanding that is different or contradictory, I should appreciate his placing it in the RECORD, so that we may see the basis for such belief.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the California case, California claimed that the line was 3 miles from the outer chain of islands?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall that aspect of the matter. Certainly in the Supreme Court decision there is no such statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; I agree it is not in the Supreme Court decision, but in the record of the hearings before the master of the Supreme Court, Mr. William H. Davis.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the only document I have seen on that matter is the report of recommendations by the master and the objections made by both sides. Neither side was satisfied. I understand the point in argument before the master was not the question mentioned by the Senator from Illinois, but, instead, the question, What is the outer boundary of inland waters, particularly of San Pedro Bay?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Most certainly that was one question. But I believe also there was a question as to whether the 3 miles should be measured from the continental land mass or from a line connecting the outer shoreline of the chain of islands lying off the coast of southern California.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the joint resolution, no such contention could be maintained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator certain of that?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is what I believe, and that is what every legal authority I have consulted on the subject believes. Incidentally, the only reason

why there was some thought to the contrary was some wording in the original joint resolution, which has been omitted, which would have made the outer boundary of inland waters farther out than that which is now provided by the joint resolution. The joint resolution simply continues the outer boundary of inland waters pursuant to the decisions of the Supreme Court already made. In the case of California I think the record should also show that very deep waters exist off the shore of the mainland of California, so, in my opinion, it would certainly be completely illogical to make a claim that the State boundaries embraced those deep waters and channels. I do not believe any such claim could possibly be substantiated under existing law, much less under the joint resolution, if it should be passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from California. I am glad he is here to discuss the question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that in 1949, as the Senator probably knows, the State of California enacted a statute which purported to extend its boundaries seaward 3 miles from the farthest islands off its coastline.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the point to which I referred.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes. Certainly the State of California was acting either constitutionally or unconstitutionally. In either event the language of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Florida would not affect the boundaries of the State of California, aside from its provisions by which the State of California, like all the other States of the Union, would be given title to the "historic boundaries" in the specific case. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from California is, of course, correct. However, the recital in the joint resolution which, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, would absolutely preclude the State of California from successfully asserting any claim to a boundary extending beyond the islands is the last sentence in section 4, which is the saving clause which simply preserves the situation in California and every other State, under the conditions stated in that sentence, which I read into the RECORD:

Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

The Senator from Florida, without seeking in any sense to limit the State of California or any other coastal State—and he could not do so if he wished to—but simply observing what he believes to be the facts and law in the matter, has merely stated that he does not think that reservation would breathe life into a statutory extension or attempted extension of the boundaries of California or any other State after the time of its admission to the Union, unless Congress should approve such extension.

Mr. KUCHEL. At the time the State was admitted to the Union originally.

Mr. HOLLAND. Or since.

Mr. KUCHEL. Or since; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. If Congress did approve the action of California, Louisiana, or Texas, or the action of one of the New England States which might seek to extend its boundaries—and I believe Delaware made such an effort, but the legislation was passed by only one house—that, of course, would be the right of Congress, subject to the law of nations as to how far it could exercise such rights.

The point the Senator from Florida is making is that he has not heard of any contention on behalf of California that at the time it became a part of the Union its constitution or its laws prescribed its boundaries in any different place than 3 English miles off the shore of the mainland. The Senator from California knows that there has been nothing done since that time by way of congressional action to extend those boundaries; and there is nothing in this joint resolution which would affect the right of California or any other State to claim what it thinks it is entitled to claim. But there is certainly nothing in the joint resolution which would confirm, or even tend to confirm, a claim based upon a statutory extension of boundaries made since the State was admitted to the Union, such attempted statutory extension not being approved by Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Or to deny the State that right if, indeed, by its 1949 statute it did no more than what was originally intended at the time the State came into the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, that would be a question for the courts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator from California to feel that this joint resolution would not foreclose California from claiming the shoreline as being the line connecting the outer shoreline of the islands, rather than the shoreline of the continental mass? Does the Senator from California feel that, under this bill, California would not be foreclosed from making such a claim?

Mr. KUCHEL. I should say that, with respect to the State of California, the joint resolution merely places the boundaries as they existed when the State came into the Union, or as they may subsequently have been established in accordance with the language of a statute enacted by the Congress at a later date. In any event, we have a question unanswered in 6 years before the Supreme Court in connection with a master's report; and so far the Supreme Court has not found where the outer limits of the inland waters are with respect to our shore line. In my judgment, whether or not the 1949 statute is valid or invalid is not touched upon in any fashion by this joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from California believe that the measurement of the seaward boundaries of California at the time it came into the Union started from the continental land mass or from the outer edge of the chain of islands?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no comment to make upon that question. The fact is

that my State has enacted a statute on this point. Whether or not that statute is valid is something for the courts to decide, and quite apart, however, from the pending joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator from California believes that there is an ambiguity in the joint resolution?

Mr. KUCHEL. Not at all. The question of a definition of boundaries by metes and bounds is something which is not, and in my judgment should not be made, a part of the joint resolution before us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator is suggesting that it may later be decided that the boundary is measured from the continental land mass, or it may later be decided that the boundary is measured from the outer edge of the chain of islands lying off the continental land mass.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think it would be within the purview of a court of competent jurisdiction to determine, in any instance, what actually are the boundaries of a littoral State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not that open up the prospect, under this bill, (a) of endless litigation; (b) of endless delay; and (c) of the possibility of tremendous extension of State boundaries and State ownership into the open ocean?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida can understand the impatience of the distinguished Senator from Illinois with the law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. After all, the law is not so certain a science as, for example, mathematics or other sciences with which the Senator from Illinois is familiar. The Senator from Florida knows full well that if the United States Supreme Court should change its mind as to what constituted the outer limits of inland waters, and should change it to a sufficient degree, it could open up, not only under this joint resolution, but of its own initiative, questions which would reach out much farther than anything we have been talking about here.

The Senator from Florida believes that the laws, as announced over and over and over again by the Supreme Court, as to the delimitation of inland waters, are sufficiently fixed, definite, and certain so that it would require a complete, cataclysmic change of the Supreme Court's philosophy in that field to afford any hope for an extension of the boundaries of the good State of California so that they would go out beyond the islands as to all areas contained within an outer line. There is no way for us to foreclose the Supreme Court from changing its mind. It might change its mind with reference to inland waters and their delimitation. But failing such change, the Senator from Florida cannot see how, under this joint resolution, there could possibly be any serious question affecting California or any other State.

What we are talking about is the boundaries as of the time the various States came into the Union. If such boundaries have been approved by Congress on an extended basis since that time, that fact, too, is germane in connection with the joint resolution. But

unless the boundary can be brought into one or the other of those categories, the State is bound by the limitation of 3 geographic miles, which applies, without constitutional action and without statutory action, as the outer limit of the claimed boundary of jurisdiction of the Nation, and of the States situated on the coast.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Florida favor an amendment to the joint resolution which would eliminate the possibility of future boundary extensions of States into the marginal sea and further transfers of ownership or control to the States beyond the limits which the Senator has designated as the present limits of the coastal States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida hopes that no amendments whatever will be made to the joint resolution. As the Senator from Florida understands, the President of the United States is committed to the support of the joint resolution. Those acting for the President have checked the very minor changes made up to this time. The Senator from Florida does not want any substantial changes of any sort made in this measure. However, he does invite the attention of his friend to the fact that even if Congress should take such action now, there would be nothing in that action to prevent future Congresses from adopting a different point of view. So there would be little to be gained by the inclusion of such a provision in the joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is merely suggesting that we might place in the legislation that which the Senator from Florida says is its intent.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Illinois wishes to prepare an amendment the Senator from Florida, of course, will be glad to study it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would he support it?

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Florida insists there is, in his opinion, no substance whatever to the claim that the State of California can under present conditions and under the pending measure successfully surmount that part of the California facts and law which fixes its boundaries 3 miles offshore.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Florida permit the Senator from Illinois to turn his questioning to the field of so-called inland waters?

Mr. HOLLAND. Gladly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the Supreme Court in an unbroken series of decisions has stated that ownership of and title to submerged lands under navigable inland waters belong to the States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Supreme Court decided that the States have qualified ownership in the bottoms or beds under their inland waters. However, I doubt whether the Supreme Court has stated that point any more often than members of the Supreme Court had stated in cases prior to the bringing of the Cali-

fornia case that the same situation obtained as to all lands under waters lying within State boundaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that in every case, up until the California case, the lands involved were (a) true tidelands, or lands daily washed by the tide, (b) submerged lands under bays and ports, (c) submerged lands under rivers, and (d) submerged lands under inland lakes, and that in every case the Court held the ownership in and title to such lands rested in the States?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; but the Court sometimes used a good deal more general language than that. Furthermore, the Senator from Illinois is not correct in saying that the cases are limited to the subjects which he mentions. The Florida case of *Skiriotes versus Florida* has to do with the enforcement of police laws of the State of Florida in the open sea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That did not involve ownership of submerged lands; it involved questions of control over fishing rights.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. However, the whole general subject matter of where control lay, whether in the State or in the Federal Government, was a part of that case. There have been other cases not yet cited. For instance, the Senator from Florida is looking at a quotation from the United States Supreme Court case of *Manchester v. Massachusetts* (139 U. S., 240), in which a very responsible and highly regarded Justice of the Supreme Court, writing a decision by the Supreme Court, which was, I believe, unanimous, used these words:

The extent of the territorial jurisdiction of Massachusetts over the sea adjacent to its coast is that of an independent nation, and, except so far as any right of control over this territory has been granted to the United States, this control remains in the State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is that case?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the case of *Manchester against Massachusetts*. It is a fishing case. It had to do with the waters of Buzzards Bay. Again, the waters of Buzzards Bay are within a bay which I believe would be held and should be held to be inland water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has it not always been so regarded?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has; but the point I am making is that the Supreme Court time after time has used general language, which it regarded as having no particular effect when it later decided the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases.

Incidentally, let me call this further fact to the attention of my distinguished friend from Illinois. Those who adopt his view in this matter are very reluctant to give any force and effect at all to obiter dicta, or statements made by the court in decisions which were not necessary to a determination of the facts in the case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Such statements are irrelevant and not germane.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yet they are asking us to give attention to obiter dicta in connection with the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, in their finding, for

instance, that the Thirteen Original States never had jurisdiction out to sea beyond 3 miles, and in the references of the Court to other States of the Union which were not before the Court at the time.

So we shall ask and hope that the distinguished Senator will be consistent, and when he claims the benefit of obiter dicta, he will be gracious enough to admit that obiter dicta have the same effect when pronounced by 48 judges of the Supreme Court over a long series of years, each of whom said, in effect, that it was his understanding that the States owned the lands under their waters out to their boundaries, including both tidal waters and inland waters.

Therefore the question of obiter dicta must be allowed play in both directions in a discussion of this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to let it apply in both directions. The Senator from Illinois, as the Senator from Florida well knows, is not a lawyer, and cannot contend with him in legal ability. But the Senator from Illinois understands that the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case was to the effect, first, that the Original Thirteen States could not have ownership in and title to any of the lands situated seaward from the low-water mark, because it was generally asserted first by the Federal Government in 1793, under Thomas Jefferson, that the Federal Government had ownership of and title to such lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me interrupt at this point to say that none of the Thirteen Original States was before the Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. None of the Thirteen Original States was a party, nor was the bottom land of those States before the Court. So, the decision of the Court, and the effort to deprive the Thirteen Original States of their opportunity to be heard by the Court, is on a par with what recently happened when the former President of the United States sought to declare a naval oil reserve not merely over the lands and waters of California, Texas, and Louisiana, which States had had their day in Court, but also over the waters of Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and other States, both on the Pacific and the Atlantic, ignoring the fact that they never had had their day in Court, but showing complete willingness to reach out and grab the land for the United States Government, in such a way as to deprive sovereign States of a right to be heard by their Court, our Court, the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Florida permit the Senator from Illinois to observe that he proves too much? He said that the Supreme Court indulged in obiter dictum in the California case, because it cited the fact that the Original Thirteen States did not possess ownership of or title to submerged lands. But this was precisely the opposite argument to that which was advanced by the State of California as the basis of her claim. California argued that the Original Thirteen States did have ownership in and title to the submerged lands; and that, since it came into the Union on an equal footing with

the Original Thirteen States, it was entitled to the submerged lands off its shores also.

In elaborating its ruling denying the validity of this California argument, the Supreme Court conceded the application and validity of the equal-footing clause in the statute admitting California to the Union.

So, if the Senator from Florida says that the decision of the Supreme Court as to the Thirteen Original States and as to the equal-footing clause is obiter dictum and therefore falls, then the claims of Texas, Florida, California, and Louisiana, all of which came in after the Thirteen Original States were admitted, fall also. I do not believe that in any of the cases the Supreme Court was indulging in obiter dictum. Those sections of the decisions which we are discussing seem to me relevant and necessary to the Court's rulings.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be very exciting if it should be the fact. However, as a matter of fact, not one of the Thirteen Original States had had its day in Court, as Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi have not had their day in Court, and as the two States on the Pacific seaboard north of California have not had.

The only place now existent in all the Nation where this question can be reasonably settled, so as to obviate the absolute necessity of litigation affecting each of these States, and also the necessity of litigation affecting countless local communities and private individuals, is the Congress of the United States; and here is where we are trying to settle the question, in order to obviate hundreds or thousands of cases which may otherwise have to be filed, and to obviate long delays such as have already occurred in the California case for example, in which approximately 6 years have elapsed since the Supreme Court committed the question to a special master to determine where the boundary of 15½ miles of inland waters was on the shore of California. They are still struggling over those 15½ miles, out of a thousand miles of coastline of the good State of California; and they have not yet reached Oregon or Washington, and they have not yet reached the other coastal States.

Nevertheless, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senators who join with him, apparently do not want to see this question settled, ignoring the fact that Congress is the only place where it can be settled, and ignoring the further fact that Mr. Justice Black in writing the majority decision in the California case, almost closed his opinion with a statement—I think it is the next to the last paragraph—to the effect that he and the Court do not believe that the Congress of the United States will be unjust to States, local communities, and literally thousands of private owners.

I do not see how he could have made any more clear the suggestion that in Congress was the place for the question to be settled. We are trying to settle it. We hope that we may have the cooperation to that end of the distinguished Senator from Illinois and of his friends.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that it is the desire of the Senator from Illinois and the other Senators who hold similar opinions on the pending resolution to treat both the coastal States and the private lessees with complete equity. In the so-called Anderson bill, S. 107, which we are sponsoring, we are proposing to turn over to the coastal States 37½ percent of all royalties obtained from resources inside the 3-mile limit, and to continue unchecked the rights of the existing lessees from the States.

So the idea that the Federal Government and those of us who are supporting the claims of the Federal Government are trying to gouge the coastal States or their lessees is not well taken.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator from Illinois should have said, because he has more of a case than he has indicated, that he and his associates are willing in their bill to quiet the title to some billions of dollars' worth of submerged lands off the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will point that out.

Mr. HOLLAND. At this time I wish to comment on it, because I believe it is a completely inconsistent and discriminatory provision.

It happens that the State of Florida has almost throughout its length beaches which are susceptible of development. It has hundreds of miles of beautiful beaches, where cities, hotels, apartments, boating facilities, and other developments can be erected. Unfortunately, the State of Louisiana does not have that kind of coastline, but it has along its coast great assets of a different kind.

The Senator from Illinois and his associates have been suggesting to the Senator from Florida and to other Senators whose States are in a similar situation, "If you go along with us, we will quiet the title of your own State and your own public units and your own thousands of private owners to these properties if you will help us take away from Louisiana and Texas what they happen to have along a coastline that is completely different from yours."

Mr. President, I do not think that is equity. I believe it is discrimination. I believe that all the values, whatever there are, within the coastal belt lying off the shores of the several States—and in different places the values vary—have to be considered at one time. So far as I know, there is no oil in the submerged lands lying off the State of Florida. Many millions of dollars have been spent in an effort to discover oil there, but no oil has yet been discovered. However, I wish to have equity done to Texas, Louisiana, and California.

Furthermore, if oil were to be discovered off the coast of Florida, I do not wish to have settled in Washington, far removed from the scene of production, the question of whether oil-development operations should be had just off of the front steps of a hotel in Miami or of a hotel in Jacksonville or of a hotel in Palm Beach. I want there to be local control regarding the question of how that development shall occur, and I believe that is the only sound kind of control.

It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Illinois and his friends

have been trying as hard as they could to make this matter exclusively one of oil, for they have been willing to give away everything else, provided only that they can hold on to some oil and gas assets which are found in portions of only 3 States out of the approximately 20 or 22 States which are affected, not including the Great Lakes States. It seems to me that is not equity; and I hope my distinguished friend from Illinois will reexamine the situation and will determine whether in his judgment it is equity to give to one State all it can claim, simply because its frontage happens to be of the type I have mentioned, but to deny to a sister State, which has a different type of frontage, the enjoyment of the properties which are found off its shores.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Florida at the beginning of his remarks this afternoon pointed out that the comparative acreage which would be under State control, as against Federal control, under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 13, would be, I believe, five-sixths, as compared to one-sixth.

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. PASTORE. Or perhaps it was nine-tenths, as compared to one-tenth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Nine-tenths as compared to one-tenth in the case of the area; five-sixths as compared to one-sixth, in the case of the estimated production of oil and gas, as determined by the best estimates available.

Mr. PASTORE. That leads me to a question which I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida. Has there been any reliable estimate, or any estimate that is reliable in the judgment of the senior Senator from Florida, as to what the comparative resources would be in terms of the value of the oil, as against the five-sixths and the one-sixth?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would know of no basis for fixing that value, except the barrel basis, which would be the same in both places.

However, in the deeper water in the offshore belt it is quite possible that the cost of production would be greater than it would be in the more narrow belt along the States. Except for that difference, I see no difference between a barrel of oil produced 10 feet beyond a State boundary and a barrel of oil produced 10 feet within a State boundary.

Mr. PASTORE. Neither do I see any difference at all.

The reason for my question is that there have been many estimates as to the worth of these oil resources. I have heard the figure \$40 billion mentioned. Does the Senator from Florida believe that estimate to be correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that estimates of that size, and even greater estimates—and some of the estimates have amounted to as much as \$300 billion—are simply figments of someone's imagination, because the best qualified experts in this field have arrived at much

smaller estimates. I am glad the Senator from Rhode Island has asked the question.

The amount of proved reserves now existing offshore California, Texas, and Louisiana is 259 million barrels only. The Senator from Rhode Island will find the figures on that point in table V in the hearings. The amount of the estimated proved reserves appears on page 577, in table V. There the Senator from Rhode Island will find that, according to the testimony of the geological experts of the Department of the Interior, it is stated that the complete estimated proved reserves within State boundaries are as follows:

Eighty-four million barrels, in the case of Louisiana.

Fifteen million barrels of oil, in the case of Texas, together with 75,000,000 thousand cubic feet of gas.

In the case of California, 160 million barrels of oil—or a total of 259 million barrels of oil.

That is approximately a 32 days' supply of oil for this Nation. That is all the oil that is known to exist within State boundaries, as stated by the geological experts.

The royalties to accrue over a period of 25 or 30 years constitute only a small amount. My recollection is that all-told it would be approximately \$50 million to the Federal Government and approximately \$30 million to the State governments. However, as to that the Senator from Rhode Island can make his own computations.

With reference to the estimated reserves which are seaward of traditional State boundaries, the Senator from Rhode Island will see the figures stated in the lower portion of the same table.

Mr. President, I think it would be well at this point for me to ask unanimous consent that table V, as it appears on page 577 of the hearings, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE V.—Estimated proved reserves
FIELDS WITHIN THE AREA CLAIMED BY UNITED STATES BUT LANDWARD OF TRADITIONAL STATE BOUNDARIES

State and product	Number of proved fields	Estimated proved reserves
Louisiana: Oil or oil and gas.	5	84,000,000 barrels.
Texas: Oil	2	15,000,000 barrels. ¹
Gas	1	75,000,000 thousand cubic feet. ¹
California: Oil	5	160,000,000 barrels.

FIELDS SEAWARD OF TRADITIONAL STATE BOUNDARIES

Louisiana: Oil or oil and gas	17	335,000,000 barrels.
Gas	14	2,100,000,000 thousand cubic feet.
Texas	None	None.
California	None	None.

¹ Estimates based on incomplete data.

² Includes 2 gas and 12 oil and gas fields.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Rhode Island will notice from the table that the only estimated proved reserves outside the traditional boundaries of the

States are in Louisiana, where they are stated to be 335 million barrels. Of course, under the philosophy of the pending measure, that is wholly the property of the Federal Government, and is so confirmed by the pending joint resolution.

With reference to the areas in general, and the estimates of the amount of oil to be found, as given by these experts in the field of geology, the Senator will find those figures on another page of the printed report, page 584. If he will turn to that page, he will find that the total estimated amount, nonproved and proved—the table includes both—in the case of Texas, within its State boundaries, is 1.2 billion barrels, and for the entire Continental Shelf off the Texas coast including the 1.2 it is 9 billion barrels. In the case of Louisiana, he will find that 0.25 billion barrels is estimated as the total amount, both proved and unproved, within State boundaries off the Louisiana coast; whereas, for the entire Continental Shelf off the Louisiana coast the estimate is 4 billion barrels. In the case of California, the similar amounts are 1.1 billion barrels within the 3 sea miles, or 3½ land miles, of the coast, and for the entire Continental Shelf off the California coast, 2 billion barrels, including the 1.1 billion barrels; or a total overall of 15 billion barrels estimated, both proved and unproved, of which 13 billion barrels are outside State boundaries, and 2-billion-plus barrels are estimated to be within State boundaries.

So the Senator will see that, even using the maximum figures estimated by the geologists of the Department, we are talking about something over 2 billion barrels within all the State boundaries, to be produced over the next 25, 30 or some say even 50 years. Consequently, the amounts of money to be figured by way of royalties are indeed small as compared to the astronomic figures I have heard mentioned over the radio and have read in some of the newspaper columns. There is no just basis at all for such astronomic figures.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 13, make any claim whatever to a percentage of the oil that is beyond the so-called statutory boundary?

Mr. HOLLAND. None whatever. To the contrary, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13), in section 9—which I hope the Senator will read—makes it very clear that not only will all the natural resources in the outer shelf appertain to the United States, but that the jurisdiction and control of everything in the outer shelf is confirmed in the United States.

The unfair, untrue propaganda about this measure has gone to such an extent as to make people shudder, when what they are really anxious to get at is the facts. The very idea that some columnists and some commentators, too, have stooped to the practice of reporting, where all can hear it, such extravagant claims as that there are involved 200 billions of barrels of oil, or 300 billions of barrels, and that the share for one State for a certain year, if it were split among the States, would be \$9 million. I heard such a statement over the air

not long ago, as to one of our smaller States.

Such statements are so completely variant from the facts as to be disturbing; but, under our system of free speech, such is the latitude given to permit the propagandizing of people who only want to know the facts. I may say that they are gradually getting the facts, because conservative papers and some of the conservative broadcasters have finally come to the point of telling the facts just as they were told in the two editorials which the Senator from Florida placed in the *RECORD* earlier, the one from the *Washington News*, the other from the *Washington Star*. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his questions.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the legal case, and I shall yield for questioning at the termination of my discussion of that phase. Because of the recent rulings of the Supreme Court, it is necessary to consider briefly the legal questions involved in this controversy. I shall not deal with them at length, for many reasons. In the first place, they have been hashed and rehashed in the hearings and in the debates. In the next place, there are two Members of the Senate, namely, the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Louisiana, who are so much better qualified than is the Senator from Florida to speak about all the legal details that he yields to them, and particularly, because the Senator from Florida feels that what the Senate wants in this *RECORD* and what the people are hungry for are the facts in this case. So it is to the facts to which the Senator from Florida will largely confine himself after this brief discussion of the legal case.

THE LEGAL CASE

In the face of exceptionally strong evidence of historic ownership and use of the submerged coastal lands by the respective States, the Supreme Court in its latest decisions has seen fit to declare that the Federal Government holds paramount rights in these lands.

This holding contravenes the earlier beliefs of the Supreme Court as frequently stated by them.

State ownership of the offshore lands in question had always been recognized by the Federal courts in their decisions up until the recent decision in the California case. As a matter of fact, even in the California case, in the majority opinion, Mr. Justice Black frankly concedes that the United States Supreme Court had in previous decisions—

Many times * * * used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that State not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

Those are the words of Mr. Justice Black, who wrote the majority decision against the States, in the California case, and even he recognized that he had to change the law to reach that decision, because of the fact that so many Justices before that time, in statements which he held to be obiter dicta—and I think they were—had so frequently and clearly held that there was no question as to their belief that the States did own the soils

beneath their navigable waters, whether inland or outside. Certainly the record bears out this statement of Mr. Justice Black, and I should like at this time to insert as a part of my remarks a list of the Supreme Court Justices who, in their written opinions, held and expressed, through the many years of the life of this Nation, just such a belief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list of Justices was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

LIST OF JUSTICES

Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, Associate Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice Benjamin M. Cardozo, Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice George Sutherland, Associate Justice Pierce Butler, Associate Justice James C. McReynolds, Chief Justice William Howard Taft, Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice Edward Terry Sanford, Chief Justice Edward Douglas White, Associate Justice Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice William R. Day, Associate Justice Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justice John H. Clarke, Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, Associate Justice Horace H. Lurton, Associate Justice Joseph R. Lamar, Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller, Associate Justice David J. Brewer, Associate Justice Rufus W. Peckham, Associate Justice William H. Moody, Associate Justice Henry B. Brown, Associate Justice George Shiras, Associate Justice Stephen J. Field, Associate Justice Horace Gray, Associate Justice Howell E. Jackson, Associate Justice Joseph P. Bradley, Associate Justice Samuel Blatchford, Associate Justice Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Associate Justice Samuel F. Miller, Chief Justice Morrison R. Waite, Associate Justice Nathan Clifford, Associate Justice Noah H. Swayne, Associate Justice David Davis, Associate Justice William Strong, Associate Justice Ward Hunt, Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, Associate Justice James M. Wayne, Associate Justice Samuel Nelson, Associate Justice Robert C. Grier, Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, Associate Justice Joseph Story, Associate Justice John McLean, Associate Justice John McKinley, Associate Justice Peter V. Daniel.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will not take up the time of the Senate to read this entire list, but I do call to your attention the fact that the names of such jurists as Charles Evans Hughes, William Howard Taft, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Louis D. Brandeis, appear on this list of 48 Justices.

After reading many opinions of the Supreme Court regarding this subject, I agree with the statement found on page 7 of the report which the Senate Judiciary Committee filed on the submerged lands question in the second session of the 80th Congress. After quoting the excerpts from the opinion of Mr. Justice Black cited above, the Senate committee said:

Thus the Court by its decision not only established a law differently from what eminent jurists, lawyers, and public officials for more than a century had believed it to be, but also differently from what the Supreme Court had believed it to be.

This decision has resulted in chaos and complete instability, and as a matter of sound public policy must be corrected. This is the only place where it can be properly corrected. As you know, in the decision in the California case the Court was divided 6 to 2, and in the

Texas case the division and by the even closer margin of 4 to 3, and obviously a change in the personnel of the Court could very easily cause a reversal of this decision. This fact alone causes confusion and instability.

Mr. President, when people who are asked to invest, or who wish to invest, millions of dollars for a certain development in this area, are aware that the Supreme Court itself is just as evenly divided as it is possible to divide it, they know perfectly well that the law may be changed overnight with the accession of a new judge, and so they hesitate to invest, and as a result, development is stayed.

The second situation of instability is the refusal of the Supreme Court to rule on the question of title, which refusal has immeasurably increased the difficulty. The certain result will be long and complicated litigation.

Mr. President, I desire to say, to the credit of the Department of Justice, that it realized this, and asked in its prayer that the title be determined. When the first decision came down in the California case, it failed to determine the title, but simply announced in whom paramount right lay, and held that the States did not have title. The Department of Justice again realized how much confusion the decision was causing, and it went back to the Supreme Court and asked the Court to rewrite its opinion and decision so as to determine and decide the question of title. The Court failed to do so. I say that fact constitutes another element of grave instability which shakes the chance for any titles to be permanently established in the area which is affected, and it also kills the chance of any development moving forward.

Further complicating future litigation, the court will be faced with many differences in the various State constitutions. That is another matter causing instability.

A good illustration of this arises under the Washington State Constitution. In this case, the State of Washington in its constitution, ratified before it became a State, specifically asserted its ownership to the beds and shores of all navigable waters within its boundary which was fixed at 1 marine league in the Pacific Ocean.

The Court is never going to reach the ultimate problem until it gets to the State of Washington, because the constitution of that State specifically recites in one of its articles that the State has complete sovereignty over the area lying within its border, which is fixed at 3 miles offshore.

The Constitution of the State of Florida, adopted February 25, 1868, ratified by the people of Florida May 4 to 6, 1868, and approved by Congress June 25, 1868, fixing the State boundaries on the West coast in the Gulf of Mexico at 3 leagues from the land, presents still another variation. The constitutions of the Original Thirteen States present still further and varied problems in this regard. It is easy to see that these varying situations in the several States will necessarily cause much confusion and multiplicity of litigation.

I pause long enough to say, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the con-

stitutions and the laws in various States are different, that if the Government had taken a proper attitude it would have required that each coastal State be given the right to have its own situation litigated before it began to reach out and grab submerged lands in States which have not had their day in court, as it did in the recent past.

Still further instability in the present completely unsettled condition appears when we note that although the California case was decided by the Supreme Court in 1947, now, almost 6 years later the Court has not yet determined what is the coast line of the proven oil-bearing 15½ miles of their nearly 1,000-mile-long coast so that it can be ascertained where the paramount rights of the Federal Government begin. I predict that if Congress does not act by passing our bill or a similar measure such inaction will bring endless years of litigation, completely defeating for generations any stability of title and all hope of adequate development in our marginal belt.

Mr. President, in our State we can feel this situation. We know that development in this disputed area stopped when the decisions were announced. We do not want that condition longer to continue. We do not think it is in the interest of the United States as a whole that such a situation should continue in our State or in any other State, because when wealth is created in Florida it serves the whole Nation, and when industries are created in any of the other States the wealth is distributed to the entire Nation.

Mr. President, the time allowed is too brief to permit a summary of the great mass of testimony presented in hearings before congressional committees which substantiates the sound legal and historic position of the States. I think that the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Reed in the California case clearly states the fundamental legal question in the following words:

The original States were sovereignties in their own right, possessed of so much of the land underneath the adjacent seas as was generally recognized to be under their jurisdiction. The scope of their jurisdiction and the boundaries of their lands were co-terminous. * * * California, as is customary, was admitted into the Union "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever" * * *. As was the rule, title to lands under navigable waters vested in California as it had done in all other States * * *. The authorities cited in the Court's opinion lead me to the conclusion that the original States owned the lands under the seas to the 3-mile limit.

I think it is fair to say that the expert testimony presented by the States in early hearings before congressional committees, substantiates over and over again the soundness of the legal position of the States as approved by Mr. Justice Reed.

To think of carrying the new doctrine of paramount rights to its logical conclusion is most disturbing. It threatens the very fundamentals of property rights and ownership. This fact has been clearly expressed by two of the most outstanding legal groups in this country. The American Bar Association, after

careful investigation and consideration, expressed the following conclusion:

The new concept that the Federal Government has the paramount right to take property without compensation because it may need that property in discharging its duty to defend the country and conduct its foreign relations can have no logical end except that the Federal Government may take over all property, public and private, and under this theory the Federal Government could nationalize all of the natural resources of the country without paying the owners therefor, wholly in disregard of the fifth amendment.

With this very same thought in mind, the National Association of Attorneys General expressed their deep concern in the following comment:

The principles of the tidelands decisions, if not erased from the law of the land by act of Congress, could lead to nationalization of private lands as well as State lands without compensation.

Many other responsible organizations, too numerous to list at this time, have expressed this same view. They have sounded the warning, and I firmly believe that the 83d Congress, heeding this warning, will approve and pass our resolution, as necessary legislation, and that the President will approve it.

Mr. President, that concludes my dealing with the legal features, and I shall go on to the next subject, if there is no question.

Mr. President, it is no new thing for the Congress to supplant and overturn by legislation an opinion of the Supreme Court which it regards as unsound. An interesting and significant parallel to the submerged land cases is found in the case of *United States v. Wyoming* (331 U. S. 440 (1947)). The United States filed suit against the State of Wyoming and the Ohio Oil Co., its lessee, claiming ownership of certain Wyoming lands as part of the Federal public domain. Wyoming claimed the lands as State school lands, and acting on the belief that it was the owner, it had, in good faith, leased the lands for oil production to the Ohio Oil Co. Wyoming believed and claimed that, upon its admission to the Union, section 36 of each township vested in the State as school lands.

The United States claimed that under the act admitting Wyoming to the Union school lands would not become vested in the State until the date of the approval of the official survey of such lands, and if prior to such approval, the Federal Government had made some other disposition of the lands, the State could select substitute lands. In this case, the land which had been leased to an oil company had been placed in a petroleum reserve by Presidential order issued prior to the date of the approval of the official survey.

Follow this closely, Mr. President.

The Supreme Court, in the Wyoming case, unanimously upheld the United States contentions and the judgment was that the lands leased to the oil company never did vest in the State of Wyoming but belonged to the United States.

The case is parallel to the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases in that, in all four situations, the States had, in good faith, leased lands within their boundaries for oil development, acting on the belief that they owned such lands. In-

deed the equities of the three coastal States based on prior court decisions and on the long recognition of State ownership by the United States, are much stronger in their submerged land cases than they were in behalf of the State of Wyoming in the Wyoming case.

Nevertheless, on July 2, 1948, Congress unanimously passed an act directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent vesting title to the disputed lands in the State of Wyoming, and the patent was issued.

Every Member of Congress felt that it was the right thing to do. The State of Wyoming had proceeded in good faith; the oil company which had made the lease had proceeded in good faith; very large investments had been made in good faith. Under the act, there was turned back to the State more than a million dollars which had been impounded by the court.

The State of Wyoming was not content with one effort to correct the matter. It came to Congress session after session, Congress after Congress, until its rights were recognized, and they were recognized by a complete upsetting of a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in favor of the United States. Wyoming's rights were recognized because it was the considered opinion of Congress, and of all of its Members, that when a State had operated under a great undertaking with the Federal Government, and had believed it had a right to act as it had with respect to the particular 160 acres of land involved, and had done so, and the matter had stood for years without question, it was in the interest of morality and equity that the situation which had existed up until the time of the contract should be upheld legally and recognized.

Mr. President, I yield again for any questions which Senators may desire to ask.

I come now to what I believe is the strongest feature of the States' case, namely, that it is based on equitable and moral grounds of the highest value, but which the Supreme Court of the United States was not able to consider, and which it ruled out of consideration when, for instance, it refused to allow our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who at the time was attorney general of his great State, to prove his case, and refused to let him take testimony in support of practices between the Federal Government and the State since 1845.

The Supreme Court simply said—and perhaps it was correct in so saying—"We cannot consider these equitable defenses in this kind of case."

But, Mr. President, Congress is the place where equitable defenses can be considered.

EQUITABLE AND MORAL CASE

One important aspect of the strong case of the States—as well as of numerous private persons whose titles depend upon grants from the States—flows from the long and continuous course of dealing between the Federal Government and the States relative to these submerged lands, and the equally long course of dealing between States and citizens based upon the disclaimer of interest by the Federal Government and its agents.

I am well aware of the fact that in the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the California case Mr. Justice Black ruled that the ordinary rules of acquiescence laches, estoppel, adverse possession, and prescription could not operate against the sovereign Federal Government. He said, "and even assuming that Government agencies have been negligent in failing to recognize or assert the claims of the Government at an earlier date, the great interests of the Government in this ocean area are not to be forfeited as a result. The Government, which holds its interest here as elsewhere in trust for all the people, is not to be deprived of those interests by the ordinary court rules designed particularly for private disputes over individually owned pieces of property."

However, I do not believe that either Congress or the general public, which has a great stake in the matter, would ever allow their views to be controlled by such a narrow legal principle, without considering as important the facts which existed in 150 years of dealing between the Federal Government and the sovereign States and, flowing out of that background, between the States and thousands of individual citizens. It seems to me that this long course of dealing creates a strong equitable and moral case, on behalf of the States and their grantees, which merits discussion.

Aside from the long series of Court pronouncements, already mentioned, and which preceded the California case, the executive branch of the Federal Government had recognized State ownership of the tidelands for many years prior to the present controversy.

We have already heard quotations from the judiciary branch of the Government, but now I shall refer to the executive branch. Particularly is the attitude of the executive branch exemplified in its frequent acquisition from the States of locations for jetties and other submerged lands. The State of California, in a list which is incomplete, cited in its Brief 195 instances in which various coastal States—or their municipalities—had granted submerged lands to the United States at the request of some agency or department of the Federal Government. The Justice Department claimed that many of the granted lands were within the inland waters but even the Justice Department conceded that 14 of the grants were clearly in the marginal belt and that many others were doubtful.

I am now speaking about concessions made in open court during the hearing of these cases. The Federal Government recognized the fact that at least 14 of the cases represented instances in which the Federal Government had bought from States or local municipalities or private owners lands which were outside inland waters and were in the coastal belt.

Moreover, it is significant that the United States, in acquiring submerged lands by grants from States, never made any distinction between ownership in the inland waters and in the marginal belt. Apparently no one acting for the United States ever knew or believed that any such distinction existed. All submerged lands within the States' boundaries were

recognized as belonging to the State, whether the land was within a bay or harbor, or merely within the 3-mile belt. This was demonstrated by the uniform treatment on the part of the United States of all grants to acquire submerged lands from the States.

It would take too long to list all of the State grants of this type, but we have several acquisitions in Florida which are directly in point. For the sake of brevity, I would like to call attention to two of these cases. In 1938 Florida granted to the United States about 450 acres of land extending some 2¾ miles out under the Atlantic Ocean from the mouth of the St. Johns River. With the border 3 miles out, the 450 acres went to within a quarter of a mile of the border. A deed was requested from the State of Florida by the War Department on behalf of the United States to a parcel of land beginning at what is called Xalvia Island, lying just off the mouth of the St. Johns River, as the location of a jetty.

I hope Senators will follow this explanation, because it shows so clearly the course of dealing between the Federal Government and the State of Florida that no one ever could question what both parties believed about the matter.

This grant is of peculiar interest because the State of Florida reserved in the grant a three-quarters undivided interest in all phosphate and minerals in or under the granted lands and an undivided one-half interest in all petroleum under the granted lands.

In other words, those were the conditions in the deed which the Federal Government negotiated with, secured, and accepted from the State of Florida in the acquisition of a location for the construction of jetties at the mouth of the St. Johns River.

It seems clear that this reservation by the State in granting its submerged offshore lands and the acceptance by the United States of the grant subject to this reservation constituted a contract in which Florida's title to these lands and minerals was recognized. As an illustration of this type of dealing, I ask that a copy of the deed in this matter be inserted in my statement.

There being no objection, the deed was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT FUND, STATE OF
FLORIDA

DEED NO. 18,471

Know all men by these presents, that the undersigned, the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida, under and by virtue of the authority of section 1061 of the Revised General Statutes of Florida, and according to the provisions and procedure provided for in section 1062 of the Revised General Statutes of Florida, and for and in consideration of the sum of \$1 and other good and valuable consideration to them in hand paid by United States of America whose permanent address is Washington, D. C.

County, Fla., receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, have granted, bargained, sold, and conveyed to the said United States of America and its assigns, forever the following-described lands, to wit:

A certain tract or area lying and being in the southeastern part of Little Fort George or Xalvia Island in township 1 south, range 29 east, Tallahassee Meridian, portion

of said tract or area being a part of Little Fort George or Xalvia Island.

Said tract or area being further described as—

Beginning at a point 2,439 feet easterly from the west line of section 20, measured perpendicular to said section line, from a point in said section line 2,396.6 feet southerly from the northwest corner of section 20. Said "point of beginning" being 850 feet easterly from a United States Engineer Department survey mark called station VII, measured along the axis of the North Jetty, whose bearing is S. 72°55'20" east;

Thence northerly 500 feet measured perpendicular to the axis of the North Jetty to a point;

Thence easterly parallel with and 500 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty, a distance 6,450 feet, more or less, to a point;

Thence easterly, parallel with and 500 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty whose bearing is S. 80°18'20" E., a distance of 6,450 feet, more or less, to a point 500 feet northerly from the axis of the North Jetty, in a line drawn at right angles to said axis, at the east end of the North Jetty;

Thence, southerly along said line 1,500 feet to a point 1,000 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty;

Thence, parallel with and 1,000 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty a distance of 6,600 feet, more or less, to a point;

Thence, parallel with and 1,000 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty a distance of 6,600 feet, more or less, to a point 1,000 feet southerly from the point of beginning measured perpendicular to the axis of the North Jetty;

Thence, northerly 1,000 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing 449.5 acres, more or less, and lying and being in the county of Duval, State of Florida.

To have and to hold the said above-mentioned and described lands and premises, and all the title and interest of the trustees therein as granted by section 1061 of the Revised General Statutes of Florida, unto the said United States of America and its assigns, forever.

Saving and reserving unto the trustees of the internal improvement fund of Florida, and their successors, an undivided three-fourths interest in and title in and to an undivided three-fourths interest in all the phosphate, minerals, and metals that are or may be, on, or under the said above-described lands, and an undivided one-half interest in and title in and to an undivided one-half interest in all the petroleum that is or may be in or under the said above-described land, with the privilege to mine and develop the same.

In witness whereof, the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida have hereunto subscribed their names and affixed their seals, and have caused the seal of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Florida to be hereunto affixed, at the capitol, in the city of Tallahassee, on the 28th day of December, A. D. 1938.

FRED P. CONE,
Governor.
J. M. LEE,
Comptroller.
W. V. KNOTT,
Treasurer.
GEORGE COUPER GIBBS,
Attorney General.
NATHAN MAYO,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

[SEAL]

Sent to district engineer, United States Engineer Office, War Department, Post Office Box 4970, Jacksonville, Fla., December 30, 1938.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, that is a copy of the deed, as it was accepted and recorded. I wish to read the reservation clause merely to show that the Federal Government, far from claiming

the oil and other minerals in the offshore lands, not only admitted that they were in State ownership, but actually permitted the State to save, reserve, and except them in the formal deed. I read the reservation:

Saving and reserving unto the trustees of the internal-improvement fund of Florida, and their successors, an undivided three-fourths interest in and title in and to an undivided three-fourths interest in all the phosphate, minerals, and metals that are or may be in, on, or under the said above described lands, and an undivided one-half interest in and title in and to an undivided one-half interest in all the petroleum that is or may be in or under the said above described land, with the privilege to mine and develop the same.

So much for that particular transaction. A question arose in the committee hearings as to whether or not that deed had been approved by counsel for the Federal Government. Request was made by the committee for a search of the files. I find that the Department of Justice assigned this matter to be investigated by the land attorney who was an assistant in the office of the United States attorney for the southern district of Florida. The title was examined by him, and he made a written report upon the title to Hon. H. T. Bock, chief administrative assistant, United States engineer office, Jacksonville, Fla., approving it, including the reservation. This report contained a showing of the soundness of the title which was being procured.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the approving opinion be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA,
Jacksonville, January 14, 1939.

Hon. H. T. Bock,
Chief Administrative Assistant,
United States Engineer Office,
Jacksonville, Fla.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of January 4, 1939, enclosing deed No. 18471, which instrument is a deed from the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida to the United States of America.

This deed is in proper form and the execution of same is in proper form.

This office has not proofread or checked the description.

It will be noted that this deed contains a saving and reserving clause, that is, the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of Florida have conveyed to the United States of America the fee simple title to the lands described in said deed, saving and reserving to the State of Florida an undivided three-fourths interest in and title in and to all the phosphate minerals and metals that are in or may be in, on, or under said lands. This saving and reserving clause also saves and reserves in the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of Florida an undivided one-half interest in all the petroleum that is or may be in or under the said land.

With this last reservation, this deed conveys to the United States of America fee simple title.

Deed No. 18,471 is returned herewith.

Yours very truly,

HERBERT S. PHILLIPS,

United States Attorney.

By DAMON G. YERKES,

Assistant United States Attorney.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cite one more Florida case. In 1939, at the request of the War Department, the State of Florida granted a permit to the United States to deposit material obtained from dredging the entrance channel to Crystal River in the Gulf of Mexico. This particular case relates to the Gulf of Mexico. The case which I previously cited related to the Atlantic. The areas covered by this permit extended about 2 miles into the Gulf of Mexico. This document was made subject to the condition that the permit and the authorization granted to the War Department should not affect or impair the title to the bottoms used for the spoil areas, and stated that in the event, through the deposits of excavated material, the areas or any of them were raised to an elevation of 5 feet or above, as referred to mean low water, the previous authority conveyed by the permit should revert to the State of Florida on the condition that authority be granted for using other areas for like purposes. In other words, any substantial islands created by the deposit of the spoil should go back to the State of Florida. In order that the Senate may examine the document in its entirety, I ask leave at this point to insert a copy of the permit as part of my statement.

There being no objection, the permit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMIT FOR DEPOSITING DREDGED MATERIAL
ALONG NORTH SIDE OF ENTRANCE CHANNEL TO
CRYSTAL RIVER, FLORIDA—TRUSTEES OF THE
INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT FUND OF THE STATE
OF FLORIDA TO WAR DEPARTMENT OF THE
UNITED STATES

Whereas pursuant to application dated March 18, 1939, from the district engineer officer, United States War Department, Jacksonville, Fla., for permit to deposit dredged material upon certain areas along the north side of the entrance channel to Crystal River, Florida; and

Whereas the trustees of the internal improvement fund are the owners of the bottoms comprising said spoil areas: Now, therefore—

This permit issued by the trustees of the internal improvement fund hereby authorizes the War Department of the United States, its agents, engineers, and/or contractors, to deposit on those certain areas indicated as spoil areas on map attached hereto, identified by the caption "Crystal River, Fla. (6-Ft. Project), Survey January 1939," and by this instrument made a part hereof, material excavated in the construction and maintenance of the entrance channel to Crystal River, Florida.

Subject to the condition that this permit and the authorization to the War Department of the United States herein described shall not affect or impair the title to the bottoms used for said spoil areas, and in the event through the deposit of excavated material thereon said areas or any of them shall be raised to an elevation of 5 feet or above, as referred to mean low water, the privileges hereby conveyed shall revert to the trustees of the internal improvement fund, conditioned, that the trustees grant authority for using other areas selected by the War Department for like purposes.

This permit shall become effective upon the execution of the same by the trustees of the internal improvement fund and its acceptance by a proper officer of the War Department of the United States.

In witness whereof the trustees of the internal improvement fund have executed this permit in duplicate this 2d day of May

A. D. 1939, and the said War Department has accepted the said permit for the purposes herein described.

FRED P. CONE,

Governor;

J. M. LEE,

Comptroller;

W. V. KNOTT,

State Treasurer;

GEORGE COOPER GIBBS,

Attorney General;

NATHAN MAYO,

Commissioner of Agriculture;

As and composing the Trustees of the
Internal Improvement Fund of the
State of Florida.

Accepted by—

LEWIS H. WATKINS,

Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District
Engineer Officer, Jacksonville,
Fla.

Mr. HOLLAND. It will be noted that the permit was accepted, for the United States Government by the District Engineer, who appended his signature.

Another outstanding example of Federal recognition of the fact that the respective States own the tidelands off their shores is the transaction between the Federal Government and the State of Mississippi concerning an island off the shores of Mississippi in the Gulf of Mexico. In 1858 Mississippi granted to the United States title and jurisdiction to Ship Island in the Gulf of Mexico, and contiguous submerged lands around that island out a distance of 1,760 yards, or 1 mile, below low water mark, for construction of forts and other structures.

As long ago as 1858, the Federal Government requested from the sovereign State of Mississippi a grant of title and jurisdiction to an island in the Gulf of Mexico, and to contiguous submerged lands. Such grant was given. The grant included title and jurisdiction to submerged lands for a distance of 1 mile out into the Gulf of Mexico. The Federal Government not only accepted the grant, but used it to its advantage.

As late as 1940, 82 years later, the State Legislature of Mississippi passed an act confirming and clarifying the 1858 grant, so as to clear up title to the Federal Government.

Cases of similar transactions to those I have just mentioned, which are clearly in the marginal belt, can be found in Texas, California, Washington, South Carolina, Delaware, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and possibly other States, but I will not further consume the time of the Senate on this point. I think the point is abundantly clear.

That the Federal Government recognized State ownership is clearly illustrated in many past rulings of the Interior and Justice Departments. In some thirty opinions from 1900 to 1937, the Department of Interior ruled that ownership of the soil in the 3-mile belt was in the respective States.

Since former Secretary of the Interior Ickes raised the first legal challenge in this matter, I think the next part of my remarks will be particularly interesting to Senators.

A letter written on December 22, 1933, by Mr. Ickes as Secretary of the Interior to an applicant for an oil lease on submerged lands off the California coast, shows clearly his administrative ruling and the declared policy of the Interior

Department on this subject before the "great change" took place. I shall quote from Mr. Ickes' letter, as it will be found in one of the hearing records. Mr. Ickes said in part:

That title to the shore and underwater in front of lands so granted inures to the State in which they are situated. * * * Such title to the shore and the lands under water is regarded as incident to the sovereignty to the State. * * * The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no right can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437) or under any public land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean whether within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

In answer to a question concerning this letter from Senator LONG in the Senate committee hearings of 1951, Mr. Ickes said that this policy, as stated above, was the policy he "inherited" and was the policy when he wrote the letter. Obviously it had long been the standing policy of that agency and had been "inherited" by many Federal officials before Mr. Ickes' time. Many similar rulings were made by the Justice Department, the War Department, and other Federal agencies.

Certainly these positions taken by the Federal Government should be enough to convince any reasonable person that it repeatedly disclaimed ownership of the submerged areas within the boundaries of the maritime States.

I feel that the States had every right to rely in good faith on these repeated and frequent judicial rulings, administrative rulings of various executive agencies, and courses of dealing between the States and the several Federal agencies, covering the 150 years of time between the formation of the Union and the date when Secretary Ickes, according to his own testimony, was persuaded by the lawyers for the claimants who had filed applications for oil leases on the offshore lands to change his earlier ruling and ask the Court to rule that the offshore lands were Federal property. I feel that not only the States but also the many cities and other units of government and the thousands of private citizens who relied upon this sustained course of Federal conduct and spent countless millions of dollars in developing the waterfronts in every one of the 20 maritime States have a right to look to Congress to protect them against the clouding of their titles and the upsetting of their property values by the devastating effect of the opinions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

Perhaps the Court itself was justified in so limiting the effect of the equitable principles of prescription, adverse possession, estoppel, laches, and acquiescence that the States and private business and individuals could not now be protected against the claims of the Federal Government, by pleading these equitable defenses and sustaining them by evidence. But in my opinion this Congress has every right, and indeed a positive duty, to look into the equities of the moral considerations that are involved and, in passing our joint resolu-

tion, to protect the States, the local units of government, and private citizens against the destruction of their rights and property values which will ensue if the decisions of the Supreme Court are fully carried out. The Supreme Court refused to hear these equitable defenses based on actual dealings of a century and a half, and upon good-faith investment of billions of dollars. This Congress is now the only place where the long-standing rights of the States, the local units of government, and many thousands of citizens can be fully heard, and then recognized and protected for all time to come.

I now yield for questions, if there are any.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Florida if the actions and transactions of the executive to which he has referred were brought to the attention of the Supreme Court in the California case?

Mr. HOLLAND. Some of them were. A small portion of them were—enough, I think, to be illustrative. But the Supreme Court held—and I quoted that finding just before the Senator from Illinois returned to the Chamber—that in a suit against the United States Government it could not give effect to defenses of that kind. It listed certain of such defenses, including prescription, adverse possession, estoppel, laches, and acquiescence. The Court held that private individuals, States, and local units of government could not be protected under such defenses.

While the Senator was out of the Chamber I said also that even upon making effort to advance those defenses, and to sustain them by offering evidence, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], then attorney general of the State of Texas, was denied by the United States Supreme Court the right to take any such course. I have just stated, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, that perhaps the Court is necessarily bound by a rule of such complete fixity; but I do not think that the public is bound by any such rule, and I do not think Congress is bound by any such rule. I should be surprised indeed if Congress would shut its eyes to manifest equities of the type I have been discussing.

In fact, the distinguished Senator from Illinois earlier in the day stated that he does not want to shut his eyes to at least some of those equities, because he states he is a supporter of the so-called Anderson bill, by which some of those equities would be recognized and by which titles would be quitclaimed as to lands which have been already filled and which have already been developed, and as to piers which have already been built, and as to groins and other types of structures which have already been erected. So to that degree the Senator from Illinois has shown his desire to do equity, for which I commend him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did not the Supreme Court hold that these actions of the Fed-

eral Government, or previous failures to act on its part, did not bar the Federal Government from asserting its paramount rights in submerged lands?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; the court did so hold. Then the Supreme Court, almost at the conclusion of its decision, after discussing the fact that it had not overlooked the argument that great values had been created, said:

But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

Mr. President, if the Supreme Court had been trying to draft a lithographed invitation to Congress to correct the situation and to give protection to those whose properties were adversely affected, and to remove the inequities, it could not have done a better job than in writing the sentence which I have just quoted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the Anderson bill preserves all the legitimate equities of the States, of the localities, and of the private lessees?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator from Illinois has asked me that question. The Anderson bill does quitclaim any Federal right to all those who have invested up to now and have developments and improvements of the kind I have mentioned.

However, so far as doing justice is concerned to communities which are not static, because they need to move forward, and must be able to give title to land, for instance, for the location of piers which may cost millions of dollars to construct, and for which bond issues must first be floated before they can be built, the Anderson bill leaves the States, local units of government, and private owners of properties which abut on the coastal waters, without anything except the right to come with tin cup in hand to a Federal bureau in Washington, in an effort to obtain the right to build, for example, a sewage system, or to build a pier, or to construct a bulkhead, or a groin, or to pump some sand from offshore, or to do any of the other things which are completely necessary to be done for the enjoyment and development of property rights in the very important area which we call the coastal belt of the various coastal States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my friend the Senator from Florida, to section 11 of the Anderson bill, which is S. 107, appearing at page 14 of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am familiar with subsections (a) and (b) of section 11 of the Anderson bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Section 11 (a) reads:

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

Therefore, everything which in the past has been filled in is given to the States and other local claimants by subsection (a). Then I read subsection (b).

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The Anderson bill lives in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Wait a minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say what I think should be said at this point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I say advisedly that the Anderson bill does confirm to the States and local communities and to private owners their developments, which are worth several billion dollars, which have been constructed prior to the time of the passage of the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Florida is speaking about the Anderson bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am referring to the Anderson bill, in reply to the question of the Senator from Illinois. I am referring to S. 107, the Anderson bill.

But, after excepting such completed construction in seeking a grant or permit for any of those activities, many of which are detail, but necessary detail in building any future structure of the kind, the owner is left no recourse except to come to Washington or to go to an agent of the Government outside of Washington in order to get a permit before any such construction can be undertaken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask permission of the Senator from Florida to read subsection (b) of section 11, which deals with the future, and reads as follows:

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois has a point. Subsection (b) corrects the situation in part. It says, under the peculiar philosophy of those who think that public rights should be placed above private rights, that States, political subdivisions, and public agencies may go ahead in building, on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, parks, bathing beaches, and the like, and that the right to do so shall not be denied.

However, there are two things it does not do. First, it does not put private industry on a parity with public units of government. It does not say anything about private industry, except that in another section it has the right to come to the Capital City and deal with Washington, if it can. The second thing it does not do is that it does not completely correct the title situation with reference to the future, as it does with reference to things in the past.

So, Mr. President, what is sought to be done is to inhibit public communities in the future to a degree, though not to the same degree, that private industry and private property is to be harmed if S. 107 should be passed.

Mr. President, if S. 107 should be passed, I hope the Senator will read the statement in the RECORD by the distinguished public coordinator of the city of New York, Mr. Robert Moses, who stated in effect, though I shall not attempt to quote his exact words, that insofar as S. 107 is concerned it is simply an invitation to people generally to come to Washington and entertain the Army or other agencies in Washington if they expect to get any recognition.

Mr. Robert Moses told about the tremendous developments on Long Island and on Staten Island. I believe Long Island is approximately 100 miles long, and my understanding is that very little of its present ocean shoreline was originally in existence, but that most of it has been filled in by developments of the greatest value, worth many millions of dollars, as, for instance, Coney Island, the Idlewild Airport, the Floyd Bennett Airfield, and all the public parks and beaches on the south shore of Long Island. All of them have been built on filled-in land, and much of the other development on Long Island has been on filled-in land. Before our committee Mr. Moses indicated he was outraged by what he thought was a deliberate and so far successful effort to cloud the titles to highly expensive and highly valuable frontages on Long Island, which is the principal sea and recreational outlet for the teeming millions of people who live in New York City and on Long Island itself. He also mentioned Staten Island, the parks there, the other public improvements, and the private improvements on that island. Both those islands face the open sea.

Mr. President, I hope that some of the Senators who are opposing this measure will search their consciences and, in the sanctity of their rooms, or wherever they go to pray, will examine a picture of Long Island and a picture of Staten Island in the light of the testimony of that distinguished public servant, Mr. Moses, who says that the actual values there amount to hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars, and then will decide whether they want that kind of development to continue freely and without interruption, or whether they want, instead, to impose an obstacle, a handicap and a hurdle to the making of further developments of that sort. If Senators search their souls as I have suggested I do not believe they will return from their sanctum sanctorum with any other answer than that we must not disturb the initiative of the American people, who already have developed to such great degree lands of the type I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I believe that completes my answer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, except that I may say I remember that those who testified upon this particular point exemplified better than anything I could possibly say on the floor of the Senate the difference between the thinking of those who want the present stymied status to be continued, except as it would be modified by Senate bill 107, and those of us who still want to see American private enterprise move forward and accomplish worthwhile things in the building of our great country.

I remember that the distinguished former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, when he was questioned by me specifically about these two subsections, namely, subsection (a) and subsection (b) of section 11 of Senate bill 107, the so-called Anderson bill, said in so many words that he thought they were good, and that he thought it would not impose any handicap upon private owners or public agencies who wanted to do something that is not permitted by those provisions, to require them to come to the Federal Government in Washington; that it would amount to nothing more than a change in landlord—the word “landlord” was actually used by him—which he said need not cause anyone any concern; that it would be just as well to have located in the city of Washington a landlord who would pass on the matter of whether a sewer could be constructed to serve a small home in one of those areas, as it would be to permit such a matter to be handled by and decided by the local agencies in Miami Beach or by the local agencies in any other of the many coastal cities of our Nation. Mr. President, the latter is the American way of doing things, and the way by which our country has grown great.

It is sound and right to have the Federal Government serve as the arbiter in the case of all these rights, tiny in themselves, but which in the aggregate constitute such a tremendous set of values, and which in their totality will determine whether our coastal cities can continue to move forward and progress, or whether they must enter the doldrums, must stop moving, and must not even have any title to such areas—for under the Supreme Court decisions or under the partially remedial proposed laws there is nothing whereby the coastal cities can really obtain a title on the basis of which they can move forward with any really important undertaking.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator from Florida exaggerating this point? I ask that question because, so far as the inland waters are concerned, the States, the municipalities, and local government units would have a right to fill in land and to convey such rights as they deem proper to convey.

Mr. HOLLAND. Why is it not just as well to grant the same right on the lands lying outside?

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, is that not true in the case of inland waters?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; it is true as to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The inland waters cover a very broad extent, as the tables previously inserted in the RECORD of this debate by the Senator from Florida reveal. For instance, to mention only a few pertinent examples, they cover New York Harbor, Long Island Sound, Puget Sound, and, I believe, the waters between the coast of Florida and the outward chain of islands, and so forth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois will permit me to say at this point that he is adopting the form of pleading which we know in the

law as de minimis. He says that because we did not work complete catastrophe on all coastal units everywhere, therefore we should not pay much attention to the fact that we would work complete catastrophe upon the units of government and the properties which border the open sea.

I recognize, as I have said, that Senate bill 107, the so-called Anderson bill, would quitclaim title to lands beneath the inland waters just as effectively as would our joint resolution. However, I say to the Senator from Illinois that I find it very hard indeed to justify a philosophy by which the good city of Tampa, Fla., which happens to be located on inland waters, would be told, "Yes, you can proceed with your developments and progress with the building of docks, and so forth," but by which the good city of Miami Beach, Fla., would be told, "No, you cannot do that, at least as to your ocean frontage, because we have not seen fit, in the grace of Congress, to give you the right to do that sort of thing."

Mr. President, I think this is a good time to relate an actual occurrence at Miami Beach during the war. This matter has no particular pertinency to the present situation except to show what ridiculous things can be done by persons who do not know the local situation. At Miami Beach there is no depth of soil; there are just a few inches of sand over rock. As a result, it is not possible to dispose of the sewage from Miami Beach except by treating it and then moving it out to sea. The sewage-disposal plant of the city of Miami Beach reaches out to sea 2 or more miles, into the edge of the Gulf Stream, and disposes of the treated sewage at that point. That sewage-disposal plant cost many millions of dollars to build. During the war the Navy was convoying tankers in the Gulf Stream. The alert commander of one of the Navy destroyers or destroyer escorts saw bubbles rising at a point in the ocean where a submarine could have lain in wait. He decided that a German submarine was lying there. So he had his vessel dash to that point, and had the crew drop several depth charges there. Then he left, thinking that he had probably destroyed the enemy submarine, and that all now was safe for democracy. However, as a matter of fact, he had bombed the sewage outlet of the city of Miami Beach. That fact is clearly set forth in a letter written to me by the city engineer of Miami Beach.

Mr. President, are we going to impose intolerable handicaps upon necessary construction of the sort to which I have just referred.

In the case of Los Angeles, for instance, the record shows that the city is about to complete an enormous outlet. I believe, a 12-foot steel and concrete pipe—that is what it amounts to—which reaches more than 1 mile into the open Pacific Ocean, by means of which sewage from the city of Los Angeles will be discharged. That will be the second pipe of the sort, but the second one is much larger than the first. The city of Los Angeles has invested in its sewage disposal construction \$43,800,000 of its funds. Are we going to admit that that

type of development cannot move ahead except with all the restrictions, handicaps, and hurdles the Senator from Illinois and his friends would place in the way of such communities, by requiring them to go through various Federal Government procedures before they could make such developments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator from Florida aware that by both subsection (a) and subsection (b) of section 11 of Senate bill 107, the so-called Anderson bill, works of construction on the part of municipalities, States, or local subdivisions resulting in filled-in land or buildings or structures in the submerged lands can be carried out or made, and title in the local unit is recognized and confirmed by the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from Illinois put his finger upon the confirmation of title? I should like to have him do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now read subsection (a) of section 11 of Senate bill 107:

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

I now read subsection (b) of section 11 of the same bill:

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

I stress the fact that the former subsection uses the words "any right granted is hereby recognized and confirmed" and the latter subsection uses the words "right, title, and interest."

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Illinois understand that to mean areas not now owned and not now claimed by the cities and the public units of government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. "Submerged lands on the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands."

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that the people in the coastal cities are not at all sure that it applies except to titles which they now have, and that it is joined with subsection (a) of section 11. They are not at all sure that that permits them to choose new sites, which will have to be chosen. They are not at all sure that adequate machinery at all is provided by which title can be granted in such cases. At the very most, all the Senator could claim for subsection (b), even if it is as good as he thinks it is, is that public units are recognized as having rights superior to private property owners. But there is no machinery included by which private property owners can proceed, except and unless they go

to the Washington functionaries to get permission.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not on the floor when the Senator from Florida referred to the situation in New York State. I want to mention that particularly, because it certainly is not my desire in any way to misquote the Senator or to misrepresent him in anything he may say.

Mr. HOLLAND. I remember the Senator from New York submitted subsection (b) of section 11, which I was happy to have him do, when the debate was raging last year. But I called his attention during the debate at that time—and the RECORD will so show—to the fact that he was showing a much more tender regard for, and a much more tender recognition of, public developments than he was for private developments, and that his amendment, taken by itself, left no place in the development picture for private investors or private property owners. The Senator will recall that I mentioned that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I think the Senator said that. Of course, I am in favor of having private development, too, as well as public development. What I am trying to make clear to my colleagues in the Senate is that, when Robert Moses, power commissioner of New York—and he has been a very fine power commissioner—came here and made representations at the hearings that the rights or the titles of the city of New York and State of New York were jeopardized, unless this quitclaim measure were enacted, he was setting up what in my opinion was entirely a straw man. Likewise when the mayor of the city of New York, Mr. Impellitteri, wrote in support of a quitclaim for the State, he was setting up a straw man, and was in my opinion entirely ignorant of the facts.

There has never been any question on the part of any State official, during the many years I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor, as to the title and control of the piers and docks of the Harbor of New York, of our inland lakes, or of the built-in lands on Coney Island, Staten Island, Oriental Beach, and Manhattan Beach, as well as the various other recreational centers which have been developed. I may say to the Senator from Florida that last year when I submitted this proposed amendment to his joint resolution, an amendment which would have amply protected the public interest in the State of New York, it was drafted in association with and with the full consent of the corporation counsel of the city of New York. He was entirely satisfied with it. As a matter of fact, he inspired the submission of the amendment.

For years it has been proposed by Members of Congress that such an amendment be included in any bill on this subject. It never was adopted, and, as has been testified to before the committee in my presence, I believe that one of the reasons it was not adopted was because the proponents of the quitclaim legislation did not want to lose what they felt was an argument. In my opinion it was no argument at all. There is no threat made to docks or piers in the in-

land waters, or on the sound, or on the seacoast, provided they are on filled-in land. Under the provisions of the Anderson measure, I believe it is clear that the rights, not only of New York State, but of all the States, are amply protected both with regard to land that has already been filled in and the land that may be filled in in the future.

It seems to me that the only interference there could possibly be on the part of the Federal Government would be when the interests of navigation were involved; and of course, then the Federal Government would be in a position to exercise its rights, and we would want it to do so. It is impossible to build a long dock from the Jersey coast, the Jersey shore, or the New York shore, which would impede navigation, without receiving authority from the Federal Government; and I do not think the Senator would urge to the contrary. Except in such circumstances as that, it does not seem to me that the Federal Government could, or ever would, interfere with the control and ownership of these lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Of course, he is correct in one thing he said, namely that the Government's engineers have the say under present law, as they would under any law that has been suggested, with reference to whether any proposed improvement would be harmful to navigation. Nobody questions that.

Mr. LEHMAN. That goes back many, many decades.

Mr. HOLLAND. But in the other features of his statement the Senator from New York is almost alone in taking the position which he has taken, so far as the distinguished dignitaries of his own State are concerned. The present Governor of the State of New York has repeatedly asserted himself in behalf of the State's legislation. The attorney general of the State of New York, Mr. Goldstein, has not only come to Washington to testify, but has aided in perfecting the measure by suggesting an excellent amendment. The former attorney general, who served as such under the distinguished occupancy of the governor's chair by the Senator from New York, has also supported it. The mayor of New York City, Mayor Impellitteri, supports it. The public commissioner, or the commissioner of parks—I believe he is called the public coordinator—Mr. Moses, whom the Senator from New York recognizes as a distinguished figure in the field of public improvements, also supports the State's position; and so far as the Senator from Florida knows, he does not know anyone other than the junior Senator from New York who takes a different position. The senior Senator from New York has taken exactly the opposite position.

The Senator from Florida would be glad to feel, if he could, that the junior Senator from New York was on sound ground; but he does not entertain that view. When he looks at a map and sees that the larger part of the great developments on the south side of Long Island are on built land, and that there is need for further extension of that land in

order to bring about further developments—and Mr. Moses said there are plans now under way to build many millions of dollars' worth of additional parks and bathing beaches in that same area—it seems to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from New York is not on sound ground, even with reference to public improvements. Particularly do I feel that the Senator is on completely quaking sands when he declines to propose, in the protection of private investors and the owners of private property, legislation which would give them even the same modicum of rights which he offered to give to the public units of government under his amendment of last year.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the Senator from New York to say a moment ago that he wished private industry could have those rights. But I am not aware that he has submitted to the Anderson bill any amendment to give private industry those rights; and there is no measure as yet known to the Senator from Florida by which private industry can get those rights, except by the support of the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida will recall that I offered last year an amendment to protect private rights. So far as the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Florida is concerned, that the present Governor of the State of New York favors turning over these great assets to the States, that is correct. It was one of the issues when I ran against the present Governor of the State of New York, and the people of the State supported me. I ran against the park commissioner, Mr. Moses, and I again won by a very large plurality.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did not the Senator from New York defeat Mr. Moses by the largest majority ever received by a candidate for Governor of the State of New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think that is true, up to that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the senior Senator from New York prevailed over his opposition by something like 1,150,000 votes last fall. My recollection is that the prevailing party in New York, which has stood with the States of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California, carried the State, as I recall, 850,000 votes. If my recollection is incorrect, I hope the Senator will correct me. It was a very large vote. It seems to me that the Senator from New York must feel rather keenly that he stands in a rather isolated position, considering that not only his present Governor, with attainments almost equaling his own, but both the Attorneys General whom I have mentioned, the mayor of New York, the public parks commissioner, and the senior Senator from New York, all differ

with the opinion of the junior Senator from New York. The junior Senator from New York simply counters by saying that that is a ridiculous position for them to take.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the Senator to use those words.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I did, I do not recall using them. But I may point out to the Senator from Florida that when he says the junior Senator from New York stands alone on this proposition, I deny it. It is perfectly true that the present Governor of New York, the present mayor of New York City, who is of my own party, and the present commissioner of parks of New York, do not take the same position I take, but it is my sincere and heartfelt belief that the vast majority of the people of the State of New York stand shoulder to shoulder with me in this fight which I am joining with my associates in conducting.

I believe they realize, if the Senator from Florida will yield further, that this gift of billions of dollars of assets to 3 States at the expense of 45 States is contrary to the spirit in which this country became a federation.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York is one of those referred to by the Senator from Florida a little while ago who, for some unknown reason, proceeded to put their sights up into the billions of dollars when they talk about the funds which the Federal Government would be relinquishing to the States under this resolution. The actual fact, as shown by the highest estimates made by the public servants whose duty it is to know and understand this field, is that the total of all the royalties which could move to the 3 affected States from all oil and gas estimated to be within their State boundaries, in the event it could all be produced, would be well under \$1 billion, and would be stretched out over the next 25 or 30 or even 50 years. Those facts are so clearly shown by the record that there is no debating them whatsoever.

So the Senator from New York, in talking about a grant of billions of dollars, could have been referring only to one thing, because there is only one place where there are billions of dollars in value, namely, in developments along the shore. The Senator's own State certainly has many hundreds of millions of dollars invested in filled land along Long Island Sound and Staten Island. I would not be able to make a good guess on that exact amount, as would the Senator from New York; but it is a fact that the values involved in the development along the coastlines of our 20 coastal States upon lands which have been filled run into many billions of dollars.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the case of New York, the value of the lands in question is paid for out of New York capital, for the benefit, as a matter of fact, of persons from all over the Nation. We are proud and happy to welcome people from the other 47 States. I can say that so far as I am concerned—I can speak only

as the junior Senator from New York—New York State is perfectly willing to share the mineral wealth which may come from the sea outside the low tide with the 47 other States of the Union. New York State does not want anything that gives us an advantage. We today pay infinitely more than our share of taxes on a per-capita basis, and we are glad to do it because we believe that what is good for one part of the Nation is good for every part of the Nation. Therefore, we are glad to do it. But we certainly do not want to see this great wealth—and I do not agree with the figures given by the distinguished Senator from Florida—used for the purposes of only 3 States when we know the Nation needs great amounts of money to build up and maintain its schools and to pay decent salaries to its teachers. We want Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Georgia to get exactly the same relative advantage from funds derived from offshore resources as New York State receives. There is nothing selfish about the attitude of those of us in New York State who want to use this money for education, for defense, or to pay off the national debt. We are willing to share the wealth, if there is any off our shores, with all the other States of the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since it is apparent that the distinguished junior Senator from New York has not examined the record, I refer him at this time to table V on page 577 of the hearings and to table I on page 584 of the hearings, which give the latest information obtainable from the most expert sources in Government as to the amounts involved.

So far as the State of New York is concerned, I am quite persuaded that the distinguished Senator from New York has no selfish motive at all. Yet I would remind him that there is no State in the Union which, in a dollars-and-cents way, will profit so greatly from the passage of this resolution as will the State of New York, because the coastal developments there greatly exceed those to be found in any other State of the Union, far surpassing anything that could even be hoped for or dreamt of as possible royalties to be received by Louisiana, Texas, or California out of the comparatively small amounts of oil and gas which may be found within the offshore boundaries of those three States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the minimum figures which the Senator from Florida quotes refer to proved reserves?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct as to that table—

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if we turn to potential reserves, are not the sound estimates very much higher?

Mr. HOLLAND. The potential reserves are contained in the other table, namely, table 1 on page 584, to which I referred. They show that, including both proved and potential, the reserves within those boundaries are 2 billion barrels plus. Outside those boundaries, there are 13 billion barrels to which the States make no claim, and in those lands

the resolution confirms the title of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall make an argument on that point when I obtain the floor.

Is it not true that the minimum estimate of 15 billion barrels of oil on the Continental Shelf, which at present prices, as a matter of fact, would amount to about \$40 billion, is nothing to be sneezed at?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois insists upon including in those figures the great bulk of five-sixths of the oil that would not be confirmed to the Federal Government. The States would not have any interest in it whatsoever under the joint resolution. Instead, the interest would go to the Federal Government. There are only three coastal States where any oil has been found and they would get something like 2 billion barrels, if all of it could be produced.

Incidentally, if the Senator will look at the last sentence on page 585 of the report of the hearings, which I now show to him, he will read the following:

The estimate includes, of course, much oil that is not now economically recoverable by processes of exploration and production that are now known to be practicable. Only a small part of the Shelf lies beneath water of such shallow depth as thus far to invite exploration and development by the use of existing techniques.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the definition of "Continental Shelf" is that it is submerged land not more than 100 fathoms, or 600 feet, beneath the surface of the water.

Mr. HOLLAND. Exactly; but the point I am making to the distinguished Senator, which is a valid point, is that these very estimates on their face show that much of the oil and gas that is said to be present is not recoverable under any presently known methods, and it is not known whether they will ever be recoverable.

I listened to the testimony as it was presented to the committee, and it was very apparent, at least to me, that the extra costs of production of oil and gas in the offshore waters would be such that the same degree of exhaustion of proved deposits of oil and gas could not be accomplished as economically as it could be accomplished on the upland.

Incidentally—and with one more point I desire to close on this subject—these estimates are the most fictional sort of estimates which could be worked out, except as to proved reserves, which are inconsequential, merely enough to supply our Nation for about 32 days. The rest of the estimates were made on the basis of a guess on production inland, back from the shoreline, in an area of land comparable with the area of submerged land which lies in the shelf.

The experts who made the estimates have said that the deposits may be found to be greater than the estimates, or they may be found to be less than the estimates. But the fact is that they are guessing, and are basing their guess upon the upland production, while they tell us in the next breath that as much cannot be produced under water as can be produced upland, because the cost of operation is such as not to permit of

production in the case of deposits which, on the uplands, would be marginal or nearly so.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Florida said that within their historical offshore boundaries, according to the highest estimates, the States would receive only a little more than 2 billion barrels of oil. Actually, the States would receive only the royalties on a little over 2 billion barrels.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's correction. The royalties on 2 billion barrels, even if every bit of it was produced, would be well under a billion dollars. Incidentally, the very people who are opposing the joint resolution propose to divide that amount by allotting 37½ percent to the States and the balance to the Federal Government. Under that arrangement, the Federal Government would actually receive something like a half billion dollars over the next 25, 30, or 50 years if all estimates within State boundaries were actually produced. That is all anyone can see in the matter up to this time. Yet I still hear effusive statements about billions and billions of dollars worth of oil being cast away, when there just does not happen to be any factual basis for such statements. As a matter of fact, there is no oil in the States represented by many Senators and Representatives who are supporting the resolution, and there is no chance, under present geological disclosures, of their being any oil in their States; but they are tremendously interested in again releasing the palsied hand of private enterprise, which has been stayed by the three Court decisions, under which there is no title anywhere and no assurance anywhere as to what the law is going to be in the future. Private development has been held up pitifully during the years since 1947, when the first decision was handed down.

The question is, does Congress, which is the only place where there is sufficiently far-reaching jurisdiction to bundle this whole set of problems up into one basket and solve them fairly, as between the Federal Government and the States and the people, intend to do that, or is Congress going to continue to drag its feet and decline to do what it is quite evident the people want it to do? What is desired has been indicated by the Gallup Poll, by the great majority of newspapers, by the great majority in Congress every time the question comes to a vote; and I do not know how many times it has come to a vote between 1946 and the present. Two bills have been passed by both Houses. At other times bills on the subject have passed the House. A great majority of the Members of both Houses listen to what the people back home say to them.

There is an American way to handle the question. There is a democratic way to solve the problem and that is to turn private energy loose and enable it to go again into the building of developments of immense value, such as exist on the south shore of Long Island, where there is one value after another, of multi-million dollar proportions, in

great flying fields and great beach resorts and parks.

Mr. Moses placed in the record pictures of Coney Island, showing the same kind of groins built into the Atlantic there in order to protect the shores, as have been built from the beaches into the open Atlantic along the coast of Florida.

That tremendous set of values presents a challenge, as to whether we are to stop or to move forward. It seems to me that it is unthinkable that we should prolong this stalemate and require the good people who desire to go ahead with building new values to stay their hands until they can ascertain what Congress is going to do and what the law will be.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely had in mind some questions about the estimates of potential oil reserves. The distinguished Senator from Florida earlier this afternoon referred to astronomical estimates, and stated that enough unfair, untrue propaganda had been issued about the joint resolution to make one shudder and that outlandish claims had been advanced.

I took to the radio last night and made some statements about the quantity of oil which might be contained beneath the submerged lands on the Continental Shelf of the United States, so I believe I have some statements to defend.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois made no statement of his own which the Senator from Florida has asked him to defend, because I have made no reference to any such statement made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he is aware of the article written by a very eminent oil geologist, Mr. L. G. Weeks, entitled "Concerning Estimates of Potential Oil Reserves" in the Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, volume 34, No. 10, pages 1947 to 1953, issued, I believe, in the year 1950.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have seen the article.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that that very distinguished oil geologist estimated that the potential oil reserves in the Continental Shelf off the coast of the United States amount to 40 billion barrels, which at \$2.70 a barrel would amount to \$108,000,000,000, with the value of gas and sulfur to be added to that amount?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall the amount stated in the Bulletin. What I was referring to, if the Senator will allow me to refer to it again, was, for instance, the testimony of John J. Gunther, legislative representative of the Americans for Democratic Action, who played a considerable part in the hearings, together with the CIO and other ultraliberal groups. Mr. Gunther said:

These offshore lands are rich in oil. Estimates run from forty or fifty to two hundred billion dollars.

The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] then asked Mr. Gunther:

Where did you get those estimates? That is the highest maximum I have heard yet.

Mr. Gunther said he got them from a newspaper article; and that was that. One of the members of the commit-

tee projected a 300-billion-barrel guess. Various others whom the Senator from Florida has heard over the radio, and whose effusions he has seen in various columns, have claimed amounts up to 400 billion barrels. That is the largest estimate the Senator from Florida has yet seen. But the Senator from Florida prefers to think that the Senate will believe that the expert testimony of Government geologists, uncertain as it is and uncertain as it is stated by them to be, is the best we could have right now, particularly when it happens to agree very closely with the estimates of the best oil predictors. The figures from the geologists are the ones in the record which the Senator might like to escape, but which are there, and which show repeatedly that about 2 billion barrels is all that can be expected to be produced at the most in the areas within the State boundaries.

Let me say to the Senator that the veto message of former President Truman used pretty much the same figures. He stated in his message that the proved reserves amounted to 278 million barrels, as I recall, and that there was a possibility of finding something over 2 billion barrels, including the 278 million.

So there is not very much difference between the figures. The thing which has distorted the figures so badly has been the inability of many people who, I think, were trying to make an honest appraisal, to realize that there is not now and never has been any bill introduced to claim for the States the areas outside the State boundaries. They have either been unwilling to see that, or they have not had the facts brought to their attention. They prefer to take the largest possible estimate applying to the whole Continental Shelf, and reduce it to terms of State boundaries, as though it came from within State boundaries, where there is only about one-sixth of what is in the Continental Shelf. Then they prefer to use that figure as though there were not to be a distribution between the State and Federal Government, even though you advocates of Federal ownership concede that the States should have 37½ percent.

They come up with a figure which is wholly unrealistic, completely extravagant, and highly exaggerated. They set up a straw man which they like to demolish for their own edification. The Senator from Florida has hope that at long last the public is beginning to understand what the facts are. Editorials in responsible newspapers are showing what the facts are.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Senator from Illinois takes the floor he intends to introduce a table which will make allowance for the factors to which the Senator from Florida has referred.

In addition to the estimate of 40 billion barrels by Dr. Weeks, who is a very able oil geologist, is the Senator from Florida aware of an article which appeared in the Houston Post for October 26, 1952, signed by 18 eminent Texas oil geologists?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not seen that particular article. I shall be glad to have

the Senator place it in the RECORD in his own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a matter of fact—

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida will continue with his next point, unless the Senator from Illinois has a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that there is an estimate by these Texas geologists of \$80 billion worth of oil off the coast of Texas alone?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would be astounded if any responsible person should place his signature under any such statement, but he has not seen the statement. He has just said so. So he could not discuss it further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of an estimate by Dr. W. E. Pratt, published in the Bulletin of the American Association of Oil Geologists, of 100 billion barrels for the Continental Shelf, which, at current prices, would represent a value of \$270 billion?

Mr. HOLLAND. I read that article; and it seemed to me that the larger part of that oil was claimed to be off the coast of Alaska.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I submit to the Senator from Florida for his inspection the Houston Post of October 26, 1952. The headline is: "Rich Tideland Potential Cited—Engineers Say Ultimate Worth Is Over \$80 Billion."

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to have the Senator place that article in the RECORD in his own time. I shall be glad to read it. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has received a great deal of cumulative evidence from sources which are unimpeachable, and of the highest character, including the highest officials in our own Government. Even those who try to give away to the Federal Government the assets of the States, and even those who tried to seize those assets under the so-called surplus grab last year, come to just about the same figure—about 2 billion barrels within State boundaries, and about 13 billion barrels outside State boundaries. The Senator from Florida would be surprised to see any figure from reputable sources which varied greatly from that estimate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida cited as an added reason why these oil lands should be turned over to Florida, Texas, and Louisiana the great improvements in recreation facilities, airports, and parkways which were built at great cost. I wonder whether the Senator knows that the beautiful developments which we have in New York State—such as Jones Beach, Idlewild Airfield, LaGuardia Airfield, and all our magnificent parkways on Long Island—were paid for out of public funds provided by the taxpayers of the State of New York. They did it cheerfully, and they would be happy to have the Senator from Florida and our other friends from all over the country come to New York and share those facilities.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has already made that point, and it is a good

point. I do not care to have it reiterated in my time.

All I can say is that the very gentleman who had most to do with making those improvements came to Washington fighting for the right to go ahead with similar developments, and telling us about bond issues which had already been sold in order that they might move ahead with other developments. They told us that they were stymied and held up, and that no one could safely proceed. They implored Congress, including the distinguished Senator from New York, to pass this measure so that they could go ahead in further service to the people of the great city which is the metropolis of our country.

WHAT IS THE SOUND PERMANENT PUBLIC POLICY?

The next subdivision is built around the title "What Is the Sound Permanent Public Policy?"

Congress has the clear right and power in determining and carrying out what it regards as sound public policy, to quit-claim or convey to the States the submerged lands within their original boundaries. Article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution vests in Congress "Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States." Mr. Justice Black specifically refers to this power of Congress in his majority opinion in the California case. He closes the very paragraph in which he takes note of the great value of the improvements made in the coastal belts by public and private agencies with the sentence:

But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

Former Solicitor General Perlman stated several times in his testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 82d Congress, that Congress had the undoubted power to dispose of the coastal belt. One of his statements is as follows:

Now, if Congress can provide that the Secretary of the Interior can make leases, certainly it can authorize the States to make leases, and the power of Congress to dispose of the minerals or dispose of the revenues of the minerals is absolute. (Hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 82d Cong., 1st sess., on Senate Joint Resolution 20, at p. 366.)

Congress followed its judgment as to what constitutes sound public policy in another matter when it conveyed, under the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act in 1850, the immense areas of valuable Federal swamplands to the 15 States in which these public lands lay. Congress believed that this course would result in quicker development and sounder administration of these swamp areas, which were much larger in area and value than the submerged lands covered by our bill, and by and large the States have handled the problem successfully, to the great good of the whole Nation. That great area now comprises some of the greatest tax values and some of the greatest production values to be found in our Nation. By way of specific comparison, the

total area of public Federal lands, whose title lay without question in the Federal Government, which was conveyed by Congress as swamp and overflowed lands to 15 States, was 64 million acres, whereas the offshore areas to be quitclaimed under our bill to the 20 coastal States total only 17 million acres.

I repeat that statement, Mr. President. In 1850 our great Nation which was then certainly much poorer than it is today, gave to only 15 States a grant of 64 million acres, as contrasted with the 17 million acres proposed to be granted in the submerged lands offshore to our 20 coastal States.

I have read the debate in that case, and I was impressed with the fact that the men who passed that bill were largely from the original States and the early-admitted States, none of which had any Federal public lands within their limits.

There was considerable argument on the bill. However, the final outcome of it was that the Thirteen Original States and the great States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Vermont, and Maine, the early established States in the Nation, and others which had been established before 1850, through their representatives—and the result in the Senate was by unanimous vote—granted to 15 States 64 million acres of land, comprising most of the swamps and most of the overflowed lands in that area of our Nation which had been surveyed up to that time.

In the case of my own State, such great values have been produced as those in the reclaimed lands around Lake Okeechobee which constitute the winter market basket of the Nation. In the States of Iowa and Michigan, as well as in other great agricultural States, tremendous agricultural values have been produced by reason of that grant. Likewise many industrial and residential values have been created, as well as many mining values and many oil-producing values. There is no telling what value, under modern measurement, should be placed on that grant.

But a new, ambitious nation, full of initiative, and seeking to develop and promote self-government and local government, could find it in its heart to grant 64 million acres of land to 15 of the newer States, who needed that shot in the arm in order to get started.

Speaking for my own State, Mr. President, I wish to say that we are extremely grateful, not only to the Nation, but particularly to the Senators from the older States for the action taken at that time.

I see before me Senators from several of those States, who are worthy successors to worthy predecessors who looked at the national interests and said it is not sound government for these great areas to remain in Federal control; it is not sound policy for these areas to remain unreclaimed; it is not sound from any standpoint to put any handicap upon the play of private initiative in those areas. So they made it possible for reclamation and drainage to go ahead on a great scale and to make possible the development of tremendous values in the 15 States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois interfere with the regular progress of the Senator from Florida if he were to ask a question at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I should like to complete my presentation of this section of my remarks. Then I shall be happy to yield.

Congress has also followed what it regarded as sound public policy in the granting of many millions of acres to States and Territories for schools, railroads, canals, and other improvements. In order to clearly illustrate this point, I ask leave at this time to insert excerpts taken from an official publication, table 105, page 128, of the 1951 Report of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, listing the acreage of Federal lands granted to the States as of June 30, 1951, for some of the various purposes which Congress has held to be in furtherance of sound public policy.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the real question here is, What is the sound public policy in this matter? Those who want to be legalistic will find no comfort in looking at the course of action of our Nation up to this time. Our Nation has freely granted from its great land reserves immense values, not because the Nation did not own them, but because it thought the country should be built up, that riches should be created from the developments which would follow, and that the public interest would be promoted by making such huge grants.

The total of all such public lands granted to the States by Congress is 245 million acres.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreage granted to States and Territories,¹ as of June 30, 1951

State	For common schools	For other schools	For railroads	For swamp reclamation
Alabama	911,627	383,785	2,747,479	441,184
Alaska	² 21,009,209	² 438,250		
Arizona	8,093,156	849,197		
Arkansas	933,778	196,080	2,563,721	7,686,575
California	5,534,293	196,080		2,192,678
Colorado	3,685,618	138,040		
Connecticut		180,000		
Delaware		90,000		
Florida	975,307	182,160	2,218,705	20,324,980
Georgia		270,000		
Idaho	2,963,698	386,686		
Illinois	996,320	526,080	2,595,133	1,460,164
Indiana	668,578	436,080		1,259,231

¹ For additional information concerning these grants, see the Report of the Director, 1947, Statistical Appendix pp. 118-135; 1948, p. 59; 1949, p. 59; 1950, p. 58.

² Except for 102,500 acres granted to the Territory for university purposes, the lands in Alaska are reserved pending statehood.

Acreage granted to States and Territories, as of June 30, 1951—Continued

State	For common schools	For other schools	For railroads	For swamp reclamation
Iowa.....	1,000,679	286,080	4,706,945	1,196,392
Kansas.....	2,907,520	151,269	4,176,329	
Kentucky.....		330,000		
Louisiana.....	807,271	256,292	373,057	9,491,865
Maine.....		210,000		
Maryland.....		210,000		
Massachusetts.....		360,000		
Michigan.....	1,021,867	286,080	3,134,058	5,680,310
Minnesota.....	2,874,951	212,160	3,047,469	4,706,503
Mississippi.....	824,213	348,240	1,075,345	3,347,853
Missouri.....	1,221,813	376,080	1,837,968	3,432,481
Montana.....	5,198,258	388,721	(9)	
Nebraska.....	2,730,951	136,080		
Nevada.....	2,061,967	136,080		
New Hampshire.....		150,000		
New Jersey.....		210,000		
New Mexico.....	8,711,324	1,346,546		
New York.....		990,000		
North Carolina.....		270,000		
North Dakota.....	2,495,396	336,080	(9)	
Ohio.....	724,266	699,120		26,372
Oklahoma.....	1,375,000	1,050,000		
Oregon.....	3,399,360	136,165		286,108
Pennsylvania.....		780,000		
Rhode Island.....		120,000		
South Carolina.....		180,000		
South Dakota.....	2,733,084	366,080		
Tennessee.....		300,000		
Texas.....		180,000		
Utah.....	5,844,196	556,141		
Vermont.....		150,000		
Virginia.....		300,000		
Washington.....	2,376,391	336,080	(4)	
West Virginia.....		150,000		
Wisconsin.....	982,329	332,160	3,652,322	3,360,786
Wyoming.....	3,470,009	136,080		
* Total.....	298,532,429	17,033,972	37,128,531	64,893,482

* Includes not more than 65,000 acres of lands in Montana, North Dakota, and Washington which were selected by a grantee of the State of Minnesota.

† See footnote 3.

‡ (See footnote 2.) Includes acreage of grants for "educational and charitable" purposes, as follows: Idaho, 150,000; North Dakota, 170,000; South Dakota, 170,000; and Washington, 200,000. Includes 660,000 acres granted to Oklahoma for "charitable, penal, and public building" purposes, and 290,000 acres granted to Wyoming for "charitable, penal, education" and other institutions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call special attention to the fact that the grants of public lands of unquestioned Federal ownership to 29 States and Alaska for public school purposes alone total in excess of 98,000,000 acres. That does not include the grants for higher institutions of learning.

The point I have been trying to make to those who refuse to look beyond the decisions of the majority of the Supreme Court is that this question is not a purely legalistic one—that the major consideration is and should be one of sound permanent public policy. This Congress has been thoroughly within its rights in conveying to the States full fee simple title to vast areas of the public domain whose Federal ownership was established and unquestioned, when Congress has determined that sound public policy quickened national development and more democratic government would result from such conveyances. For the same reasons, Congress would have the clear right to make such a conveyance here, even if the Supreme Court had heard the entire case of the States and the people, which it did not, and even if the Supreme Court had decided unanimously in favor of Federal ownership, which it did not, and even if there were not present the many elements of instability and uncertainty now apparent, and which of themselves cry out for positive and stabilizing action by Congress to replace the present frustrating situation.

In determining what kind of bill Congress should pass as its expression of sound permanent public policy to clear up the primary question before us, that of the ownership, control, and develop-

ment of the submerged coastal belt within the boundaries of the States, we must consider the many values that are involved in this narrow coastal belt and how they may best be used, developed, and conserved. It is clear that the oil involved is of substantial value in at least 3 States, but the oil will be produced and used within a comparatively short period, possibly 25 or 30 years, and its value is only temporary, whereas the greater values in the coastal belt will continue throughout the life of our Nation and will be of greater importance with each passing year. Senate Joint Resolution 13 will assure to all 20 of the coastal States their continued control, within their boundaries, of the taking of fish, oysters, shrimp, sponges, kelp, and other forms of marine life, the use of sand, shell, and gravel, the erection of piers, bulkheads, and groins, the filling of new lands, and the control thereon of valuable recreational, commercial, and private improvements, and the disposal of sewage and industrial waste. The control by the States of the production of oil from their coastal belts will also be restored, which is important in a few places for a few years, but insignificant when compared with the permanent values which determine the development and prosperity of our coastal communities.

It might be helpful to consider some of these permanent values, private and public. There are only a few Members of the Senate in the Chamber, and perhaps they could view this one little picture of the highly developed coastal frontage on a part of the Atlantic coast of my State, which I believe illustrates better than many words the various

types of values which go into an enormous development of this kind.

I present for inspection a photograph showing a portion of the ocean frontage of the city of Miami Beach, which is largely land built up from the little strip of sand and mangroves which constituted the original Miami Beach.

Mr. President, I do not go to Miami Beach because it is different from other similar areas in the country—there are many others which are comparable—but because I happen to know its history and because I happen to have from my wall a picture which illustrates the many millions of dollars of investment in this part of Florida better than any words could portray it. The photograph shows 12 or 15 of the beach-front hotels.

I ask Senators not to become too nostalgic when they look at the picture of this beach. It will be difficult for Senators who have been there not to grow very nostalgic when they examine the picture, but I ask them to withhold their desire to return to that beach, and not to return to it until after the vote on the pending joint resolution has been taken. After the vote is taken, they will certainly have my approval to go there.

As I count the structures which were built in that very limited area to protect that built land and the improvements thereon from the devastating force of the ocean's waves, I note great lengths of expensive bulkheads, besides at least 19 different groins, which are structures which extend perpendicularly into the Atlantic Ocean. Each of the groins extends several hundred feet from the built-up shoreline into the body of the Atlantic Ocean. Each of the groins and the various bulkheads consists of a steel-and-concrete structure built down into the very mother rock itself. An excavation must be made, and part of the underlying rock must be removed, in order to weld, as we might say, this protective structure into the rock which at that point underlies the little film of sand at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean. Many of the hotels themselves stand in whole or in part on this built land; and their cabanas, swimming pools, and beaches are on built land. All of the sand with which the fills were made was pumped either from the ocean bed or from the bottom of the bay which lies between Miami Beach and the mainland. The expensive municipal pier which appears in the picture is constructed on and over the bed of the Atlantic Ocean. The sewage line from the city of Miami Beach, which I cannot place in the picture, but which is in existence and is a highly expensive structure, extends along the ocean bed for some distance seaward. The jetties appear in the distance, built upon ocean bottom along the ship channel. As shown in this one picture alone, the man-made values on the original offshore ocean bed alone amount to many, many millions of dollars; and at the very place shown in this picture, many private and public titles of great value are hurtfully affected by the present situation, which flows out of these decisions of the Supreme Court.

Certainly an additional threat to the millions of dollars invested in those coastal regions is apparent as a result

of the testimony of Mr. Mastin G. White, former Solicitor of the Department of Interior, before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the recent hearings on submerged lands proposed legislation. In answer to a question concerning the legality of the Federal Government's filling in of the submerged lands beyond the low-water mark in front of privately owned, State-owned, or municipally owned land for the use of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or some other public purpose, Mr. White said that he did not have any doubt whatever about the authority of the Federal Government itself in the present situation to use the lands for a public purpose, regardless of whether they lie in front of a shore holding belonging to the Federal Government or a shore holding belonging to the State or to the State's grantees.

Mr. President in the record of the hearings, Senators can read for themselves what Mr. White said. He said there is no doubt in the world that under the present situation resulting from these three Supreme Court decisions, an airstrip could be built immediately adjoining the shore of Miami Beach, where the multi-million-dollar hotels now stand, and he said a similar development could be made at Atlantic City or at Coney Island or at Rockaway Beach, or at many other places along the shores of New York State.

Mr. President, the question is, not what will be done, but what can be done and what sort of threat is presented by proceeding under a laissez faire policy and by permitting to remain undisturbed the immense power which is given to Federal administrators or at least is implied under the decisions in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases, and by not doing our duty to remedy the present highly unstabilized, unsatisfactory, disturbing, and distressing situation under which the developments of ocean-front properties has virtually ceased.

In other words, Mr. President, the Federal Government now claims the right to build an airstrip or any other structure desired for a public purpose closer to these hotels than the end of the groins we see in the picture. Mr. White further stated that the sand and gravel on the bed of the sea below the line of mean low tide, and outside the inland waters, would be subject to the Federal Property Act in the same way and to the same extent as oil and gas, regardless of how destructive to the values of the upland property the taking of the sand or the seabed there would be.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the use of the sand and gravel is completely necessary. Sand and gravel cannot be brought from 100 miles inland to make these fills. It is necessary to pump sand and gravel there by dredging from sand bars which lie offshore or from sand bars which lie in the bay. Yet, under present circumstances, if the Federal Government needs that sand or gravel or shell, it can pump out all of it, and then can leave a naked frontage of completely impoverished ocean shore—in other words, a beach with no attraction whatsoever, a beach made of nothing but

bare rock extending into the Atlantic Ocean.

In order not to place too much importance on the values already created, and to give adequate consideration to the additional vast values which should be created in the future in our State and in every other coastal State of this growing Nation, I wish to invite attention to a specific problem in Florida concerning the development of the string of islands which, beginning just below Miami, extend nearly 200 miles into the open sea, roughly from the southeast corner of Florida, southwestward and westward to Key West and on to Loggerhead Key.

Senators will see those islands portrayed on the map as the little finger of State holdings—as we now believe them to be—extending from the southeast corner of Florida in a generally westward direction, for a distance of approximately 200 miles. That whole string of islands constitutes all of the land area that is left of Monroe County, whose mainland area was given to the Federal Government to become a part of the Everglades National Park.

Mr. President, I hear some Senators say that a few States are trying to grab something from the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the fact. The State of Florida has already granted much to the Federal Government, more than 1 million acres of land, for the development of the Everglades National Park. We have done so because we believe that is a purpose for which that land can serve to the best advantage, and we have granted that land to the Federal Government, and we are proud to have our part in that development. So it cannot be said with correctness that our State and the other States have not adopted a fair and proper approach to these problems.

The future development of this long string of islands is gravely endangered by the present situation, and will be vitally helped by the legislation which we propose. These islands, or keys, of which there are hundreds, are generally quite narrow. They lie between the Atlantic Ocean and the gulf, or between the Florida Straits and the gulf. In general, they must be extended into the vast, shallow areas of water which surround them, if they are to be commercially developed. Generally they have long fingers of rock, with open, shallow spaces between them. In order to develop them and make them of sufficient size to be profitable, bulkheads have to be built, to connect the ends of those rocky fingers. Then sand or gravel has to be pumped within the bulkheads, and then groins have to be built, in order to preserve the newly made areas; and then sewage plants and pipes and piers have to be built. In fact, no one could possibly begin a development of that kind without having advance assurance that he would have access to the manifold values in the Gulf of Mexico, on the one hand, or in the Atlantic Ocean, on the other.

On many, the land is already being sold on a front-foot basis because it is extremely desirable for the location of winter homes. No one can start making

a development there, at the very large expense which is involved, without having the following questions answered: "How are we going to make a fill? Where will we get our sand?" The islands themselves are practically all coral rock with only thin layers of sand overlying.

Other questions which must be answered are: "How can we enlarge the land area of our investment to the point where we can build a group of beautiful homes or hotels and facilities and utilities to serve them?"

"Where are we going to get the authority to build the bulkheads or groins which are necessary to protect our investment, or the authority to build a pier? Where shall we get the authority to lay out sewage lines which have to be built along the sea bottom in the form of permanent concrete and steel structures?"

How ridiculous it would be to take such problems away from the local or county health officers and engineers who by State law are empowered to determine where it is safe to dump sewage or industrial waste, so that it will not come drifting back to the shores of the very persons who are to live there. How ridiculous it would be to handicap the genius of our American people for the development of new properties and the creation of new values by transferring the handling of such local problems as these to far-away Washington and its agents.

To get the true meaning of the immensity of these problems of coastal properties to the 20 maritime States as a whole, we must multiply hundreds of times the values we see depicted on the Miami Beach picture and extend them to the hundreds of other residential and recreational coastal areas on our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts. We must likewise extend the total picture to include the many port and commercial developments which appear along the thousands of miles of our coastline. I wish that time permitted my making specific reference to the excellent book of plats which has been prepared by the American Association of Port Authorities, which shows the immense values on built-up lands in only a comparatively few of our ports, selected for illustrative purposes, which are adversely affected under the present situation and the much greater values which would be affected if the present ruling of the Supreme Court should be extended to the bays, harbors, great rivers, and the Great Lakes. It is not overstating the situation to say that already billions of dollars of developments are directly affected and that many additional billions are indirectly affected in that they are to be found on the bays, harbors, or other parts of the so-called inland waters or on the shores of the Great Lakes.

To mention only a few of the recreational and vacationland areas which show immense values of developed properties that would be released by the passage of our bill from the present clouds that hang over them, I cite the Massachusetts Bay area, the areas along the ocean shores of Long Island and Staten Island, and along the coast of New

Jersey, at Atlantic City and similar highly developed areas.

Mr. Robert Moses, the distinguished commissioner of public works, city of New York, testified before the committee that on Staten Island and Long Island the values run into many hundreds of millions of dollars.

To complete the picture, we would have to consider the whole coastline of the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to the Florida straits along with the entire coastline of the Gulf of Mexico and the entire coastline of the three Pacific States. The total general coastline alone is nearly 5,000 miles, not counting the thousands of miles on bays and harbors, many of which are of doubtful classification, and the thousands of miles on the Great Lakes. The immensity of this issue is so self-evident and the adverse impact of the present status upon the 20 coastal States and hundreds of coastal communities and tens of thousands of coastal private developments is so clear that I cannot believe the Congress will longer delay clearing up the matter by the prompt passage of our joint resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida is again mentioning the development of shore-front property in New York State, and I am very eager to have the information, because I cannot exactly follow him. As I look back, and as I think about New York State, which is the State in the Union I know best, of course, I cannot think of any instances where private development of the shore front would be interfered with through failure to pass this quitclaim measure. It has been developed for many, many generations. There is nothing to stop the development, and I am simply confused by the statement of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, all I can say is that the present status is one of complete stoppage of developments, because the United States Supreme Court has held in so many words that the States do not own the offshore area, and that the Federal Government has paramount rights to it. The Supreme Court has said that it is only an incident of this general paramount-right situation that applies to the oil and gas, that all property values are affected. There is no way to read the decisions without realizing that that is the case.

Surely the distinguished Senator does not think that all the dignitaries of his own State and of his own city, whose names have been mentioned already, and similar dignitaries of other States throughout the Union, are disturbed needlessly about this question, or that the continued development of additional parks on Long Island and Staten Island is to be held up for reasons that are unsound, when it is desired to proceed with them. The fact of the matter is, I think, that the Senator has never come face to face, he has never come completely to grips with the decisions and realized that they have stayed the hand of prospective developers, public and private, in such a way that only an act of Congress can release them and enable them

to go ahead again. I believe, had the Senator understood that, he would have listened with attentive ear to the prayer of the developers throughout the Nation, both public and private, who are supporting the passage of this measure, because they have realized, whether others have or not, that the hand of progress has been stayed, and that coastal communities have now no place to which to turn for their necessary developments, because they cannot go ahead safely under the present condition. Surely the Senator realizes that that is the case, or he would not have submitted his amendment last year to take care of future public developments.

When the Senator from Florida called the attention of the Senator from New York to the fact that it did not cover private developments, the Senator said he was willing for them to be covered; but he did not submit any further amendment, and he has not done so yet.

The only way we can provide the tools with which to do this job for private industry, which greatly transcends in importance the public units, is to pass Senate Joint Resolution 13, which is the only measure I know of now before us which deals adequately with this problem. I hope the Senator, revising his own views, particularly when he realizes that only one-sixth of the estimated amount of offshore oil and gas is within the State boundaries and that five-sixths is without State boundaries, which proportion is recognized and confirmed in the Federal Government by this joint resolution, will be found supporting us, instead of imposing on us the necessity of overcoming his very able and very effective and very stubborn opposition. I glory in the fact that the Senator stubbornly asserts his own views; but I again call his attention to the fact that all the dignitaries of his State of first rank, other than himself, are on the other side of the fence. Is he going to take the position that "everybody is out of step except my son John"?

Mr. LEHMAN. No. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I repeat that I believe the majority of the people of my State are in step with me. It is perfectly true that some of the officials are opposed to the position I have taken, but I think they are opposed largely through a misapprehension, because they fear, until the matter has been explained to them, that there might be some uncertainty with regard to the ownership and control of inland waters and of improvements on inland waters.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator on that point—he was not here when I dealt with it earlier—it is crystal clear from reading the brief of the Federal attorneys, themselves, in the California case, not by one reference but by repeated references, that they do not favor the inland water rule. They do not believe the States have any right to claim ownership of lands under the inland waters, and they have said so in their brief time after time. We have more reason to be apprehensive now with reference to the inland waters than the coastal States had reason to be apprehensive of their offshore waters before

the time the California decision was handed down. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I assure the Senator from Florida that I am eager to hear his clarification of certain statements he has made. In very moving terms he referred to the development of parks, great recreational facilities, and wonderful airfields. I hope the Senator will not consider the reference immodest when I make the statement which I am going to make, to the effect that I think during my own public career I had as much as anyone else to do with the development of recreational facilities in the State of New York, the parks, the forest reserves, the airfields, the parkways, and other things.

I wish to make it clear that in no instance were difficulties raised by Federal authorities or by the local authorities to the development of these great and wonderful facilities by a great governor, my predecessor, Mr. Alfred E. Smith, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by myself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York pause just at that point? Of course, he is 100 percent correct in that statement. I have already put into the RECORD evidence showing that we were proceeding in just that way in our dealings with the Federal Government, in my own State of Florida, up to the time of these decisions; but, once the decisions were rendered, the wheels of progress were turned back, the hand of the developer was stayed—and it is stayed now. The Senator's own public lands and park commissioner of the city of New York, appearing before the committee, said that they had ambitious and expensive plants and programs laid out and money provided with which to go ahead with them; but they could not do it because of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases.

I certainly honor the Senator from New York for the magnificent administration of public affairs of the State of New York which characterized his service as governor, but I am telling him that he is thinking in terms of what used to be, and not in terms of the present time. What we are trying to do is to strike the shackles which have been imposed by the three decisions and put a practical tool into the hands of private industry and public units so that they can go ahead with the fine type of expensive and useful developments in the construction of which the Senator has heretofore had such a large part. He is entitled to be proud for having had that part. But we want subsequent public officials in New York, Florida, and all the other States to have the same possibilities. We would regret extremely to see those possibilities restrained by a continuation of the present situation under which that type of development is stymied. The Senator from New York does not have to rely upon what I tell him. He can read the testimony offered by his own public officials. I tell the Senator from New York and the world

that there are areas ready to be improved and developed, and we are asking that Congress do the necessary thing to permit them to be improved and developed.

I hope the Senator from New York will give a willing and attentive ear to the prayer of the public servants of his State who are trying to emulate the example of illustrious service which the Senator so wonderfully exemplified during the years he was Governor of the great State of New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Let me make one brief observation. I still have not heard of a single concrete instance in which there has been any difficulty in development, either by public or private interests, of shore-front property down to low tide.

Mr. Moses testified and talked about Oriental Beach and Manhattan Beach—

Mr. HOLLAND. He also talked of certain parks, some of which I had never heard of, as needing original or additional development.

Mr. LEHMAN. There can be no question that the Anderson bill recognizes title in lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend to the Senator a reading of pages 139, 140, 141, and 142 of the printed hearings, being the testimony of Mr. Moses relating to New York City parks, the Manhattan Beach story, and Long Island. Then there is a list of other extensive areas of land, under water, granted to the city of New York. I think the Senator will find in that portion of the testimony exactly what I have been telling him. I was present and heard the testimony, and I have in my files letters from the distinguished park commissioner stating in so many words that improvements were being held up. I am sure the Senator must have seen these letters, because two of them were printed in the New York Times. I placed them in the RECORD last year. Certainly the commissioner of parks has sounded the alarm; so has the present Governor, two attorneys general, and the mayor of the city of New York. I hope the distinguished Senator will be attentive to those alarms.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have never known any question raised with regard to the control, ownership, or development of any properties on inland waterways, including streams or lakes, or on the shore front of Long Island or Staten Island. I say that in spite of the statement of Mr. Moses.

Mr. HOLLAND. My attention has been invited by my administrative assistant to a fact which I should have mentioned earlier, namely, that the Legislature of the State of New York has, by the adoption of resolutions on this subject, invited the attention of the public servants who serve that great State to the fact that they desire the passage of this resolution restoring the rights to the States which they enjoyed so long. New York has enjoyed them for the longest possible time. Commissioner Moses referred to public port developments on Manhattan Island, in Brooklyn, and on the East River, totaling \$350,000,000 in

value, every one of which is built on submerged land. They are on inland waters which are affected by the same philosophy and subjected to the same hazard which I have already repeatedly pointed out and which the Senator from New York knows must be present, or why would the attorneys general and governors of other States be furthering the passage of this resolution?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know. I just cannot understand it. It is incomprehensible to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am trying to help the Senator to see this question in its proper perspective. The Governor of New York would not have come to Washington and testified for a case in which he did not believe. I think the Senator from New York must realize that the Governor of Kansas, the Governor of Nebraska, and the Governors of other States far removed from the seacoast must have tremendous apprehension in their minds and hearts, or they would not come here and testify and jointly maintain a permanent office here through the years. The Council of State Governors would not have taken that position through the years; the American Bar Association, through its legislative committee, would not have taken the position which it has taken through the years if it did not have that apprehension. I hope the Senator will open his eyes and see.

Mr. LEHMAN. I frequently disagree with the American Bar Association on many questions, and this is not the first time I have fought alone when I thought something was right and in the interests of my State and my country. That is what I am doing now. I believe the officials of my State, with whom I have frequently disagreed, are mistaken. I believe the people of the State of New York and the people of the other 47 States understand the issues and do not want these great resources belonging to all the people of the Nation turned over to 3 States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before leaving that point, I invite the attention of the Senator from New York to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 4, page 5308, in which the letter from Mr. Moses is printed. I read only one sentence from that letter:

In my letter I made the point that unless the title of the coastal States to the submerged lands along their shores is confirmed by congressional action, endless confusion would result as to ownership, and further waterfront development by the States and municipalities would be paralyzed.

He, of course, maintained that position at greater length last year and again this year. I thought the distinguished Senator from New York was present when Mr. Moses maintained that position in the hearing before the Senate committee this year. Perhaps I was mistaken.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator advise me how much longer he expects to speak?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a page and a half remaining, I will say to the distinguished majority leader, and I can complete my statement in 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. If possible, I should like to have the Senator from Florida conclude his statement this afternoon. We will continue until half-past five or six o'clock in order to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can conclude within 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I now come to the next point in my statement, which deals with the political implications of the question. I have often been asked what the political implications are in this controversial issue, and I think the answer to the question is both important and revealing. I think it should be stated on the floor, because I have heard it misstated so frequently that I believe there ought to be one entirely accurate, authoritative statement contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, based on actual recitals of the platforms and other facts which I shall mention.

It is interesting to note that in spite of frequent reports to the contrary, the Democratic Party platform has never contained a plank on the submerged lands issue. I wish to make that statement particularly emphatic, because for a long time I have received letters stating an understanding of the writers that the Democratic Party had come out on the other side of the question. The Democratic Party has done no such thing. So far as votes in the House are concerned, the Democratic Party has shown a majority in favor of passage of measures on this subject supported by the States.

Last year in the Senate the vote was exactly even—24 to 24—but in the House of Representatives there was a sizable majority of the Democratic Party in favor of the joint resolution.

There has never been a plank on this subject in the Democratic platform. Mr. Ickes tried to obtain such a plank from the platform committee in 1948 at Philadelphia, but his proposal was voted down overwhelmingly. The Republican Party platform in 1948 and in 1952 included a plank to confirm to the States the very values covered in Senate Joint Resolution 13. As a matter of fact, those who oppose this bill will have to look to the platform of the Progressive Party—Mr. Wallace's party—in 1948 to find any comforting political philosophy or party support for their position. To my knowledge, the Progressive Party is the only party which has gone on record against the philosophy of our joint resolution.

In closing, it is interesting to note that many of those who oppose this proposed legislation are the very ones who have been active proponents of an ever larger Federal Government and who seem to think that an all-powerful Federal Government is a panacea for all the ills of the people of this country. Those of us who support the proposed legislation are strongly opposed to the nationalization of resources—and that is what they are attempting to do to us—in the 5,000-mile shoestring of coastal waters which

throttles the shores of our coastal States. The resources in this narrow belt are vital to the States and to local growth and prosperity, and we feel that the ownership and control of these resources should remain in the States and be subjected to State and local control where it will be very close to the people who are so greatly affected.

We are now talking about fundamental philosophy. We are talking about local self-government. We are talking about the opportunity of a citizen to see the very officials who serve him in the regulation of lands which may represent the total investment of his lifetime savings. We think it is sound government to keep such regulation, control, and ownership just as close to home as is possible.

We strongly feel that our position is sound and just, and that it will receive, as it has already received, the approval of the vast majority of our people who, we believe, as indicated by the result of the recent Gallup poll, agree with us that the important rights enjoyed by the States for 150 years should be restored and safeguarded, and that such action would be in the interest of soundly economic and democratic government. These rights and the immense values already developed and to be developed in the coastal belt, plus the similar values in the inland waters and in the Great Lakes, involve problems which are so clearly local in nature that we shall continue with all of our strength to fight to prevent their transfer to a Federal Government which is already too big, too wasteful, and too far from the people.

Mr. President, there is not a Senator within the sound of my voice who does not know that much of the body of ills which afflict us on the domestic front flows directly from the fact that the Federal Government is too big, and that there is no finite mind which can grasp all its implications or all its details, even though it is the responsibility of Senators and Representatives to make laws for the government of our huge, swollen Federal system, as well as of our people, and it is our duty to provide appropriations whereby those immense pieces of uncoordinated machinery can attempt to function.

It is our hope that the joint resolution will speedily pass the Senate and be enacted into law.

Mr. DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The hour is late, and there is still to be read a message from the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] may have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Florida on the excellent presentation he has made this afternoon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 38)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my state of the Union message I recommended that the Congress take the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under immediate study and extend it by appropriate legislation.

I now recommend that the present act be renewed for the period of 1 year.

I propose this action as an interim measure. As such, it will allow for the temporary continuation of our present trade program pending completion of a thorough and comprehensive reexamination of the economic foreign policy of the United States.

I believe that such a reexamination is imperative in order to develop more effective solutions to the international economic problems today confronting the United States and its partners in the community of free nations. It is my intention that the executive branch shall consult with the Congress in developing recommendations based upon the studies that will be made.

Our trade policy is only one part, although a vital part, of a larger problem. This problem embraces the need to develop, through cooperative action among the free nations, a strong and self-supporting economic system capable of providing both the military strength to deter aggression and the rising productivity that can improve living standards.

No feature of American policy is more important in this respect than the course which we set in our economic relations with other nations. The long-term economic stability of the whole free world and the overriding question of world peace will be heavily influenced by the wisdom of our decisions. As for the United States itself, its security is fully as dependent upon the economic health and stability of the other free nations as upon their adequate military strength.

The problem is far from simple. It is a complex of many features of our foreign and domestic programs. Our domestic economic policies cast their shadows upon nations far beyond our borders. Conversely, our foreign economic policy has a direct impact upon our domestic economy. We must make a careful study of these intricate relationships in order that we may chart a sound course for the Nation.

The building of a productive and strong economic system within the free world—one in which each country may better sustain itself through its own efforts—will require action by other governments, as well as by the United States, over a wide range of economic activities. These must include adoption of sound internal policies, creation of conditions fostering international investment, assistance to underdeveloped

areas, progress toward freedom of international payments and convertibility of currencies, and trade arrangements aimed at the widest possible multilateral trade.

In working toward these goals, our own trade policy as well as that of other countries should contribute to the highest possible level of trade on a basis that is profitable and equitable for all. The world must achieve an expanding trade, balanced at high levels, which will permit each nation to make its full contribution to the progress of the free world's economy and to share fully the benefits of this progress.

The solution of the free world's economic problems is a cooperative task. It is not one which the United States, however strong its leadership and however firm its dedication to these objectives, can effectively attack alone. But two truths are clear: the United States' share in this undertaking is so large as to be crucially important to its success—and its success is crucially important to the United States. This last truth applies with particular force to many of our domestic industries and especially to agriculture with its great and expanding output.

I am confident that the governments of other countries are prepared to do their part in working with us toward these common goals, and we shall from time to time be consulting with them. The extension for 1 year of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will provide us the time necessary to study and define a foreign economic policy which will be comprehensive, constructive, and consistent with the needs both of the American economy and of American foreign policy.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 7, 1953.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 8, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Felix Edgar Wormser, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Guy O. Hollyday, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth 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 for the fourth calendar quarter of 1952.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three 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:

(1) "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.")

(11) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" an answer to Item "B."

(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.

(1) 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.

(11) 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"—Section 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 "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes anything of value. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of \$500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of \$500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to \$500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. \$_____ Dues and assessments
2. \$_____ Gifts of money or anything of value
3. \$_____ Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. \$_____ Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. \$_____ Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. \$_____ TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. \$_____ Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. \$_____ TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. \$_____ TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. \$_____ Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. \$_____ Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. \$_____ "Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of \$500 or more

(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total \$500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount Name and Address of Contributor

("Period" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)

\$1,500.00 John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.

\$1,785.00 The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

\$3,285.00 TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. \$_____ Public relations and advertising services
2. \$_____ Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. \$_____ Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. \$_____ Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. \$_____ Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. \$_____ Telephone and telegraph
7. \$_____ Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. \$_____ All other expenditures
9. \$_____ TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. \$_____ Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. \$_____ TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . loan . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. \$_____ TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. \$_____ Lent to others during this Quarter
14. \$_____ Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of \$10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "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 "Marshblanks Bill."
\$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at \$800.00 per month.

\$4,150.00 TOTAL

L. J. Carson Advertiser, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese. (a) Amendment to Contract Settlement Act. (b) H. R. 6693. (d) For. E. (10) \$391.18; (11) \$391.18.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.

D. (6) \$4,094.29.
E. (2) \$3,750; (6) \$5.06; (7) \$336.23; (8) \$3; (9) \$4,094.29; (10) \$18,288.78; (11) \$22,353.07.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See attached sheet containing answers to items 1, 2, and 3.)¹

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.

D. (6) \$50.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) \$4,374.99; (7) \$1,001.66; (9) \$5,376.65; (10) \$16,132.72; (11) \$21,509.37.

A. American Citizens Committee for Economic Aid Abroad, 124 East 70th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Bills pending in Congress or which may hereafter be introduced appropriating funds for economic assistance and technical aid to foreign countries.

E. (10) \$3,209.70; (11) \$3,209.70.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$797.
E. (5) \$343.91; (6) \$40.77; (9) \$384.68; (10) \$5,045.95; (11) \$5,430.63.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.

D. (6) \$1,593.56.
E. (2) \$1,472.45; (5) \$64.20; (6) \$6.98; (7) \$49.93; (9) \$1,593.56; (10) \$9,628.41; (11) \$11,221.97; (15) See attached statement item F, pages 3-5.¹

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$6,576.
E. (2) \$6,576; (9) \$6,576; (10) \$22,107.25; (11) \$28,683.25; (15) \$3,000, Francis J. Garvey, salary as counsel to council on legislation; \$1,603, B. J. Conway, salary as assistant secretary to council on legislation; \$1,152, O. O. Norberg, salary as executive assistant to Mr. Garvey; \$822, Helen Hofener, salary as secretary to Mr. Garvey.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, General office: 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. Washington office: 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See schedule "2").¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) \$21,310.

E. (2) \$15,057; (4) \$3,467; (5) \$1,629; (6) \$609; (7) \$185; (9) \$20,947; (10) \$63,988; (11) \$84,935.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.

E. (1) \$7,189.34; (2) \$14,663.58; (4) \$4,161.85; (5) \$950.80; (9) \$26,965.57; (10) \$78,571.63; (11) \$105,537.20; (15).¹

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C.¹
D. (6) \$4,500.
E. (10) \$3,425; (11) \$3,425.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D. (6) \$124,139.01.
E. (See rider).¹

A. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which affects the conduct of the business of marine insurance. Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

E. (2) \$2,000; (8) \$208.11; (9) \$2,208.11; (11) \$2,208.11; (15) \$2,208.11, December 30, 1952, Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.; counsel fee for services, together with their disbursements.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) See statement attached (p. 4).¹

D. (6) \$320.74.
E. (2) \$1,531.25; (4) \$1,322.33; (5) \$2,628.94; (6) \$272.82; (7) \$1,310.38; (9) \$17,065.72; (10) \$89,169.37; (11) \$106,235.09.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life insurance business. (a) Life insurance company income tax (U. S. C. A., title 26, sec. 201); Social Security Act; individual retirement legislation.

D. (6) \$5,601.34.
E. (2) \$4,261.12; (5) \$513.95; (6) \$149.07; (7) \$677.20; (9) \$5,601.34; (10) \$13,020.88; (11) \$18,622.22.

A. American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which affects the business of hull insurance. Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

E. (2) \$1,500; (8) \$208.11; (9) \$1,708.11; (11) \$1,708.11; (15) \$1,708.11, November 25, 1952, Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.; counsel fee for services, together with their disbursements.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine.

E. (2) \$25,854.81; (5) \$7,275.60; (6) \$1,164.40; (7) \$738.82; (8) \$5,733.64; (9) \$40,767.27; (10) \$229,406.99; (11) \$270,174.26; (15).¹

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Defense Production Act, Federal meat inspection appropriation, forest range

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

improvement fund, foot-and-mouth disease, capital gains, transportation legislation.

D. (6) \$15,468.47.
E. (2) \$5,100; (9) \$5,100; (10) \$19,645.06; (11) \$24,745.06.

A. The American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Leo G. Miller, 420 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) S. 106, bill to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; H. R. 4528, bill to prohibit interstate commerce of fireworks; S. 2325, bill to create bureau to promote safety in industry; S. 2714, bill to provide assistance to State agencies to promote safety in industry; S. 2738, bill to equalize treatment accorded commissioned officers of the Corps of Army Medical Service; H. R. 7320, bill to grant free outpatient medical care to children of deceased veterans; H. R. 6319, bill to amend Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act to authorize.
E. (10) \$9,222.12; (11) \$9,222.12.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) \$453.90.

E. (2) \$375; (5) \$69; (6) \$9.90; (9) \$453.90; (10) \$2,138.97; (11) \$2,592.87.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices, and properties.

D. (6) \$295.
E. (2) \$250; (6) \$25; (7) \$20; (9) \$295; (10) \$590; (11) \$885.

A. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction; support of legislation providing national school health services; appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers; bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers; appropriations for the Children's Bureau; appropriations for the national school-lunch program; emergency maternal and infant care, S.2337.

D. (6) \$7,664.10.
E. (2) \$1,030.80; (4) \$78.70; (5) \$138.50; (6) \$48.12; (7) \$113; (8) \$446.49; (9) \$1,855.61; (10) \$6,329.92; (11) \$8,185.53.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

D. (6) \$1,180 (see attached explanatory statement).¹

E. (2) \$5,625; (5) \$3,200; (6) \$142; (6a) \$1,635; (9) \$10,602; (10) \$32,478; (11) \$43,080; (15) \$2,625, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. E. Kane, API, Washington, D. C., salary; \$635.80, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. E. Kane, API, Washington, D. C., expenses; \$484.10, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. E. Kane, D. of C. PI, Washington, D. C., expenses; \$3,000, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. L. Dwyer, API, Washington, D. C., salary; \$515.23, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. L. Dwyer, API, Washington, D. C., expenses; \$142, October 1 to December 31, 1952, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices, and properties.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See page 3.)¹

D. (6) \$60,634.14.

E. (2) \$8,750; (5) \$785.83; (6) \$607.69; (7) \$309.60; (9) \$10,453.12; (10) \$31,649.52; (11) \$42,102.64 (see pp. 6 and 7).¹

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See Legislative policies, p. 224 of Proceedings, attached).

D. (6) \$943.20.

E. (2) \$250; (4) \$192.39; (5) \$241.15; (6) \$25.60; (7) \$194.22; (8) \$39.84; (9) \$943.20; (10) \$4,512.72; (11) \$5,455.92.

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Continuing in general.

D. (6) \$14,089.

E. (2) \$9,142.52; (4) \$1,275.55; (5) \$1,824.34; (6) \$185.48; (7) \$2,988.94; (8) \$915.83; (9) \$16,332.66; (10) \$39,332.71; (11) \$55,665.37; (15) \$874.14, Chas. F. Noyes Co., rent and electricity; \$157.72, Graham Stationery Co., stationery and supplies; \$179.32, New York Telephone Co., telephone service; \$18.04, Great Bear Spring Co., water service; etc.¹

A. America's Wage Earner's Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,380.

E. (2) \$3,537.50; (6) \$42; (8) \$0.90; (9) \$3,580.40; (10) \$12,554.48; (11) \$16,134.88; (15) 90 cents, District Unemployment Compensation Board, quarterly tax; \$31.30, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., telephone bill; \$10.70, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., telephone bill, etc.¹

A. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.¹

C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads. For: S. 1657, airmail subsidy separation; H. R. 4483, to amend section 307 (d) of ICC Act; S. 719, clarifying Robinson-Patman Act; S. 2349, S. 2351, S. 2355, S. 2357, S. 2358, S. 2359, S. 2361, S. 2362, S. 2365, S. 2518, S. 2519, all amending the ICC Act. Opposed: H. R. 2 and H. J. Res. 27, St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend railroad unemployment insurance; H. R. 1998 and S. 2356, making mandatory certain communication systems.

E. (1) \$4,374.99; (7) \$519.33; (8) \$4,894.32; (9) \$18,037.29; (10) \$22,931.61.

A. Richard H. Anthony, the American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$3,125.

E. (7) \$56.91; (9) \$56.91; (10) \$193.05; (11) \$249.96.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,250.

E. (10) \$1,782.77; (11) \$1,782.77.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. ARO, Inc., Tullahoma, Tenn.

C. (2) The following rider to the Air Forces appropriation for research and development,

Defense Appropriations Bill, H. R. 7391: "Provided, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Inc., for the operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center."

E. (6) \$41.50; (9) \$41.50; (10) \$439.81; (11) \$481.31.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle 4, Wash.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) \$900; (7) \$180.30; (9) \$1,080.30; (10) \$3,157.17; (11) \$4,237.47.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.

D. (6) \$1,500.

E. (4) \$1,500; (9) \$1,500; (11) \$1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. None. (See Rider D-14 for list of full member roads, A. A. R.)¹

C. (2) (See Rider C-2);¹ (3) (See Rider C-3).¹

D. (6) \$53,066.96.

E. (2) \$31,135.10; (3) \$10,500; (4) \$136.44; (5) \$3,225.05; (6) \$351.54; (7) \$3,203.52; (8) \$4,515.31; (9) \$53,066.96; (10) \$182,910.73; (11) \$235,977.74; (15) (See Rider E-15).¹

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The registrant is an unincorporated association. For a statement as to the nature of its business, reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.¹

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. (See attached list of member companies).¹

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.

D. (6) \$1,661.78.

E. (See Exhibit A attached hereto);¹ (2) \$1,302.85; (4) \$39.87; (5) \$94.53; (6) \$30.69; (7) \$72.99; (8) \$120.85; (9) \$1,661.78; (10) \$5,056.71; (11) \$6,718.49.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) This association is interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the Western Railroads.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See appended statement, page 3.)¹

C. (2) (See appended statement, page 4.)¹

D. (6) \$6,250.

E. (6) \$3.63; (7) \$137.86; (9) \$141.49; (10) \$176.66; (11) \$318.15; (15) \$31.17, November 17, Pennsylvania Railroad, travel; \$31.17, December 10, Pennsylvania Railroad, travel; \$25.52, December 11, Pennsylvania Railroad, travel.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.

B. National Council, Junior Order, 3025-3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Any laws relating to immigration, free public schools, communism, other legislation considered of benefit to Americans.

D. (7) \$249.99.

E. (5) \$69; (6) \$3; (7) \$8.14; (8) \$1.25; (9) \$81.39; (10) \$322.68; (11) \$404.07.

A. Frazer A. Bailey, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Baker.

B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman St., Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (legislative office). My only receipts consist of my salary which is \$11,700 per annum.

E. All expenses incurred by me are paid by the National Farmers Union and the specific items appear in the report submitted by the National Farmers Union covering this quarter.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. H. M. Baldrige, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.

A. J. H. Ballew, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.

D. (6) \$8,724.08.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor—especially railroad labor.

D. (6) \$1,860.45.

E. (6) \$202.04; (7) \$202.46; (8) \$191.19; (9) \$595.69; (10) \$2,110.78; (11) \$2,706.47.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, page 5.)¹

D. (6) \$4,500.

E. (6) \$18.47; (7) \$590.56; (8) \$64.18; (9) \$673.21; (10) \$1,118.14; (11) \$1,791.35;

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

\$27.89, October 29, 1952, Hotel Delmonico, New York City, hotel bill; \$12.50, November 18, 1952, Biltmore Hotel, New York City, restaurant; \$16.00, December 8, 1952, Fan & Bills, Washington, D. C., restaurant; \$27.14, December 18, 1952, Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City, Mo., hotel bill; \$20.10, December 19, 1952, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., hotel bill.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Jr., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) \$2,124.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicine industry.
E. (7) \$150; (9) \$150; (10) \$300; (11) \$450.

A. J. A. Beirne, president, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Library services bills and legislation affecting libraries and librarians.

E. (2) \$1,451.25; (4) \$20.77; (5) \$5; (9) \$1,477.02; (10) \$4,712.10; (11) \$6,189.12.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See p. 3.)¹

D. (6) \$1,000.

E. (10) \$9.50; (11) \$9.50.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) See attached.¹

D. (6) \$303.75.

E. (7) \$3.68; (9) \$3.68; (10) \$146.77; (11) \$150.45.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The firm represents companies engaged in the business of marine insurance and as members of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.

C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks, reparations, subrogation. Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

D. (6) \$3,500.

E. (5) \$75.60; (6) \$21.33; (9) \$96.93; (10) \$319.29; (11) \$416.22.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$600.

E. (7) \$500; (9) \$500; (10) \$1,500; (11) \$2,000.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

E. (10) \$283.68; (11) \$283.68.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.

D. (6) \$2,193.30.

E. (2) \$1,999.98; (7) \$117.72; (8) \$75.60; (9) \$2,193.30; (10) \$8,396.41; (11) \$10,589.71.

A. Chester F. Bletch, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) (a) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks. War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951. S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848 and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against the legislation.

(b) H. R. 7844 and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.

E. (2) \$700; (8) \$65.43; (15)¹

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and those institutions.

D. (6) \$625.

E. (10) \$133.14; (11) \$133.14.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C. (When in Washington, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.)

B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

C. (See previous quarterly reports.)

D. (6) \$3,000.

E. (5) \$540.82; (6) \$123.07; (7) \$780.89; (9) \$1,444.78; (10) \$5,154.56; (11) \$6,599.34.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.

D. (6) \$125.

E. (10) \$21.86; (11) \$21.86.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security; (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. D. H. Brackett, Post Office Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc.; (3) The Brewery Worker.

E. (10) \$167.50; (11) \$167.50.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the Association are interested.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dawes E. Brisblin, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Such legislative interest is primarily for analysis and reporting—(a) Revenue Act of 1951; (b) H. R. 4473, and the Senate version; (d) for modification of automotive excise tax provisions.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.

D. (6) \$7,500.

E. (2) \$8,025; (5) \$375; (8) \$45.90; (9) \$8,445.90; (10) \$22,239.55; (11) \$30,685.45; (15)¹

A. Paul W. Brown, Department 731, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Postal legislation.

E. (10) \$1,222.37; (11) \$1,222.37.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., attorney and director of television, NARTB, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C., a national trade association.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

D and E.¹

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.

E. (10) \$1,588.03; (11) \$1,588.03.

A. John M. Brumm, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance. (The numbers of the specific bills are unknown since the 82d Congress has been terminated.) (3) (See attachment B.)¹

D. (6) \$2,374.98.

E. (14) \$660.77.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects. Specific legislation interested in during the calendar year 1952 included appropriations for the civil functions of the Army, H. R. 7628.

D. (6) \$1,350.

E. (6) \$23.35; (8) \$32.57; (9) \$55.92; (10) \$151.16; (11) \$206.08.

A. Henry H. Buchman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.; 351 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y. (consultant service for benefit of independents in rubber-tire industry), National Federation of Independent Business, 351 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (national trade association representing interests of independent business).

C. (2) Interested in rubber tires bill, basing-point legislation, antitrust law legislation, F. T. C. quantity limit discount case—all legislation affecting independent small business. Opposing spare-tire monopoly.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, page 5).¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) \$1,875.

E. (7) \$369.98; (8) \$40.05; (9) \$410.03; (10) \$1,165.68; (11) \$1,575.71.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, post-office box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) \$8,097.50.

E. (2) \$3,036.61; (5) 316.90; (6) \$36.34; (7) \$190.64; (8) \$273.60; (9) \$3,854.09; (10) \$11,139.54; (11) \$14,993.63.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Orrin A. Burrows, assistant to international president, International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave for Federal employees, and in support of unemployment insurance and severance pay, and other liberal benefits for the workers.

D. (6) \$3,683.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable and educational institutions, and organizations.

D. (6) \$2,475.

E. (10) \$124.05; (11) \$124.05.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For the quarter covered by this report, the undersigned worked with Schenley in seeking reduction in the rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits, and in seeking extension of the bonding period for distilled spirits—both as part of full-time work on general public relations for which Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., is retained by Schenley. (a) Revenue Act of 1952. (b) Internal Revenue Code.

E. (2) \$550; (4) \$490; (6) 90; (7) \$735; (8) \$1,050; (9) \$2,915; (10) \$2,772; (11) \$5,687; (15) \$167.67, November 16, United Air Lines, New York City; \$85.49, November 20, Saxony Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla.; \$490, October 1 to December 31, Mailing Specialists, Inc., 41-14 29th Street, Long Island City, N. Y.; stationery used in distributing statements regarding Revenue Act of 1952, and extension of Federal bonding period; \$12.50, November 19, National Association of Beverage Control Administrators, Cleveland, Ohio; \$13.14, November 19, Amanda McMahon, mimeograph specialist, Miami Beach, Fla.; \$20, November 18, Beach Letter Co., Miami Beach, Fla.

A. John W. Caffey, 830 Southeastern Building, Greensboro, N. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting wine.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

D. (6) \$760.20.

E. (10) \$88.47; (11) \$88.47.

A. James A. Campbell, Room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government Employees and District of Columbia government employees.

D. (6) \$2,307.66.

E. (7) \$230.76; (9) \$230.76; (11) \$230.76.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants. H. R. 1062 would establish a Tax Settlement Board—for; H. R. 4371, H. R. 4373, H. R. 8390, H. R. 8391 would permit postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund—for; H. R. 7269 would provide for retirement pay for Tax Court judges—for; H. R. 7746 would provide for voluntary social-security coverage for self-employed certified public accountants—for; H. R. 7893 would provide for improved enforcement and administration of revenue laws—for, with reservations.

D. (6) \$76.25.

E. (7) \$87.51; (9) \$87.51; (10) \$75; (11) \$162.51.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C.; 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural-gas industry.

D. (6) \$3,197.95.

E. (1) \$1.67; (2) \$20; (4) \$103.28; (5) \$14; (6) \$28; (7) \$31; (9) \$197.95; (10) \$910; (11) \$1,107.95.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

D. (6) \$3,000.

E. (5) \$634.86; (6) \$62.50; (7) \$382.21; (8) \$187.50; (9) \$1,267.07; (10) \$3,230.04; (11) \$4,497.11; (12) \$1,267.07; (14) \$1,114.76.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) Enactment of S. 1308, H. R. 63—30-year, half-pay retirement legislation.

E. (6) \$11.34; (7) \$33.57; (9) \$44.91; (10) \$220.42; (11) \$265.33.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The foundation has a "general legislative interest" in statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers. Its only "specific legislative interest" at present is the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and any amendments thereto or extensions thereof which may affect the interests of milk dealers.

E. (10) \$15.30; (11) \$15.30.

A. Larry Cates, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Aviation legislation—Railway Labor Act.

D. (6) \$1,302.90.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

C. (2) S. 75, Bridge Canyon Act; and H. R. 1500 and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act (known more frequently as central Arizona project bill), or as it may be renumbered. (3) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River, What the Central Arizona Project Means To You, Truth, Settling Up Time, Facts You Should Know Respecting the Central Arizona Project, National Tax Benefits From the Central Arizona Project.

D. (6) \$4,535.65.

E. (2) \$5,921.13; (4) \$191.91; (5) \$915.74; (6) \$232.75; (7) \$3,436.12; (8) \$128.99; (9) \$10,826.64; (10) \$30,002.60; (11) \$40,829.24.

A. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislative interests consist of advocating, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. William E. Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the 81st Congress as H. R. 2756, "To implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes"; and bills in the 82d Congress such as S. 1693, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes"; and H. R. 1755, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

D. (6) \$20.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See attachment A, p. 3.)¹

C. (2) (See attachment B, p. 4.) (3) (See attachment C, pp. 5 and 6.)

D. (6) \$749,603.95.
E. (9) \$8,515.34; (10) \$84,781.95; (11) \$93,297.29.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (See schedule E attached).¹

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.

D. (6) \$2,527.98.

E. (1) \$648; (2) \$1,827.50; (4) \$1,615.23; (5) \$148.89; (6) \$23.16; (7) \$190.62; (8) \$7.85; (9) \$4,461.25; (10) \$10,528.54; (11) \$14,989.79; (15).¹

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Robert M. Clark, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 50 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$4,400.

A. David R. Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting industry in general.

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Genocide, the President's civil rights program, House Resolution 561 (82d Cong.), Public Law 414.

D. (6) \$125.

A. Marvin J. Coles, Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Promotion of Tramp Shipping under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

E. (6) \$62.69; (8) \$837.98; (9) \$900.67; (10) \$1,119.26; (11) \$2,019.93.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Bldg., Denver, Colo.

C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code. Specific bills in which it is presently interested will be similar to those known in the last session of Congress as H. R. 240 known as the Mason bill, S. 892 proposed by Senator WILLIAMS, and H. R. 1179 proposed by Congressman DAVIS.

D. (6) \$370.

E. (2) \$375; (4) \$1.50; (5) \$19.25; (8) \$569.20; (9) \$964.95; (10) \$1,191.56; (11) \$2,156.51.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) (See page 3 attached).¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (1) \$8,667; (2) \$10,699.26; (4) \$1,967.76; (5) \$2,044.05; (6) \$1,462.56; (7) \$4,537.58; (9) \$29,378.21; (10) \$82,159.94; (11) \$111,538.15; (15) \$97.60, 10-2, 11-6, 12-4, Allen's Press Clipping Bureau, 124 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, clipping service; \$100, 12-4, T. G. Armstrong, 548 Spreckles Bldg., San Diego, Calif., public relations services; \$30, 12-4, N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., newspaper directory; \$138.48, 10-2, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, hotel room and expenses, etc.¹

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.

B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. as assistant general claim agent with headquarters at Lewisville, Ark.

E. (10) \$1,372.85; (11) \$1,372.85.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the 81st Congress as H. R. 2756, "To implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes"; and bills in the 82d Congress such as S. 1693, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes"; and H. R. 1755, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

D. (6) \$100.

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$455.

E. (3) \$650; (8) \$204.95; (9) \$854.95; (10) \$592.17; (11) \$1,447.12; (15) \$250, 10/25/52, Kilgore Committee, Daniel Boone Hotel, Charleston, W. Va., for Senator KILGORE's campaign fund; \$100, 10/25/52, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Somerset, Ky., for his campaign fund; \$100, 10/25/52, District of Columbia Montanans for Mansfield Committee, 3207 Highland Place NW., Washington, D. C., for MIKE MANSFIELD's campaign fund; \$100, 10/25/52, Benjamin A. Javits, treasurer, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, for Jacob K. JAVITS' campaign fund; \$100, 10/29/52, District of Columbia Montanans for Mansfield Committee, for MIKE MANSFIELD's campaign fund; \$192.59, 11/19/52, Hooven Letters, Inc., 352 Fourth Ave., New York City, for letter-shop work; \$12.36, 12/9/52, Hooven Letters, Inc., for lettershop work.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See attachment A.)¹

C. (2) Legislative interests: Cannot state bills, since none yet introduced into 83d Congress. In last Congress we were interested in the following: H. R. 27 and H. R. 54; S. 337, S. 445, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, H. R. 14, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3) (See attachment B.)¹

D. (6) \$11,604.

E. (2) \$6,939.52; (4) \$598.01; (5) \$1,844.02; (6) \$410.04; (7) \$579.61; (8) \$500; (9) \$10,871.20; (10) \$34,380.86; (11) \$45,252.06.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies was organized and functions to protect the legitimate interests of petroleum

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

pipelines, including, when necessary, legislative interests. At this time the only pending legislation affecting petroleum pipelines in which the committee is interested is S. 1889, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and H. R. 5632, a bill to require interstate oil pipelines to procure certificates of public convenience and necessity before construction of new or extension of existing lines. The committee is opposed to certain provisions contained in bill S. 1889 and to bill H. R. 5632. There has been no action on either of these bills during the period covered by this report.

D. (6) \$237.
E. (2) \$9,128.90; (4) \$55; (5) \$890.55; (6) \$90.73; (7) \$800.76; (8) \$2,067.12; (9) \$12,923.06; (10) \$39,998.74; (11) \$52,921.80; (15) (see attached p. 3).¹

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests: (a) mutual security; (b) military manpower.

D. (6) \$1,003.89.
E. (2) \$1,478.63; (5) \$1,632.23; (6) \$212.77; (7) \$2,814.81; (9) \$6,138.44; (10) \$12,776.61; (11) \$18,915.05; (15) \$738, October 8, November 4, December 2, the Sheraton, Inc., 1 Court Street, Boston, Mass. office rent; \$22.50, October 17, November 4, December 4, Answering, Inc., 422 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., telephone answering service; \$49.44, October 17, November 4, December 3, Fox-Jones Co., 1419 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$22.50, October 17, Typewriter Sales & Service Co., 811 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C., rental of office equipment, etc.¹

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades. A bill to this effect has been introduced in the House as H. R. 5346.

D. (6) \$1,200.
E. (4) \$234.83; (6) \$135.70; (7) \$962.48; (8) \$150; (9) \$1,483.01; (10) \$13,760.72; (11) \$15,243.73.

A. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News.

D. (6) \$1,422,908.24.
E. (1) \$15; (2) \$3,833.32; (4) \$130; (7) \$213.04; (8) \$176.49; (9) \$4,367.85; (10) \$15,068.68; (11) \$19,436.53.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Counsel for Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc. No change from previous report.

D.¹

A. John C. Cone, Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) May be interested in supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways System.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$8,179.37.
E. (2) \$2,165; (3) \$3,500; (4) \$525; (5) \$635; (6) \$900; (8) \$454.37; (9) \$3,179.37; (10) \$28,399.52; (11) \$36,578.89; (15) \$1,115, October 1 to December 31, 1952, Marguerite Nadonley, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., clerical salary; \$1,040, October 1 to December 31, 1952, Patricia Shilby, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., clerical salary; \$3,500, November 5, 1952, CIO Housing Committee, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution; \$18.96, October 9, 1952, Congressional Quarterly, 723 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C., subscription, etc.¹

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) \$2,560.
E. (10) \$143.62; (11) \$143.62.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

D and E. (See attached.)¹

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Lime Association, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and particularly those affecting the lime industry.

D and E. (See attached.)¹

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$300.
E. (2) \$194; (5) \$9; (6) \$14; (9) \$217; (10) \$651; (11) \$868.

A. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (2) \$500; (5) \$125; (6) \$50; (7) \$210; (9) \$840; (10) \$2,520; (11) \$3,360.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.

D. (6) \$3,741.
E. (5) \$351.27; (6) \$28.02; (7) \$180.30; (9) \$559.59; (10) \$1,266.92; (11) \$1,826.51.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$150.
E. (10) \$1,260; (11) \$1,260.

A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company in addition to my administrative duties at the company's Capitol offices.

E. (7) \$73.50; (9) \$73.50; (10) \$164.50; (11) \$238.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) \$400.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation which may help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland. House Resolution 82.

D. (6) \$790.67.
E. (7) \$40.67; (9) \$40.67; (10) \$294.82; (11) \$335.49; (15) \$9.45, December 17, Hotel Commodore, New York; \$16.50, December 17, Eastern Airlines; \$8.72, December 17, Pennsylvania Railroad; \$6, December 17, miscellaneous expenses.

A. Nathan E. Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$4,586.66.
E. (7) \$920; (9) \$920; (10) \$1,830; (11) \$2,750.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) On behalf of the association, I have a general interest in any legislation affecting the chemical industry.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
E. (2) \$425; (9) \$425; (10) \$1,297.88; (11) \$1,704.88.

A. Leo J. Crowley, Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Arnold Adler, 1011 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Amendment of Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to grantors dying after January 1, 1951.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Estate of Maryam Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.
 C. (2) A bill to amend section 8 of the act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (Public Law 378, 81st Cong.) to permit persons under a disability to take advantage of same.
 E. (10) \$17.58; (11) \$17.58.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.
 C. (2) A bill to amend section 811 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit its application in certain disability cases.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) A bill for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

A. John C. Cuneo, post-office box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
 B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
 C. (2) H. R. 2678-2679 (new 1953 members not assigned); Townsend plan bills in Congress.
 D. (6) \$2,698.82.
 E. (1) \$1; (5) \$593.73; (6) \$113.92; (7) \$170.45; (8) \$114.34; (9) \$2,007.21; \$4,731.77; (11) \$6,738.98.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
 D. (6) \$2,250.
 E. (6) \$19.56; (7) \$127.15; (9) \$146.71; (10) \$261.98; (11) \$408.69; (12) \$6.38; (14) \$143.39.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
 D. (6) \$3,750.

A. William L. Daley, 911 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Newspaper Publishers' Association—National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) H. R. 3760, to revise and codify laws relating to patents; H. R. 2682, Government stamped envelopes; H. R. 505, to separate subsidy from airmail pay; H. R. 2516, to deny benefits of NLRB to certain labor organizations; S. 1137, to separate subsidy from airmail pay; S. 719, to allow price differentials made in good faith; H. R. 2188, to prohibit interstate transportation of liquor advertising; H. R. 1514, to let FTC regulate liquor advertising; S. 672, to increase minimum age of District of Columbia newspaper boys; House Resolution 116, to authorize House Commerce Committee to investigate newspaper; S. 106, to regulate practice of optometry; H. R. 1768, to require cost and indemnity in political advertising; H. R. 116, seeks repeal of Gearhart amendment; H. R. 525, definition of "employee."
 D. (6) \$825.
 E. (5) \$66.25; (6) \$31.78; (7) \$100; (9) \$198.03; (10) \$480.02; (11) \$678.05; (15) \$31.78, October, November, December 1952, C. & P. Telephone Co., telephone service; \$32.10, October, November, December 1952,

United States Post Office, postage; \$100, November, B. & O. Railroad Co., transportation.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
 C. (2) Bill listed deals with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail. Study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
 D. (6) \$1,875.
 E. (6) \$1.69; (9) \$1.69; (11) \$1.69.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
 C. (2) Bill listed deals with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail. Study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
 D. (6) \$1,875.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, legislative affairs department, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
 B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
 C. (2) Legislative interests—as an employee of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce such matters affecting business and commerce in Ohio as are referred to me from time to time by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce; e. g., proposals in the fields of taxation, general appropriations, old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, industrial development and other management problems.
 E. (7) \$77.55; (9) \$77.55; (10) \$222.36; (11) \$299.91.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General legislative interest: Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba. Specific legislative interest: The Sugar Act of 1948 (P. L. 388, 80th Cong.) and 1951 amendments thereto (P. L. 140, 82d Cong.).

A. William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Magazine Publishers Association, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Activities limited to advising association in connection with postal rate matters.
 D. (6) \$1,875.
 E. (6) \$4.07; (7) \$27.71; (9) \$31.78; (10) \$82.12; (11) \$113.90.

A. B. B. Derrick, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mr. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. A. W. Dickinson, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
 D. (6) \$1,375.
 E. (7) \$3.75; (9) \$3.75; (10) \$31.45; (11) \$35.20.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) H. R. 3408 and legislation affecting the motion picture industry.
 D. (6) \$3,900.
 E. (7) \$1,300; (9) \$1,300; (10) \$3,900; (11) \$5,200.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
 C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before the Senate Finance Committee; Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee; two Post Office and Civil Service Committees; two Armed Services Committees; House Veterans Affairs Committee.
 E. (2) \$5,066.60; (7) \$63.25; (9) \$5,129.85; (10) \$15,834.28; (11) \$20,964.13.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
 E. (2) \$2,500; (9) \$2,500; (10) \$7,652.46; (11) \$10,152.46.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
 B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employee Compensation Acts.
 D. (6) \$1,458.93.
 E. (10) \$368; (11) \$368.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
 C. (2) Legislation terminated. (This closes my employment.)
 D. (6) \$1,248.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Wilcox Oil Co., et al.
 C. (2) Legislation terminated. (This closes my representation in this matter.)
 D. (6) \$1,500.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Bldg., Washington, D. C.
 B. District Lodge No. 44 is subject to the direction of the International President and the General Executive Council of the I. A. of M. and subject to the will of the membership of District No. 44 as per its by-laws.
 C. (2) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 5 percent of its time and resources was spent on this during the fourth quarter of 1952. For further

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

particulars see page 3 under c-2 hereto attached.

D. (6) \$12,672.43.
E. (2) \$4,803.06; (4) \$180; (5) \$525; (6) \$223.80; (7) \$1,030.33; (8) \$1,396.09; (9) \$8,158.28; (10) \$28,472.35; (11) \$36,630.63; (15) \$175, October 1, 1952, I. A. of M., Machinists Bldg., City, rent; \$500, October 1, 1952, N. P. Weathersby, Room 303, Machinists Bldg., City, salary and expenses; \$42.29, October 1, 1952, Nettie Barkersmith (same), clerical services; \$62.99, October 1, 1952, Mabel Almael (same), secretary services, etc.¹

A. Doctors for Freedom, 511 Medical Arts Bldg., Houston, Tex.

C. (2) General legislative interests in the medical field. (3) "A Christian's Political Responsibility," "The America We Lost," "Worth Repeating," "Eisenhower Slaps Socialized Medicine Again."

D. (6) \$131.26.

E. (4) \$51.86; (8) \$17.92; (9) \$69.78; (10) \$1,796.48; (11) \$1,865.96; (15) \$43.12, October 1, 1952, Houston, Tex., postmaster, stamps; \$8.74, November 3, 1952, Moore Paper Co., Houston, Tex., manila envelopes; \$10, November 3, 1952, Brazos Floral Co., Houston, Tex., floral arrangement; \$7.92, December 5, 1952, Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y., 2 copies of "Understanding Our Free Economy."

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York City.

C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.

D. (6) \$885.

A. Doherty, Rumble, Butler & Mitchell, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) \$2,750.

E. (6) \$60.92; (7) \$264.28; (8) \$31.25; (9) \$356.45; (11) \$356.45; (15) \$29.27, October 24, 1952, N. & W. Railway, railroad and pullman fare; \$27.88, October 25, 1952, Chicago B. & O. Railway, railroad and pullman fare; \$10.09, October 25, 1952, Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Ill., meals and lodging; \$13, October 20, 1952, secretary of state, State capitol, St. Paul, corporation filing fee, etc.¹

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act.

D. (6) \$9.50.

A. James L. Donnelly, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.

E. (10) \$697.51; (11) \$697.51.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.

D. (6) \$900.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. No specific interests during fourth quarter of the year.

D. (6) \$99.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.

D. (6) \$1,339.25.

E. (10) \$155.80; (11) \$155.80.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber-manufacturing industry. Impractical to state names of specific bills and statutes because of broad basis of interests.

D. (6) \$1,900.

E. (7) \$93.67; (9) \$93.67; (10) \$479.29; (11) \$572.96.

A. Mrs. F. P. Douglas, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$550.02.

E. (7) \$2; (9) \$2; (10) \$22; (11) \$24.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.

C. (2) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies is interested in any legislation which, if enacted, would divorce pipelines that are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act from their existing owning companies. It is also interested in any proposed legislation which would require any extensive revision of the Interstate Commerce Act, S. 1889 and H. R. 5632, for example.

D. and E.¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. M. J. Dowd, Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

E. (10) \$1,311.17; (11) \$1,311.17.

A. Adin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

D. (6) \$1,625.

E. (10) \$69.90; (11) \$69.90.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action.

D. (6) \$1,650.

E. (4) \$225; (5) \$225; (6) \$225; (7) \$225; (8) \$225; (9) \$225; (10) \$675; (11) \$900.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Transportation legislation.

D. (6) \$1,000.

E. (2) \$175; (5) \$847.15; (6) \$158.41; (7) \$180.76; (9) \$1,361.32; (10) \$2,610.87; (11) \$3,972.19.

A. Reed Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

E. (10) \$63.52; (11) \$63.52.

A. William M. Dunn, assistant to the president, Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mills Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mills Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Matthew Dushane, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Seafarers International Union of North America, 450 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Bills of interest to unions affiliated with the international union.

D. (6) \$568.75.

E. (5) \$41.25; (6) \$12; (7) \$170; (8) \$35; (9) \$258.25; (10) \$1,318.30; (11) \$1,576.55.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Petroleum legislation, S. 1498, S. 2348 through S. 2366, S. 2743, S. 2744, Senate Resolution 50, and various petroleum

bills before House Interstate Commerce Committee, current tax bills, House Joint Resolution 42 and House Joint Resolution 206.

- D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (7) \$515.23.

A. George S. Eaton, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. National Tool & Die Manufacturers Association, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small businesses.

A. John W. Edelman, 910 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy and general welfare—oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. Support health insurance, aid to medical education, rent control, housing point 4, District home rule, FLSA, Mutual Security. Oppose certain amendments to UMT bill, S. 349, Taft-Hartley law. Dirksen, Fulbright, Robertson, and Bricker amendments to DPA, cut in school-lunch appropriations.

- D. (6) \$2,055.80.
E. (7) \$430.80; (9) \$430.80; (10) \$1,272.93; (11) \$1,703.73.

A. Herman Edelsberg, Director, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

C. Registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans; more specifically, the program of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, and opposes discrimination in immigration legislation.

- D. (6) Approximately \$140.
E. (7) \$15; (9) \$15; (10) \$45; (11) \$60.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interest on all bills relating to education and training of World War II veterans and Korean veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.

- D. (6) \$1,050.
E. (6) \$47.56; (7) \$99.50; (8) \$73.36; (9) \$220.42; (10) \$821.40; (11) \$1,041.82.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 708, Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.

C. (2) Affiant is interested in general legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers—no specific legislation.

- D. (6) \$3,000.

A. John E. Else, 302 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retail lumber dealers, including housing, controls, etc.

- D. (6) \$2,750.
E. (7) \$378; (9) \$378; (10) \$908.95; (11) \$1,286.95.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting public-power projects generally.

- D. (6) \$2,000.
E. (10) \$313.60; (11) \$313.60.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. Department of Water and Power of the city of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Conference and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public-power projects.

- D. (6) \$1,800.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.

C. (2) Public Law 470, 82d Congress, Interior Department Appropriations Act, 1953, and legislation affecting social security coverage for municipal employees.

- D. (6) \$2,100.
E. (10) \$410.45; (11) \$410.45.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the District's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.

- D. (6) \$2,100.
E. (10) \$158.35; (11) \$158.35.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project, and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions, and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.

- D. (6) \$10,990.13.
E. (4) \$70.13; (6) \$27.16; (7) \$888.29; (8) \$27.05; (9) \$1,012.63; (10) \$858.08; (11) \$1,870.71.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. Sun-Pacific, Inc., 520 Ash Street, San Diego, Calif.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to client on legislation affecting Sun-Pacific's interests, i. e., tuna tariff legislation (H. R. 5693) and related Federal Tariff Commission hearings.

- E. (10) \$229.86; (11) \$229.86.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project and legislation affecting Federal reclamation and public power policies and projects generally.

- D. (6) \$2,250.
E. (10) \$16.80; (11) \$16.80.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) Public Law No. 504, 82d Congress, Army Civil Functions Appropriations, 1953,

and legislation affecting flood control projects generally.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)¹

B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans educational assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, 78th Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

- D. (6) \$3,359.85.
E. (10) \$959.85; (11) \$959.85.

A. Emergency Committee of Small- and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Postal legislation.

- D. (6) \$510.
E. (2) \$1,375; (4) \$26.09; (6) \$26.25; (8) \$2.50; (9) \$1,429.84; (10) \$3,487.11; (11) \$4,916.95; (15) Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses, 4th quarter, \$1,004.84; J. K. Lasser & Co., 1440 Broadway, New York, N. Y., accounting fees, \$425.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.

- D. (6) \$6,775.
E. (6) \$226.15; (8) \$226.15; (9) \$1,172.12; (10) \$1,398.27; (13) \$226.15.

A. Leon J. Engel, 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) Excise taxes.

A. Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

C. (2) All Federal legislation relating to equality of taxation, governmental economy, and tax reduction.

- D. (6) \$450.
E. (6) \$15.27; (7) \$31.08; (8) \$50; (9) \$93.35; (10) \$2,341.88; (11) \$2,437.23.

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Millers' National Federation, 209 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

- E. (10) \$92.87; (11) \$92.87.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers.

- D. (See attached statement.)¹
E. (15) \$32.86, October 1, Angus McDonald, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense; \$103.84, October 1, Dorchester House, Washington, D. C., rent; \$48.15, October 1, Gist & Chairs, Inc., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$23.40, October 1, A. C. Electric Co., Washington, D. C., electrical work, etc.¹

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles J. Farrington, National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All small-business legislation, tax revision, funds for public roads, highway safety legislation.

D. (6) \$7,355.78.

E. (7) \$1,715.65; (9) \$1,715.65; (10) \$4,953.36; (11) \$6,669.01.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests: those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Abner H. Ferguson, 1130 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

D. (6) \$900.

E. (6) \$9; (9) \$9; (10) \$27.70; (11) \$36.70.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) No legislation pending during this quarter.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Irving Ferman, Century Building, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Supported: (H. R. 28, S. 127, S. 1733); (H. R. 1320, S. 1734); (H. R. 29); (S. 1732); (S. 656); (S. 49, S. 50).

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.¹

A. H. L. Filler, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., New Haven, Conn.

B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

A. James Finucane, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Foreign economic assistance programs, military appropriations, universal military training, and other manpower legislation, peace treaties, disarmament, immigration, and educational exchange.

E. (7) \$84.39; (9) \$84.39; (11) \$84.39.

A. Mrs. Edith Fisher, 3601 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 600 South Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Congress are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in fields of education; social and economic well-being, child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection, and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. The National Congress may support or oppose specific statutes and bills

which relate to the area of its general legislative interests.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.

D. (6) \$675.

A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies.

D. (6) \$18,000.

E. (4) \$223.43; (6) \$904.50; (7) \$2,067.65; (8) \$499.45; (9) \$3,695.03; (10) \$11,291.45; (11) \$14,986.48.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Particularly interested in legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) (See attached).¹

D. (6) \$1,166.66.

E. (7) \$31.09; (9) \$31.09; (10) \$120.52; (11) \$151.61.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement. Items in Agricultural Department budget affecting research and control work on black stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.

D. (6) \$1,875.

E. (2) \$254.70; (5) \$93.02; (6) \$41.60; (7) \$100; (9) \$489.32; (10) \$3,980.33; (11) \$4,469.65.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects. Specific legislation interested in during the calendar year 1952 included Appropriations for Civil Functions of the Army, H. R. 7268.

E. (2) \$1,350; (8) \$55.92; (9) \$1,405.92; (10) \$4,201.16; (11) \$5,607.08; (15) \$450, October 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., for professional services; \$22.81, October 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, reimbursement for expense incurred; \$450, October 30, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, for professional services; \$17.05, November 30, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, reimbursement for expense incurred; \$450, December 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, for professional services; \$16.06 December 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, reimbursement for expense incurred.

A. Aaron L. Ford, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill to provide compensation from blocked or vested funds to Nicholas B. Perry for losses suffered as a result of seizure of his property by the Government of Rumania or Hungary, or either of them. H. R. 5557, 82d Congress, 1st session and S. 2338, 82d Congress, 1st session.

E. (7) \$2; (9) \$2; (11) \$4.25.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

C. (2) H. R. 3994 and S. 1767, to amend the definition of "agriculture" as contained in section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; H. R. 2752, to encourage the prevention of water pollution; S. 1149, Reorganization Act of Department of Agriculture; H. R. 5474, to provide for accelerated amortization of stream-control expenditures; H. R. 565, Tackett bill, direct 10 percent of national forest receipts to recreation and wildlife development; H. R. 3527, McKellar bill, direct 25 percent of national forest receipts to recreation and wildlife development.

E. (10) \$366.42; (11) \$366.42.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See rider C-2).¹

D. (6) \$9,290.40.

E. (7) \$816.37; (9) \$816.37; (10) \$641.81; (11) \$1,458.18; (15) (See rider E-15).¹

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation pertaining to war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which the DAV is interested are before the Senate Finance Committee, Senate Labor and Welfare Committee, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, two Post Office and Civil Service Committees, two Armed Services Committees.

D. (6) \$2,260.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retail Druggists.

C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. Protection of the Robinson-Patman Act. (3) N. A. R. D. Journal.

D. (6) \$2,800.

E. (2) \$675; (5) \$399; (6) \$105; (9) \$1,179; (10) \$2,396; (11) \$3,575.

A. Dr. John H. Frederick, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.

B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, mineral, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

A. H. Maurice Fridlund, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 3715 and H. R. 3797 to amend Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950. For these bills or equivalent. H. R. 3715, enacted July 21, 1952; H. R. 3797, not reported out.

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) No particular bills; but any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.

D. (6) \$4,299.98.
E. (7) \$1,515.09; (9) \$1,515.09; (10) \$3,319.81; (11) \$4,834.90.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

D. (6) \$625.

A. Fyffe & Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the manufacturing industry.

E. (10) \$50; (11) \$50.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota railroads.¹

C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and proposed amendments; Interstate Commerce Act and proposed amendments; and Federal Employer's Liability Act and proposed amendments. Generally favor legislation favorable to railroads and oppose unfavorable legislation.

D. (6) \$500.
E. (10) \$523.94; (11) \$523.94.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, including H. Res. 520.

E. (7) \$100; (9) \$100; (10) \$349.50; (11) \$449.50; (15) \$20, 10/5/52, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., dinner, two persons; \$35, 10/9/52, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., dinner, three persons; \$45, 10/20/52, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., dinner, five persons.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.

C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, 81st Congress, H. R. 4702 and H. R.

5802, 82d Congress. (3) Memorandum in support of H. R. 6074, 81st Congress, dated March 1, 1950.

E. (6) \$6.25; (7) \$39; (9) \$45.25; (10) \$190.35; (11) \$235.60.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) (See attached).¹

D. (6) \$1,062.48.
E. (7) \$38.83; (9) \$38.83; (10) \$112.33; (11) \$151.16.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

D. (6) \$2,362.50.
E. (10) \$181.96; (11) \$181.96.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Explanation and analysis of Federal bills, rendering of advice concerning their relationship to ADA policy.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.

E. (10) \$252.59; (11) \$252.59.

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

E. (10) \$51,644.37; (11) \$51,644.37.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer & C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerks.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. William Glazier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William Glazier, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the

United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.

D. (6) \$175.
E. (7) \$49.57; (9) \$49.57; (10) \$179.70; (11) \$229.27.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D. C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.

D. (6) \$375.

A. Government Employees Council, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.

D. (6) \$4,693.99.
E. (2) \$3,209.91; (4) \$179.01; (5) \$558.41; (6) \$114.58; (8) \$315.63; (9) \$4,377.54; (10) \$13,181.75; (11) \$17,559.29; (15) \$2,277, October, November, and December, Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C., received for services, fees, per diem, etc., operations director, GECAF of L; \$938, October, November, and December, Gladys M. Monroe, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., secretary, GECAF of L.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318/418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.

E. (2) \$4,085.33; (5) \$559.37; (6) \$104.72; (7) \$820.81; (8) \$32.02; (9) \$5,602.25; (10) \$16,584.26; (11) \$22,186.51; (15) \$2,500.03, October 20, November 20, and December 20, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$1,585.30, October 15, October 30, November 15, November 30, December 15, and December 24, Glenn C. Russell (employee), 310 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; \$337.50, October 6, November 6, and December 5, Labor, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., rent; \$60, October 6 and November 25, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., postage, etc.¹

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. The Postmasters' Advocate.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Ernest W. Greene, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.

D. (6) \$1,200.

E. (10) \$74.81; (11) \$74.81.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Gargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof; tax legislation; S. 2742, Inland Waterways Corp., user charges; S. 2745, water carriers, preferential rates; S. 2752, contract carriers, rate regulations; S. 2753, water and motor carriers, operating rates; S. 2754, ICC rate regulation; H. R. 6750, Social Security Act Amendments of 1952; S. 2591, grain discount-futures contracts; H. R. 8210, DPA 1952 amendments; H. R. 6292, exempt tax coconut oil from Philippines; Public Law 420; Public Law 451.

D. (6) \$6,875.06.

E. (10) \$4; (11) \$4.

A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.

E. (10) \$85; (11) \$85.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Political organization.

C. (2) All legislation covered by convention-adopted program of organization. (3) Column in monthly organization paper, ADA World.

D. (6) \$1,575.

E. (7) \$277.69; (9) \$277.69; (10) \$979.42; (11) \$1,257.11.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation covered by convention-adopted program of organization.

D. (6) \$1,645.

E. (7) \$299.44; (9) \$299.44; (10) \$1,234.82; (11) \$1,534.26.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$949.98.

E. (7) \$26.50; (9) \$26.50; (10) \$123.25; (11) \$149.75.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) \$1,800.

E. (10) \$770.98; (11) \$770.98.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of Postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.

D. (6) \$2,395.80.

E. (7) \$122.35; (9) \$122.35; (10) \$1,014.88; (11) \$1,137.23.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 Eye Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) \$750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,125.

E. (10) \$1,918.98; (11) \$1,918.98

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; also 33 South Clark Street, Chicago.

C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.

D. (6) \$600.

E. (2) \$97.50; (4) \$690.04; (5) \$124.41; (6) \$91.21; (7) \$116.65; (9) \$1,119.80; (10) \$2,633.02; (11) \$3,752.82.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miss Elsie D. Harper, National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert E. Harper, National Business Publications, Inc., Washington, D. C.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street, NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Maritime matters. No specific bills in this quarter.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence.

E. (10) \$300.43; (11) \$300.43.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures, and livestock accounting methods.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412-14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested for the B. F. Goodrich Co. in legislation authorizing the sale to private industry of facilities for the production of manmade rubber in the United States, also on behalf of my client in the repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure which would relieve burdens upon business and industry, and generally in all legislative proposals in Congress relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products.

D. (6) \$2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See p. 3.)¹

D. (6) \$3,375.

E. (7) \$5.50; (9) \$5.50; (10) \$153.40; (11) \$158.90.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (3) Article for NRDC's Stores magazine, NRDC Washington News Letter.

E. (7) \$43; (8) \$1.25; (9) \$44.25; (10) \$518.12; (11) \$562.37.

A. Thomas P. Healy, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Works of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.

D. (6) \$1,952.70.

E. (1) \$15; (2) \$1,833.34; (7) \$95.27; (8) \$9.09; (9) \$1,952.70; (10) \$5,414.82; (11) \$7,367.52.

A. Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.

B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.

C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.

E. (10) \$851.49; (11) \$851.49.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. K. W. Heberton, Room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.

E. (7) \$68.45; (9) \$68.45; (10) \$248.10; (11) \$316.55.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. American Parents' Committee, 132 3d Street SE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction. Support of legislation providing national school health services. Appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers. Bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers. Appropriations for the Children's Bureau. Appropriations for the national school lunch program. Emergency maternal and infant care, S. 2337.

A. Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.

D. (6) \$500.

E. (10) \$200; (11) \$200.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cannery Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.

D. (6) \$2,327.49.

E. (7) \$178.71; (9) \$590.43; (10) \$769.14.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects directly or indirectly the interests of local property agents: Taxes; S. 2887, bonding; S. 2148, H. R. 6493, disaster insurance; national health bills, S. 337, etc.; S. 2714 and S. 2325, industrial safety; Federal hospitalization, S. 3001, etc.; social security; war damage, S. 1848; marine and aviation war risks; motor laws and regulations.

D. (6) \$42.49.

E. (7) \$42.49; (9) \$42.49; (10) \$431.88; (11) \$474.37.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry, such as: H. R. 137, 1278, 1514, 1749, 2187, 2188, 2982, 5505, 5563, 5889, 6241; House Resolution 278; S. 22, 1046, 2444. Any proposed legislation affecting the wool industry.

D. (6) \$2,500.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$1,365.53.

E. (6) \$3.85; (7) \$111.68; (9) \$115.53; (10) \$364.60; (11) \$480.13.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 528 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John L. Hoen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American merchant marine.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$3,666.66.

E. (7) \$5,850; (9) \$5,850; (10) \$11,100; (11) \$16,950.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life insurance business. (a) Life insurance company income tax (U. S. C. A., title 26, sec. 201); Social Security Act; individual retirement legislation.

D. (6) \$2,583.33.

E. (7) \$677.20; (9) \$677.20; (10) \$1,778.82;

(11) \$2,456.02; (15) \$2,583.33, October 1 to

December 31, Robert L. Hogg, salary; \$1-

027.78, October 1 to December 31, Robert A.

Crichton, salary; \$346.68, October 1 to De-

cember 31, Mary Louise Long, salary; \$303.33,

October 1 to December 31, Davilee Bryant,

salary; \$416.66, October 1 to December 31,

Randall H. Hagner & Co., Inc., rent, etc. ¹

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

D. (6) \$4,125.

E. (10) \$26; (11) \$26.

A. Home Rule Headquarters, 4800 U Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Kefauver bill (S. 1976), home rule for the District of Columbia.

E. (2) \$416.02; (4) \$111.41; (5) \$105; (6)

\$89.83; (8) \$235.39; (9) \$957.65; (10)

\$2,852.44; (11) \$3,810.09.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Victor Hood, 4209 Queensbury Road, Hyattsville, Md.

B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 12th and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, vet-

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

erans' educational legislation; the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto; against H. R. 5234.

E. (10) \$1,270.89; (11) \$1,270.89.

A. Jesse V. Horton, post-office box 2013, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, 100 Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.

D. (6) \$2,300.

E. (7) \$100.10; (8) \$342.69; (9) \$442.79.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. Legislation of an economic significance to family life.

D. (6) \$50.

E. (4) \$36; (9) \$36; (10) \$121.23; (11)

\$157.23.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. All legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

A. Harold K. Howe, suite C, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Laundering, box 1187, Joliet, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.

D. (6) \$2,649.99.

E. (2) \$1,079; (7) \$430.50; (9) \$1,509.50;

(10) \$4,180.60; (11) \$5,690.10.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

D. (6) \$3,959.

A. Hudson, Creyke, Lipscomb & Gray, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.

D. (6) \$1,500.

E. (6) \$13.82; (7) \$521.85; (9) \$535.67;

(10) \$129.36; (11) \$665.03.

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. (Opposed). Due to the death of Mr Carroll B. Huntress on November 29, 1952, this will, of course, be his final report.

E. (7) \$48; (9) \$48; (10) \$3,988.90; (11)

\$4,036.90; (15) \$48, November 3, traveling

expense, New York to Albany and Boston,

October 28, 29, and 30.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally and specifically.

D. (6) \$3,052.

E. (6) \$26.25; (8) \$189.75; (9) \$216; (10) \$752; (11) \$968.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattsville, Wyo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) \$750; (9) \$750; (10) \$2,650; (11) \$3,400.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$29,863.50.
E. (2) \$5,750; (5) \$300; (9) \$6,050; (10) \$18,150; (11) \$24,200.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

E. (2) \$680; (4) \$11.75; (5) \$117.40; (6) \$16.63; (7) \$689.42; (8) \$828.80; (9) \$2,344; (10) \$3,922.54; (11) \$6,266.54.

A. The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., second floor, Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation—examples, the Mason bill, H. R. 5064 in the 81st Congress, and the 1951 revenue bill.

E. (3) \$42.50; (8) \$30.75; (9) \$73.25; (10) \$1,728.14; (11) \$1,801.39.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwolson, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) \$1,125.
E. (7) \$55.65; (9) \$55.65; (11) \$55.65.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the socioeconomic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) \$2,150.
E. (1) \$1,250; (4) \$250; (5) \$150; (6) \$200; (7) \$300; (9) \$2,150; (10) \$5,450; (11) \$7,600.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) General interest is in Federal and State legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.

D. (6) \$3,750.
E. (2) \$3,750; (9) \$3,750; (10) \$11,250; (11) \$15,000.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (10) \$7.92; (11) \$7.92.

A. Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., 463 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa.

C. Such bills as H. R. 240; H. R. 1177; S. 892, and H. R. 4473 previously introduced. We definitely favor equal taxing of net profit

dollars, regardless of where these originate from an income tax viewpoint.

D. (6) \$465.
E.¹

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) \$6,785.
E. (2) \$2,750; (6) \$3; (7) \$11.35; (8) \$13; (9) \$2,777.35; (11) \$2,777.35; (15) \$2,750, December 31, 1952, Doherty, Rumble, Butler & Mitchell, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn., services; \$27.35, December 31, 1952, same as above, expenses.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.

B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.

C. (2) Tidelands legislation—supporting State ownership.

D. (6) \$2,400.
E. (2) \$591.60; (5) \$697.88; (6) \$79.13; (7) \$298.90; (9) \$1,667.51; (10) \$4,344; (11) \$6,011.51.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

D. (6) \$325.
E. (7) \$49.93; (9) \$49.93; (10) \$512.83; (11) \$562.76.

A. Seward H. Jacobi.

B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) All legislation affecting business and industry.

D. (7) \$2,750.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Federal Legislation affecting savings and loan business.

D. (6) \$300.
E. (5) \$125; (8) \$125; (9) \$375; (10) \$500; (11) \$500.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn. Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn. United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J. Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky. Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co. Cooley Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co. of Mayfield, Ky.

C. (2) We are interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown by title 26; section 114, Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) \$503.96.
E. (10) \$649.77; (11) \$649.77.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., Mountain Pine, Ark.

B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945—Millwood Dam. Legislation affecting lumber industry.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

E. (2) \$1,250; (9) \$1,250; (10) \$5,532.77; (11) \$6,782.77.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) \$2,916.
E. (10) \$122.82; (11) \$122.82.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

C. (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (6) \$3,720.50.
E. (7) \$769.65; (9) \$769.65; (10) \$2,811.31; (11) \$3,580.96.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries. S. 940, and similar bills.

D. (6) \$6,000.
E. (7) \$552.63; (9) \$552.63; (10) \$2,422.66; (11) \$2,975.29.

A. Lillian Cohen for Willard Johnson, General Secretary, United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide Convention, 56 Brook Manor, Pleasantville, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interest will continue until Senate ratification of Genocide Convention.

E. (10) \$438.13; (11) \$438.13.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) \$2,500.
E. (7) \$643.21; (9) \$643.21; (10) \$2,609.21; (11) \$3,252.42.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See p. 3).¹
D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (7) \$304.10; (9) \$304.10; (10) \$895.14; (11) \$1,199.24.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Haldressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 12th and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation; the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto, against H. R. 5234.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. The Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.

C. (2) Tax equality and other legislation affecting independent business.

D. (6) \$50.

E. (5) \$150; (9) \$150; (10) \$1,061.11; (11) \$1,211.11.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. City and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriations, civil defense, ship construction, payments in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban development, taxation and Government controls, and veterans' educational benefits.

D. (6) \$3,000.

E. (5) \$825; (6) \$344.16; (7) \$972.76; (8) \$71.10; (9) \$2,213.02; (10) \$5,198.39; (11) \$7,411.41.

A. (Miss) Elizabeth A. Kendall, 5415 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the Antarctic Continent, such as that regarding geopolitical decisions, inventions, transportation, communications, equipment, long-range planning, exploitation of natural resources, etc., in the interests of all United States taxpayers and world peace and prosperity. H. J. Res. 291 declaring right of sovereignty of United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent. (For.)

E. (6) \$15; (8) \$2; (9) \$17; (11) \$17.

A. Earle R. Kennedy, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$750.

E. (7) \$305.60; (9) 305.60; (10) \$1,885.25; (11) \$2,190.85.

A. Mr. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.

D. (6) \$500.

E. (2) \$125; (5) \$75; (8) \$25; (9) \$225; (10) \$975; (11) 1,200.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Legion, 700 N. Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) (See statement attached.)¹

D. (6) \$3,100.

E. (7) \$564.17; (9) \$564.17; (10) \$414.88; (11) \$979.05.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) \$2,730.

E. (2) \$2,703; (9) \$2,730; (10) \$8,010; (11) \$10,740.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employ-

ment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

D. (6) \$3,000.

E. (7) \$132; (9) \$132; (10) \$371; (11) \$503.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.

C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, which appear in section 4 of Public Law 594, 82d Congress, 2 session, approved July 21, 1952.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Willford I. King, Room 300, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Favor all constitutional legislation according with sound economic principles.

D. (6) \$3,075.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$165.

E. (7) \$26.26; (9) \$26.26; (10) \$260.60; (11) \$286.86.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation.

C. (2) Legislative matters in which the American Farm Bureau Federation is interested, primarily those matters affecting directly American agriculture.

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Private bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of \$725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy. Bill for relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; S. 116 and H. R. 3739.

E. (6) \$2; (7) \$20; (9) \$22; (10) \$63; (11) \$85.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative developments of interest to association members.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

E. (10) \$63.50.

A. John Kolanda, Room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Employees' Department, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.

D. (6) \$2,700.

A. Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) \$3,492.

E. (10) \$6,412.13; (11) \$6,412.13.

A. Lake Carriers Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.

D. (6) \$900.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 Amendments; vesicular exanthema in hogs.

D. (6) \$1,500.

E. (5) \$2,674.49; (7) \$50.20; (9) \$2,724.69; (10) \$5,525; (11) \$8,249.69.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 Amendments; vesicular exanthema in hogs.
D. (6) \$4,500.
E. (4) \$287.57; (5) \$2,674.49; (6) \$487.58; (7) \$787.91; (9) \$4,237.55; (10) \$6,214.71; (11) \$10,452.26.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., and United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., an affiliate of Congress of Industrial Organizations.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) \$3,208.31.
E. (7) \$2,351; (9) \$2,351; (10) \$4,872; (11) \$7,223.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$6,749.98.
E. (7) \$8.40; (9) \$8.40; (10) \$28.85; (11) \$37.25.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Relating to mining, smelting, and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically this includes, but is not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, 82d Congress, 2d session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper such as Public Law 38, 82d Congress, 1st session, May 22, 1951.

A. Clarence F. Lea, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation.

A. League of Women Voters of the U. S., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (3) Congressional Strings on the Public Purse, Put Publications To Work, the National Voter.

D. (6) \$1,149.70.
E. (2) \$550.02; (4) \$846.49; (6) \$10.10; (9) \$1,406.61; (10) \$5,499.27; (11) \$6,905.88.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General—Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. Sugar Act of 1948 and Public Law 140, 82d Congress, amending the Sugar Act of 1948. Trade Agreements Act. Tariff Acts.

D. (6) \$1,741.46.
E. (4) \$92.54; (6) \$47.47; (8) \$201.45; (9) \$341.46; (10) \$3,618.07; (11) \$3,959.53; (15).¹

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Public education.
E. (2) \$400.63; (4) \$28.70; (5) \$60.35; (6) \$37.25; (7) \$49.57; (9) \$576.50; (10) \$9,344.78; (11) \$9,921.28.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I., National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

C. (2) Measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection, and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Mining, smelting, and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically this includes but is not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, 82d Congress, 2d session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO, custom duties, including copper, such as Public Law 38, 82d Congress, 1st session, May 22, 1951.

D. (6) (See p. 3.)¹

A. Arnold Levy, Freedman & Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Anthracite Operators Wage Agreement Committee, 237 Old River Road, Wilkes Barre, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation affecting anthracite industry.

D. (6) \$4,613.30.
E. (6) \$19.19; (7) \$73.36; (8) \$20.75; (9) \$113.30; (10) \$50; (11) \$163.30.

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation concerning fair bidding procedures. Principal legislative interest is in S. 2907.

D. (6) \$5,083.13.
E. (2) \$4,400; (4) \$600; (7) \$83.13; (9) \$5,083.13; (10) \$11,826.82; (11) \$16,909.95; (15) \$1,365.95, October 1, 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; \$1,374.16, November 1, 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; \$2,343.02, December 1, 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses.

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: mutual-assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation, including universal military training and service, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees, and displaced persons, educational exchange, and immigration legislation.

D. (6) \$1,329.12.
E. (7) \$104.13; (9) \$104.13; (10) \$347.63; (11) \$451.74.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John W. Lindsey, counsel, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

D. (6) \$375.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)¹

D. (6) \$3,000.
E. (6) \$16.30; (7) \$1,096.28; (8) \$159; (9) \$1,271.58 (10) \$1,632.40; (11) \$2,903.98; (15) \$14.10, November 8, 1952, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon; \$18.90, December 9, 1952, Occidental Restaurant, Washington, D. C., dinner; \$19.40, December 23, 1952, Fan & Bill's, Washington, D. C., luncheon.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Major Steam Railroads of California (see schedule attached).¹

E. (7) \$25; (9) \$25; (10) \$1,159.32; (11) \$1,184.32; (15) \$25, December 29, 1952, California State Society, dinner.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to the pipeline industry. The committee is interested in S. 1889 and H. R. 5632. Both provide for amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. We are opposed to some provisions of S. 1889. We are opposed to the enactment of any part of H. R. 5632.

D. (6) \$4,500.

A. Mr. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks. War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951. S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against this legislation. H. R. 7844 and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.

D. (6) \$700.
E. (6) \$12.44; (7) \$175.01; (8) \$5.18; (9) \$192.63; (10) \$334; (11) \$526.63; (15) \$12.44, October 1 through December 31, 1952, Michigan Bell Telephone Co., Detroit, Mich., long-distance telephone (legislative and other business); \$175.01, November 23 to November 30, 1952, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Pennsylvania Railroad, New York Central Railroad, Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, restaurants, taxis, etc., attendance at meetings in Washington and Philadelphia.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
 E. (7) \$500; (9) \$500; (10) \$1,500; (11) \$2,000.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (See p. 3.)¹
 D. (6) \$750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
 E. (8) \$5; (10) \$5; (11) \$5.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
 E. (6) \$11.51; (8) \$5; (10) \$16.51; (11) \$16.51.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
 E. (6) \$51.21; (7) \$10; (8) \$5; (10) \$66.21; (11) \$66.21.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 D. (6) \$1,250.
 E. (8) \$5; (10) \$5; (11) \$5.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale, Phoenix, Ariz.
 B. Townsend Plan for National Insurance, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
 C. (2) Townsend plan as per H. R. 2679.
 D. (6) \$35.50.
 E. (7) \$45.50; (9) \$45.50; (10) \$185; (11) \$230.50.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Washington Office, Ford Motor Co., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
 E. (10) \$959.94; (11) \$959.94.

A. A. L. Lynn, Island Creek Coal Co., Pond Creek Pocohontas Co., Huntington, W. Va.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, Government controls, Government expenditures, etc., including so-called Federal mine safety bill.
 D. (6) \$5,500.

A. John C. Lynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) (See attached).¹
 D. (6) \$2,156.22.
 E. (7) \$20.45; (9) \$20.45; (10) \$243.41; (11) \$263.86.

A. A. E. Lyon, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
 D. (6) \$700.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.
 C. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton.

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular, and railroad employees in general.
 D. (6) \$2,500.03.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of Federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
 D. (6) \$412.50.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Hotel Association, 221 W. 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
 D. (6) \$2,250.
 E. (7) \$349.11; (9) \$349.11; (10) 709.61; (11) \$1,058.72.

A. John A. McCart, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government Employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
 D. (6) \$1,403.85.
 E. (7) \$4.90; (9) \$4.90; (10) \$34.20; (11) \$39.10.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
 D. (6) \$225.63.

A. Warren C. McClure, Mississippi Valley Association, Box 207, Camden, Ark.
 B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
 D. (6) \$900.
 E. (10) \$100; (11) \$100.

A. Angus McDonald.
 B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1556 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. A. J. McFarland, field secretary, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
 B. The Christian Amendment Movement.
 C. (2) House Joint Resolution 156; Senate Joint Resolution 29. (3) The Christian Patriot.
 D. (6) \$810.
 E. (7) \$120; (9) \$120; (10) \$740; (11) \$860.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Taxpayers, United States of America, Lobbying Purposes, 8012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All legislation touching on the taxpayers' welfare, national security, world peace.
 D. (6) \$180.
 E. (2) \$180; (9) \$180; (10) \$540; (11) \$720.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
 B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
 B. Railway Express Agency, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 E. (10) \$1,439.10; (11) \$1,439.10.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Candy Wholesalers Assn., Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Interested in amendments, if any, to the Robinson-Patman Act.
 E. (7) \$26.97; (9) \$26.97; (11) \$26.97.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) S. 106, H. R. 4528, H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, H. R. 6720, S. 2738, S. 2714, on behalf of the American Optometric Association, Inc., % Dr. Leo G. Miller, 420 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Neb.; on behalf of Vera Sarah Keenan, Franton Court, Greens Farms, Conn., bill to permit residence in the United States, S. 1126; on behalf of John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., bill to compensate John J. Braund for use of patents by United States Government, H. R. 4507.
 D. (6) \$200.
 E. (6) \$1.61; (7) \$3.67; (8) \$4.80; (9) \$10.08; (10) \$132.51; (11) \$442.59.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.
 B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees in behalf of former owners of land sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.

A. Lachlan Macleay, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
 B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
 E. (10) \$1,697.95; (11) \$1,697.95.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 E. (10) \$62.86; (11) \$62.86.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
 B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above trade association.
 D. (6) \$600.
 E. (6) \$9; (7) \$131.53; (9) \$140.53; (10) \$426.02; (11) \$566.55.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
 B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry.
 D. (6) \$2,600.
 E. (6) \$9; (7) \$131.53; (9) \$140.53; (10) \$426.02; (11) \$566.55.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
 E. (1) \$15,000; (9) \$15,000; (10) \$47,750; (11) \$62,750.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.
 D. (6) \$3,302.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 E. (10) \$1; (11) \$1.

A. Robert F. Martin, 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Vitified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., 3032 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific relationship to air transportation costs. H. R. 508 (air mail subsidy separation bill). In favor of enactment.
 D. (6) \$498.
 E. (4) \$36.50; (6) \$14.76; (9) \$51.26; (10) \$674.62; (11) \$725.88.

A. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Will Maslow, 15 East 84th Street, New York City.
 B. American Jewish Congress, Inc., 15 East 84th Street, New York City.
 C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
 D. (6) \$112.50.
 E. (10) \$30; (11) \$30.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
 D. (6) \$2,632.
 E. (6) \$14.70; (8) \$141.30; (9) \$156; (10) \$565; (11) \$721.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
 D. (6) \$2,749.98.
 E. (7) \$150.48; (9) \$150.48; (10) \$304.16; (11) \$454.64.

A. E. A. Meeks, National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters.
 D. (6) \$1,500.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 D. (7) \$2,724.92; (8) \$2,724.92.
 E. (10) \$161.48; (11) \$161.48.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
 B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (See attached statement, p. 3.)¹
 D. (6) \$1,500.
 E. (3) \$1,500; (9) \$1,500; (10) \$10,346.78; (11) \$11,846.78; (15) (See explanation No. 3, pp. 4, 5, and 6.)¹

A. Dale Miller, Room 372, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
 B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
 C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills. (3) Monthly article in Dallas magazine.
 D. (6) \$2,200.
 E. (2) \$275; (5) \$121.67; (6) \$12.81; (7) \$527.29; (8) \$51.85; (9) \$988.62; (10) \$2,931.87; (11) \$3,920.49.

A. Dale Miller, Room 372, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
 B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
 C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations.
 D. (6) \$2,250.
 E. (5) \$26.29; (6) \$34.33; (7) \$348.47; (8) \$22.36; (9) \$431.45; (10) \$1,247.21; (11) \$1,678.66.

A. Dale Miller, Room 372, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
 B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws.
 D. (6) \$1,500.
 E. (5) \$825; (6) \$76.51; (7) \$188.39; (8) \$99; (9) \$1,188.90; (10) \$3,888.58; (11) \$5,077.48.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street Northwest, Washington, D. C.
 B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

¹ Not printed. Filled with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
 E. (10) \$717.87; (11) \$717.87.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 605-607 Plaza Building, Post Office Box 1329, Jackson, Miss.
 C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulations of business and taxation such as Mason bill, H. R. 240, Davis bill, H. R. 1177, and Senator Williams bill, S. 892.
 D. (6) \$465.
 E. (4) \$4.61; (8) \$15.13; (9) \$19.74; (10) \$3,581.81; (11) \$3,601.55.

A. Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo.
 C. (2) Association is interested in legislation relating to taxation of independent business, labor legislation, and encroachment of Government into private industry.
 D. (7) \$160.
 E. (4) \$366.62; (5) \$9.03; (7) \$88.51; (8) \$7.50; (9) \$471.66; (10) \$1,655; (11) \$2,126.66.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
 B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
 D. (6) \$3,300.
 E. (10) \$1,924.08; (11) \$1,924.08.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
 B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. The Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) (a) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation. (d) Against.

A. Giles Morrow, Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Freight Forwarders Institute (same as above).
 C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
 D. (6) \$3,750.
 E. (5) \$25.78; (6) \$3.63; (7) \$40.55; (9) \$69.96; (10) \$184; (11) \$253.96.

A. Harold G. Mosler, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft-manufacturing industry.
 D. (6) \$3,750.
 E. (6) \$5.06; (7) \$418.98; (8) \$3; (9) \$427.04; (10) \$86.60; (11) \$513.64.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
 B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
 C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.
 D. (6) \$300.
 E. (6) \$50; (7) \$25; (9) \$75; (10) \$120; (11) \$195.

A. Walter J. Munro; Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.

C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.

D. (6) \$300.

E. (9) \$300; (10) \$900; (11) \$1,200.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

D. (6) \$99.

A. Francis J. Myers, 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc.

C. (2) Regulation W, Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

D. (6) \$937.50.

E. (7) \$40.53; (9) \$40.53; (10) \$502.90; (11) \$543.43.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

C. (2) H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2572, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527. (3) The Forest Farmer.

E. (11) \$246.42.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

E. (11) \$1,534.77.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security, and tax-privileged corporations in business. (3) Washington Report.

E. (2) \$3,113.80; (4) \$4.40; (5) \$624.23; (6) \$152.37; (7) \$48.50; (8) \$233.75; (9) \$4,177.05; (10) \$15,036.35; (11) \$19,213.40.

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

D. (6) \$10,000.

E. (2) \$6,043.43; (4) \$23.46; (5) \$473.80; (6) \$178.58; (7) \$1,227.63; (8) \$1,188.17; (9) \$1,135.07; (10) \$21,086.03; (11) \$30,221.10.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418-19 Homer Building, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all kinds, particularly bills relative to GI education for Korean veterans. (3) Business School News and Business School Executive.

D. (6) \$14,516.79.

E. (2) \$7,297.62; (4) \$1,177.56; (5) \$2,141.77; (6) \$92.06; (7) \$2,406.84; (8) \$77.71; (9) \$13,193.56; (10) \$28,061.87; (11) \$41,255.43.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163-65 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) 13,787.50.

E. (11) \$161.79.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)¹ (3) (See appended statement, p. 6; also see detailed listing of expenditures, E-15 (pp. 12-16).)¹

D. (6) \$29,378.39.

E. (1) \$28,972.16; (2) \$71,743.31; (3) \$350; (4) \$10,631.86; (5) \$4,655.58; (6) \$980.49; (7) \$8,138.67; (8) \$3,102.58; (9) \$128,574.65; (10) \$349,367.09; (11) \$477,941.74; (15) \$26.64, November 3, November 26, December 18, 1952, Addressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbitt Road, Cleveland, Ohio. Addressograph plates; multigraph machine supplies and maintenance. \$350, October 31, 1952. Aid Chinese Refugee Intellectuals, Inc., care of J. P. Grace, Jr., president, W. R. Grace & Co., 7 Hanover Square, New York, N. Y. Charitable contribution, \$1,612.65, October 24, November 26, December 31, 1952, American Airlines, Inc., 910 South Boston Avenue, Tulsa, Okla. Transportation, etc.¹

A. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The association has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.

D. (6) \$29.04.

E. (4) \$29.04; (9) \$29.04; (10) \$287.01; (11) \$316.05; (15) \$29.04, October 31, 1952, November 28, 1952, December 31, 1952, Kaufmann Press, Inc., 25 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Estimated cost of printing and distributing two items in Dealer News during fourth quarter of 1952 which might be said to relate to "legislative interests." This figure is based on an estimate of that part of the total cost of publication attributable to the two items.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents; War Damage Corporation legislation; social-security legislation; insurance legislation; tax equality legislation; wage, salary, and manpower control legislation.

D. (6) \$2,802.63.

E. (2) \$3,988.20; (5) \$438.25; (6) \$314.21; (7) \$42.49; (8) \$135.25; (9) \$4,918.40; (10) \$13,189.92; (11) \$18,088.32; (15) \$2,983.20, October 10, 24; November 7, 21; December 5, 19, 31, Maurice G. Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va., salary; \$1,005, October 10, 24; November 7, 21; December 5, 19, 31, Margaret E. Yeager, 4115 Nicholas Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; \$360, October 1, November 1, December 1, Washington Loan & Trust Co., Washington, D. C., office rent, etc.¹

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may relate to margarine.

D. (6) \$28.

E. (2) \$25; (7) \$3; (9) \$28; (10) \$187.80; (11) \$215.80; (15) \$200, January 15, 16, 17, April 28, June 11, 13, 17, 18, 20, December 31, Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary on account of legislative activities.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing. There were no specific legislative interests during this quarter.

E. (10) \$164.50; (11) \$164.50.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service.

D. (6) \$4,142.76.

E. (2) \$2,300; (4) \$3,865.70; (5) \$300; (6) \$10; (7) \$100.10; (9) \$6,575.80; (10) \$14,777.20; (11) \$21,352.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards—Its Public Relations Department and Its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.—1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (a) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) \$22,766.10.

E. (1) \$1,045.02; (2) \$21,598.01; (4) \$2,028.34; (5) \$2,970.37; (6) \$1,398; (7) \$8,429.01; (8) \$145.21; (9) \$37,613.96; (10) \$90,279.69; (11) \$127,893.65; (16) \$190; October 1 to December 31, 1952; Lucille Bettinger, 1882 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C., \$950.01; \$315, Mary T. Burton, 2122 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C., \$630; \$530.01, Margaret Crosby, 4305 Van Ness Street NW., Washington, D. C., \$1,325.01; \$412.50, Ruth Clements, 3447-A Stafford Street, Arlington, Va., \$825; etc.¹

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) "The Annuitant."

E. (10) \$600; (11) \$600.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, John A. Cranage, National Secretary-Treasurer, 4742 North Carlisle Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States Storekeeper-Gauger.

D. (6) \$565.20.

E. (2) \$500; (9) \$500; (10) \$1,500; (11) \$2,000.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$11,350.22.

E. (2) \$333.99; (4) \$18.50; (5) \$78; (6) \$12; (9) \$442.49; (10) \$1,327.47; (11) \$1,769.96.

A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food canning industry.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) \$321,595.94.
E. (2) \$3,827.49; (4) \$107.63; (6) \$68.69; (7) \$178.71; (8) \$46.71; (9) \$4,229.23; (10) \$16,294.22; (11) \$20,523.45; (15) \$2,327.49, October 31, November 30, December 31, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., salary; \$1,500, October 31, November 30, December 31, Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C., legal services; \$12.75, October 3, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., 25 copies of Congressional Quarterly, etc.¹

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.
D. (See attachment A.)¹
E. (See attachment B.)¹

A. National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt. Senate Joint Resolution 155.
D. (6) \$15.
E. (4) \$32.28; (9) \$32.28; (10) \$1,352.79; (11) \$1,385.07; (15) \$32.28, October 27, 1952, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. Reimbursement for months of July, August, September, October, postage and mailroom.

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.
E. (4) \$536.39; (5) \$113.82; (6) \$12.05; (9) \$662.26; (10) \$557.07; (11) \$1,219.33; (15) \$12.05, November 20, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1135 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C., reimbursement for phone calls. \$93.73, December 15, William Feather Co., Cleveland, Ohio, stationery. \$136.83, December 19, National Planning Association, Washington, D. C., reimbursement for stamps. \$20.09, December 22, William Feather Co., Cleveland, Ohio, stationery. \$393.95, December 31, Raus Bros., Cleveland, Ohio, printing.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
E. (10) \$561.76; (11) \$561.76.

A. National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) \$5,046.46.
E. (2) \$3,075.90; (4) \$394.91; (5) \$199.80; (6) \$57.53; (7) \$1,318.32; (9) \$5,046.46; (10) \$23,676.48; (11) \$28,722.94; (15) Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., 1952, salary and expense, \$8,250.21; Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., 1952, salary and expense, \$251.02; William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., 1952, salary and expense, \$804.52; J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., 1952, salary and expense, \$3,242.80, etc.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the postal service.
D. (6) \$1,023.96.

E. (1) \$900; (5) \$73.29; (7) \$50.67; (9) \$1,023.96; (10) \$4,881.53; (11) \$5,905.49; \$900, October 7, November 6, November 24, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., for public-relations counsel; \$57.74, October 7, November 24, December 31, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., to reimburse for messenger and supplies; \$50.67, October 7, December 29, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals and lodging.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such: Mutual-assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation, including universal military training and service, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange and immigration legislation. (3) Peace action.
D. (6) \$8,555.44.
E. (2) \$5,841.94; (3) \$35; (4) \$862.98; (5) \$1,187.64; (6) \$77.07; (7) \$282.17; (8) \$1,105.01; (9) \$9,391.81; (10) \$28,528.70; (11) \$37,920.51.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Our legislative interests are in favor of any legislation that tends to support private enterprise, maintain American independence, and in opposition to any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) \$18,060.13.
E. (2) \$8,222.69; (4) \$4,487.82; (5) \$4,489.07; (6) \$489.14; (7) \$995.60; (8) \$1,130.51; (9) \$18,814.83; (10) \$87,649.83; (11) \$106,464.68; (15) \$201.03, Brooklyn Eagle Press, Inc., 24 Johnson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., Council letter No. 294, copy enclosed last report.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The National Electrical Contractors Association has an interest in the enactment of S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes. (3) Qualified Contractor.
D and E. (See Ref. A.)¹

A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Members are: Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast, 110 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.; American Merchant Marine Institute, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) \$23,310.30; (11) \$23,310.30.

A. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attached.)¹
D. (6) \$80,907.50.
E. (2) \$900; (5) \$225.84; (6) \$75.75; (8) \$23.67; (9) \$1,225.26; (10) \$3,979.95; (11) \$5,205.21.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) \$125,934.65.

E. (2) \$6,587.36; (4) \$7,339.28; (5) \$330; (6) \$6.30; (8) \$5,826.53; (9) \$20,199.47; (10) \$77,669.69; (11) \$97,869.16; (15) \$1,222.39, October 9, Sound Studios, Inc., legislative expenses; \$147.92, October 17, Railway Express Agency, express charges on transcript; \$340.80, October 17, Radio Station, WCFM, talent and program time for September 1952; \$97.49, October 31, Railway Express Agency, express charges on transcript, etc.¹

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In support of the Robinson-Patman Act, the law prohibiting unfair price discriminations. Opposed to S. 719, a bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor. (3) An Old Enemy Haunts the Food Industry.
D. (6) \$1,179.70.

E. (2) \$500; (4) \$448.71; (5) \$30; (6) \$15; (7) \$185.99; (9) \$1,179.70; (10) \$2,093.31; (11) \$3,273.01; (15) \$500, Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. Estimated portion of regular salary as president of the association which may be considered as compensation for legislative activities; \$13.96, October 1952, railroad fare to New York, Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington, D. C.; \$101.43, November, Trans. World Airlines, Kansas City, Mo., for fare to Springfield, Ill., via American Airlines.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) At the opening of the 83d Congress no bills have yet been introduced in which the National Housing Conference has basic interests. As the session develops it is probable that measures relating to private and public low-rent housing, slum clearance, and redevelopment will be submitted and the conference will be interested in expressing an opinion on them.
D. (6) \$11,316.47.

E. (2) \$6,150.22; (3) \$30; (4) \$1,528.25; (5) \$1,590.81; (6) \$711.72 (7) \$1,207.90; (8) \$2,501.26; (9) \$13,720.16; (10) \$48,197.54; (11) \$61,917.70; (15) \$345.37, October 30, November 16, November 21, Fox-Jones, 1419 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$11.33, October 30, Capital Couriers, Press Building, Washington, D. C., delivery and messenger service; \$24, November 6, December 22, Royal Typewriter Co., 1105 D Street SW., Washington, D. C., rental of typewriters; \$602.82, November 18, December 11, Rufus H. Darby, 24th and Douglas Streets NE., Washington, D. C., stationery, etc.¹

A. The National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) \$350.
E. (1) \$467.85; (2) \$2,252.01; (4) \$273.49; (5) \$562.96; (6) \$215.59; (7) \$481.31; (8) \$89.89; (9) \$4,343.10; (10) \$11,103.61; (11) \$15,446.71; (15) \$185.50, October 1, the Bowen Building, Washington, D. C., October office rent; \$118.65, October 3, WPIK Potomac Broadcasting Co., Alexandria, Va., three radio broadcasts; \$2.04, October 6, Charles G. Stott & Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$74.86, October 6, C. & P. Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone bill, etc.¹

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) \$485.25.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News, National Defense Development Letter.

D. (6) \$9,693.40.

E. (1) \$5,534.15; (2) \$3,877.14; (4) \$858.27; (5) \$200.01; (6) \$28.84; (7) \$1,608.76; (8) \$2,831.83; (9) \$14,939; (10) \$37,541.46; (11) \$52,480.46.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) Dairy Director, News for Dairy Co-ops, Legislative Letter.

D. (6) \$43,449.86.

E. (1) \$39,130.02; (2) \$25,761.49; (3) \$13,337.13; (5) \$2,429.62; (6) \$816.86; (7) \$10,098.01; (8) \$1,029.39; (9) \$92,602.52; (10) \$127,234.74; (11) \$219,837.26; (15) October 3, 1952, District Unemployment Compensation Board, District of Columbia, District of Columbia unemployment, \$8.50; October 3, 1952, Margaret K. Taylor, Woodner Apartments, District of Columbia, travel, \$80; October 15, 1952, Val C. Sherman, 411 Highland Avenue, Kenwood, Md., salary, \$317.17, miscellaneous, \$1.50, etc.¹

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (See p. 3.)¹

E. (2) \$3,375; (4) \$2,038.83; (5) \$517.60; (7) \$176; (8) \$2.50; (9) \$6,109.93; (10) \$19,595.54; (11) \$25,705.47; (15) \$3,000 (fee), October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, John C. Hazen, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; \$44.25 (expense), October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, John C. Hazen, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; \$1.25 (expense), October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, Erskine Stewart, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; \$517.60, October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, Washington office, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., overhead.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades. E. (2) \$500; (5) \$400; (6) \$50; (9) \$950; (10) \$4,650; (11) \$5,600; (15) \$500, Leo J. Heer, National Retail Furniture Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., allocation of salary for period covered by this report (paid in semimonthly installments).

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) \$515.

E. (2) \$1,135.66; (5) \$7.19; (6) \$14.20; (7) \$23.25; (8) \$468.91; (9) \$1,649.21; (10) \$13,287.06; (11) \$14,936.27; (15) October 17, the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., 725 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone bill, October 1, 1952; \$468.56, October 17, Director of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding and FICA taxes, third quarter, 1952; \$23.25, October 17, Gulf Oil Corp., 1515 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.,

charges, September 1952; \$75, November 5, Hamilton National Bank, Washington, D. C., payroll deduction bond; \$85.16, October 8, 22, LaD. McG. Kriner, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; \$975.50, October 8, 22, November 5, 19; December 3, William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project: H. J. Res. 337; S. J. Res. 27 (opposed).

D. (6) \$10,500.

E. (1) \$500; (2) \$4,791.04; (4) \$448.44; (5) \$1,085.17; (6) \$370.82; (7) \$848.58; (8) \$171.92; (9) \$8,215.97; (10) \$53,676.10; (11) \$61,892.07; (15) \$51.44, October 1, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., bill of September 13; \$21.75, October 1, Loren & Herlihy, mimeographing, September; \$10, October 2, Dorothy H. Baker, stamps (New York); \$82.25, October 3, Whitehall Club (New York), luncheon meetings, etc.¹

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Opposition to legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.

D. (6) \$784.83.

E. (2) \$1,000; (9) \$1,000; (10) \$7,946.20; (11) \$8,946.20; (15) \$1,000, Oscar R. Kreutz, salary.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$5,000.

E. (2) \$4,372.92; (5) \$1,291.21; (6) \$187.47; (7) \$99.25; (9) \$5,950.85; (10) \$17,889.53; (11) \$23,840.38; (15) \$22.50, October 10, November 10, December 10, accurate answering, Washington, D. C., Washington office expense; \$179.70, October 10, November 10, December 10, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone; \$55.08, October 10, November 10, December 10, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., Washington office expense; \$219.65, October 10, November 10, December 10, K. Blyth Emmons, Washington, D. C., Washington office expense, etc.¹

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, including: Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bacon Act, UMT, Selective Service, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills, income-retirement legislation. (3) Legislative Bulletin.

D. (6) \$16,808.44.

E. (2) \$1,183; (4) \$252.42; (9) \$1,435.42; (10) \$4,795.20; (11) \$6,230.62; (15) \$148.89, October 9, December 19, United States Post Office, postage for Legislative Bulletin; \$103.53; October 9, December 24, Colortone Press, Washington, D. C., printing Legislative Bulletin.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation such as H. R. 240.

D. (6) \$26,731.34.

E. (1) \$3,678.22; (2) \$6,947.34; (4) \$6,442.69; (5) \$1,134.19; (6) \$2,300.71; (7) \$4,491.93; (9) \$24,995.08; (10) \$38,750.31; (11) \$63,745.39; (15).¹

491.93; (9) \$24,995.08; (10) \$38,750.31; (11) \$63,745.39; (15).¹

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Post Office Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

B. National Tax Relief Coalition, box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

C. (2) Favor tax limitation.

D. (6) \$570.

E. (2) \$375; (5) \$250; (7) \$2,735; (9) \$3,360; (10) \$2,910; (11) \$3,360.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

B. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union with headquarters at 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) \$474.75.

E. (2) \$1,250; (3) \$10; (5) \$438.53; (8) \$1.25; (9) \$1,699.78; (10) \$5,409.11; (11) \$7,108.89; (15) \$725, October 29, November 28, December 30, Elizabeth A. Smart; \$525, October 29, November 28, December 30, Alice H. Haffey; \$285, October 16, November 24, January 5, for December rent at 138 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) \$37,401.80.

E. (2) \$2,500; (7) \$992.50; (8) \$825; (9) \$4,317.50; (10) \$14,932.36; (11) \$19,249.86; (15) \$2,500, October 1 through December 31, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah, salary; \$825, October 1 through December 31, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo., services; \$643.21, October 1 through December 31, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah, expenses; \$349.29, October 1 through December 31, W. H. Steiwer, Fossil, Wyo., expenses.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C., employed by National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.¹

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) Legislative interests: all legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

D. (6) \$155.80.

E. (2) \$1; (8) \$1,093.20; (9) \$1,094.20; (10) \$396.98; (11) \$1,491.18; (15) \$1,078.20, November 4, 1952, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C., for aid in solicitation of funds and furnishing information; \$15, December 23, 1952, William P. Helm, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., 1953 subscription to Reports from Washington.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.

D. (6) \$6,232.31.

E. (2) \$210.51; (4) \$21.07; (5) \$1,574.13; (6) \$416; (7) \$385.64; (9) \$2,607.35; (10) \$7,644.69; (11) \$10,252.04.

A. Mr. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) \$900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

D. (6) \$1,250.

E. (2) \$281.59; (6) \$6.23; (7) \$384.23; (8) \$384.62; (9) \$1,056.67; (10) \$5,121.41; (11) \$6,178.08; (15) \$17.50, October 13, 1952, Beatrice Fitzhugh, 2723 P Street NW., Washington, D. C., cleaning apartment week ending October 11; \$49.47, October 18, 1952, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., hotel bill, October 5-9; \$11.05, October 18, 1952, Harvey's Restaurant, 1107 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., restaurant charges for the month of September; \$14.91, October 18, 1952, Hotel Stadler, Washington, D. C., restaurant charges for the month of September, etc.¹

A. Donald F. Nemitz, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.

B. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.

C. (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of IRC.

D. (6) \$434.53.

E. (7) \$59.53; (9) \$59.53; (10) \$141.28; (11) \$200.81.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

E. (10) \$457.12; (11) \$457.12; (see attached).¹

A. W. R. Noble, Suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSoto Building, St. Louis, Mo. and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Keeping associations informed as to pending legislation and interpretations of legislation. Special attention given to all labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer.

D. (6) \$3,375.

E. (6) \$108.91; (7) \$664.52; (8) \$184.23; (9) \$957.66; (10) \$2,664.32; (11) \$3,621.98.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)¹

D. (6) \$4,374.94.

E. (6) \$10.64; (7) \$427.65; (8) \$76.30; (9) \$514.59; (10) \$864.61; (11) \$1,379.20; (15) \$14.60, September 15, 1952, Mayflower Hotel,

Washington, D. C., luncheon, \$13.20, September 26, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon, \$13.40, October 7, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon, \$24.50, October 20, 1952, Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon, etc.¹

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. D.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, minerals, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan. Taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.

E. (10) \$20; (11) \$20.

A. A. E. Notarianni, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) A bill for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 1062, would establish a Tax Settlement Board—for; H. R. 4371, H. R. 4373, H. R. 8390, H. R. 8391, would permit postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund—for; H. R. 7269, would provide for retirement pay for Tax Court judges—for; H. R. 7746, would provide for voluntary social security coverage for self-employed CPAs—for; H. R. 7893, would provide for improved enforcement and administration of revenue laws—for; with reservations (legislation affecting certified public accountants).

D. (6) \$916.67.

E. (6) \$50; (7) \$193.17; (9) \$243.17; (10) \$927.56; (11) \$1,170.73.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Public Law 590 (H. R. 7800).

D. (6) \$9,816.50.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry. H. R. 5505 (H. R. 1535) customs simplification, amendment to section 2 (c); H. R. 5474, stream pollution (accelerated amortization); H. R. 2594, Defense Production Act; H. R. 7391 Defense Appropriations Act (clarification of Berry amendment).

E. (10) \$381.48; (11) \$381.48.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled

by this company. H. R. 5693, 82d Congress, an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930; opposed.

E. (10) \$755.75; (11) \$755.75.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio (see p. 3).¹

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

E. (10) \$600.37; (11) \$600.37.

A. Fred N. Oliver, Oliver & Donally, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East 42d Street, New York.

C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks or railroad security owners have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) (See attached statement.)¹

D. (6) \$1,929.24.

E. (7) \$122.64; (9) \$122.64; (10) \$415.76; (11) \$538.40; (15) \$121.64, October 4-8, Pennsylvania Railroad, Union Station, Washington, D. C., care for and meals and lodging incidental to the trip (to attend meetings of national executive committee by authority of the national adjutant). \$1, October 15, taxi to and from Apex Building to attend immigration hearings.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.

D. (6) \$1,875.

E. (7) \$100; (8) \$60; (9) \$160; (10) \$480; (11) \$640.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.

D. (6) \$200.

E. (2) \$900; (9) \$900; (10) \$2,700; (11) \$3,600.

A. James G. Patton.

B. Farmers Education & Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. International Minerals & Chemical Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To amend section 34 of Trading With the Enemy Act to protect the interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. Legislation affecting the real-estate industry because of its complex character does not lend itself to any ready classification on the basis of support or opposition.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (6) \$2.80; (7) \$531.33; (8) \$32.50; (9) \$566.63; (10) \$787.45; (11) \$1,354.08; (15) \$23.92, October 30, 1952, Statler Hotel, luncheon conference; \$15, December 15, 1952, Board of Trade, congressional dinner; \$18, December 15, 1952, Board of Trade, midwinter dinner; \$25, December 1, 1952, Board of Trade dues.

A. Hugh Peterson, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation referring to the cane sugar refining industry.

D. (6) \$2,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, post-office box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States, Agana, Guam, M. I.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of Guam. To make applicable laws to Guam which should be made applicable and to oppose those that should not be made applicable. A bill making certain laws applicable to Guam and declaring some laws inapplicable. Certain bills amending National Guard and Housing Acts making same applicable to Guam. For H. R. 6808. Also for National Guard Act applicable to Guam.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (6) \$8.46; (8) \$2.17; (9) \$10.73; (10) \$890.41; (11) \$901.14; (12) \$3,125; (14) \$625.

A. Philco Corp., Tlaga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (See preliminary report.)¹

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).

D. (6) \$2,175.

E. (10) \$135.45; (11) \$135.45.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) (See explanatory statement.)¹

D and E.¹

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) \$1,062.38.

E. (7) \$3.20; (9) \$3.20; (10) \$12; (11) \$15.20.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.

C. (2) No lobbying activities during this quarter.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry. (3) Legislative bulletins.

D. (See attached sheet.)¹

E. (See attached sheet.)¹ (4) \$136.80; (7) \$150; (9) \$286.80; (10) \$710.40; (11) \$997.20; (15) \$150 4th quarter, A. K. Berta (misc.), 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

E. (1) \$3,500; (5) \$35.24; (8) \$3,535.24; (9) \$11,185.35; (10) \$14,720.59; (15) \$3,535.24, October 8, 1952, Milo J. Warner, Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio, professional services.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.

E. (8) \$0.28; (9) \$0.28; (10) \$42.51; (11) \$42.79.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipbuilding, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (10) \$234.13; (11) \$234.13.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession. H. R. 4914, military construction bill, in support of this bill section 504. Defense housing bill S. 349, general support but criticizing certain aspects. H. R. 1901 Nevius Tract protesting against this. S. 898, reorganization of the National Park and Planning against this as presently proposed. S. 2645 and S. 2584, Defense Production Act continuation, in support. S. 2137 and H. R. 6598, lease purchase of public buildings, in support. S. 2487 to extend judicial review of administrative decisions, in support. H. R. 4371 (Keogh), H. R. 4373 (Reed) individual retirement, in support. H. R. 1171 (Davis), tax adjustment, in support. H. R. 7502, in support. Statement filed on civil-defense appropriation bill.

D. (6) \$200.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. The Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.

E. (10) \$267.40; (11) \$267.40.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. (See item B attached.)¹

C. (see item C (2) and (3) attached.)¹

D. (7) \$89.50.

E. (6) \$1; (7) \$93.50; (9) \$97.50; (11) \$97.50; (15) \$62.50; (16) \$25.52, October 15, Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington, D. C., tickets for New York trip; \$30, December 31, University Club, Washington, D. C., luncheon meeting.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West 57th Street, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) Public health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people.

D. (6) \$6,875.02.

E. (2) \$844.98; (5) \$423.62; (6) \$154.60; (7) \$1,884.17; (9) \$3,307.37; (10) \$11,779.82; (11) \$15,087.19.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, page 5.)¹

D. (6) \$1,650.

E. (7) \$47.20; (9) \$47.20; (10) \$87.60; (11) \$134.80.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.

D. (6) \$2,250.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Defense Production Act; excise taxes; excess-profits taxes. E. (2) \$2,937.50; (8) \$51.02; (9) \$2,988.52; (10) \$8,791.64; (11) \$11,780.16.

A. Leon Raesly, Suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) For enactment of 30-year retirement regardless of age at half-pay based on the 5 years of highest earnings—S. 1308, H. R. 63. (3) Pension Conference Bulletin.

D. (6) \$286.25.

E. (4) \$38; (5) \$182.10; (6) \$11.34; (7) \$33.57; (8) \$10.03; (9) \$275.04; (10) \$702.23; (11) \$977.27.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.
E. (10) \$50; (11) \$50.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation involving silver.
D. (6) \$4,249.98.
E. (7) \$753.08; (9) \$753.08; (10) \$2,889.76; (11) \$3,642.84.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof. In support of S. 2752, a bill to require the establishment of actual rates by contract carriers.
D. (6) \$465.23.

E. (2) \$412.50; (4) \$27.73; (5) \$25; (9) \$465.23; (10) \$12,349.18; (11) \$12,814.41; (15) \$2773, October 13, October 27, November 10, November 24, December 8, December 22, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C., biweekly newsletter; \$25, December 31, pro rata amount of rent, fourth quarter.

A. 1. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security.
(3) (a) The Reserve Officer.

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) \$21,749.18.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.

D. (6) \$1,510.
E. (2) \$3,558.38; (4) \$1,121.56; (5) \$374.78; (6) \$30.08; (7) \$1,282.76; (8) \$734.66; (9) \$7,102.22; (10) \$17,096.93; (11) \$24,199.15; (15) \$195.09, October 1, December 10, Shepherd Printing Co., 110 High Street, Portsmouth, Va., printing envelopes, letterheads, Christmas cards, etc.; \$45.69, October 1, November 6, December 1, Commercial Office Furniture Co., 915 E Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; \$1,458.93, October 3, October 17, October 31, November 14, November 26, December 12, December 24, Walter L. Disbrow, 800 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C., salary, etc.¹

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) \$425.
E. (10) \$21.55; (11) \$21.55.

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
E. (10) \$9; (11) \$9.

A. William M. Rice, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Engaged to advocate, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 14th Street, Washington, D. C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D. (6) \$1,875.
E. (7) \$68.84; (9) \$68.84; (10) \$442.01; (11) \$510.85.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation which may relate to margarine.

D. (6) \$25.
E. (7) \$3; (9) \$3; (10) \$12.80; (11) \$15.80.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

D. (6) \$2,632.
E. (6) \$16.95; (8) \$175.05; (9) \$192; (10) \$660; (11) \$852.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Suite 3, Washington, D. C.

B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects, and appropriations for construction of projects.

E. (2) \$346.11; (4) \$23.10; (5) \$155; (6) \$19.56; (7) \$25; (8) \$11.12; (9) \$579.89; (10) \$1,810.43; (11) \$2,390.32; (15)¹.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.

C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of American farmers to grow and market sugar beets.

D. (6) \$390.
E. (2) \$74; (4) \$20.36; (5) \$68.43; (6) \$16.61; (7) \$483.95; (9) \$663.35; (10) \$1,404.71; (11) \$2,068.06; (15)¹.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, including: Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bacon Act, UMT, Selective Service, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills, income retirement legislation.
(3) Legislative Bulletin.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry (see attached sheets for specific bill numbers).¹

D. (6) \$1,250.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In support of the Robinson-Patman Act, the law prohibiting unfair price discriminations. Opposed to S. 719, a bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor.

D. (6) \$500.

¹Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interest in the enactment of S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries.

D and E. (See Ref. A.)¹

A. John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipbuilding, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (10) \$632.70; (11) \$632.70.

A. Edward A. Rumely, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) \$250.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$990.

E. (7) \$103.22; (9) \$103.22; (10) \$2,206.99; (11) \$2,310.21.

A. Francis N. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (6) \$13; (7) \$7; (9) \$20; (10) \$621.55; (11) \$641.55.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.

D. (6) \$2,750.

E. (10) \$104.29; (11) \$104.29.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D. (6) \$3,750.

E. (7) \$400.41; (9) \$400.41; (10) \$906.25; (11) \$1,306.66; (15) dinner, Carroll Arms Hotel, (5), November 19, 1952, \$15.75.

A. William Henry Ryan, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Lobbying, that is, supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.

D. (6) \$1,499.94.

E. (7) \$15; (9) \$15; (10) \$45; (11) \$60; (14) \$15.

A. Sterling St. John, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In support of act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 998, 1001), as amended, to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

D. (6) \$20.

E. (7) \$274.58; (9) \$274.58; (10) \$750.53; (11) \$1,025.11; (15) \$149.58, November 15, General Oglethorpe Hotel, Savannah, Ga., lunch, November 10, for special committee, AAPA; \$125, November 10 to 15, out-of-pocket expenses for travel, food, and lodging in connection with meeting of AAPA in Savannah.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.

D. (6) \$950.

E. (2) \$26.09; (6) \$26.25; (9) \$52.34; (10) \$237.06; (11) \$289.40; (15) \$26.09, Superior Office Services, 524 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., stenographic work, during quarter; \$26.25, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., long-distance calls, during quarter.

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Labor and social legislation.

D. (6) \$1,800.

E. (5) \$102; (6) \$36; (7) \$48; (9) \$186; (10) \$438; (11) \$624.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.

C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, which were enacted as section 4 of Public Law 594, 82d Congress, 2d session, approved July 21, 1952.

E. (2) \$1,000; (9) \$1,000; (10) \$9,000; (11) \$10,000.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. Specific legislative interests include support of H. R. 910 (a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for nursing education); and support of H. R. 911 and S. 661 (a bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force). (3) The American Journal of Nursing.

D. (6) \$2,900.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 N. Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 N. Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

E. (10) \$30.75; (11) \$30.75.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Studies of Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement.

D. (6) \$4,312.50.

E. (6) \$8.19; (7) \$1.75; (9) \$9.94; (10) \$38.43; (11) \$48.37.

A. John W. Scott, 317 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$300.

A. Mildred Scott, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) "National Services for Disabled Persons Amendments of 1951" (introduced March 22, 1951, by Senator Douglas, and others) (opposed); to establish the Federal agency for handicapped—An act to increase defense manpower, and help preserve our Nation, by establishing the Federal Agency for Handicapped (for); tax exemptions for handicapped and for those who support handicapped who cannot care for themselves (for); National Leprosy Act (for).

A. Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., whose address is 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to taxation, government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (7) \$40; (9) \$40; (10) \$123.35; (11) \$163.35.

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Defense Production Act; excise taxes; excess profits taxes.

A. Mr. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

E. (10) \$37.10; (11) \$37.10.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.

D. (6) \$5,649.99.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 8th Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For bills (1) to return tidelands to the States, (2) to provide for compensation to residents who are deprived of rights to damages by the Rome Convention, (3) to amend Surplus Airport Act to relax restrictions on grantees.

D. (6) \$3,750.

E. (6) \$2.55; (7) \$175.49; (8) \$22.50; (9) \$200.54; (10) \$380.52; (11) \$581.06.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

E. (10) \$600.37; (11) \$600.37.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 C. (2) Legislation regarding silver.
 D. (6) \$1,195.
 E. (2) \$6,409.48; (5) \$856.89; (6) \$467.30; (7) \$753.08; (8) \$610.35; (9) \$9,097.10; (10) \$28,887.10; (11) \$37,984.20.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.

B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, point 4, etc.; favor plans for universal disarmament; favor full cooperation with U. N. in economic and social welfare, UNICEF; favor modification of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act; oppose UMT, UMS, and military-aid program; oppose rearming Germany and Japan; other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
 D. (6) \$1,200.
 E. (7) \$58.80; (9) \$58.80; (10) \$133.30; (11) \$192.10.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project, and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water-resources policies.
 E. (2) \$6,977.50; (8) \$1,012.63; (9) \$7,990.13; (10) \$14,279.83; (11) \$22,269.96; (15) \$2,290, October 13, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; \$637.35, October 13, 1952, Northcutt Ely, reimbursement of expenses; \$2,272.50, November 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, retainer and per diem; \$11.95, November 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, reimbursement of expenses; \$2,415, December 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, retainer and per diem; \$363.33, December 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, reimbursement of expenses.

A. Stephen G. Slipper, Room 512, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
 B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
 C. (See attached sheet).¹
 D. (5) \$1,150.
 E. (7) \$12; (9) \$12; (10) \$46.75; (11) \$58.95.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 138 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.

B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, narcotics, international relations, women and children: H. R. 1749, sale of alcohol to members of land and naval forces, etc. (for); H. R. 2187, reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials to security of United States (for); H. R. 2188, advertisement of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce (for); H. R. 2340, violations of narcotics laws (for); H. R. 264, use and sale of intoxicating beverages to Indians (against); H. R. 1206, District of Columbia sales-tax exemptions of foods in hotels, cafes, bars, etc. (against); H. R. 1736, excise tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc. (against); H. R. 3072, abolish functions of Indian Bureau, repeal act of June 18, 1934 (against); H. R. 2982, increase postal rates (against); S. 1046, increase postal rates (against); S. 1, universal service and training bill (against); S. 278, investigate radio and television programs (for).
 D. (6) \$612.

E. (5) \$114.70; (6) \$26.82; (9) \$141.52; (10) \$1,259.60; (11) \$1,401.12.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Forestry; regional development; resource conservation; labor relations.

A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests including the improvement of Government efficiency, elimination of waste and economy in Government. Specific interests include appropriations bills, bills to enact recommendations of the Hoover Commission, other reorganization proposals and substantive legislation involving Government expenditures.
 D. (6) \$2,708.36.
 E. (6) \$9.47; (7) \$426.27; (9) \$435.74; (10) \$1,656.23; (11) 2,091.97.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.
 D. (6) \$2,085.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).¹
 D. (6) \$16,249.97.

E. (6) \$100; (7) \$857.27; (8) \$348.60; (9) \$1,305.87; (10) \$3,154.08; (11) \$4,459.95; (15) \$14.79, October 3, 1952, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., lodging; \$34.90, October 6, 1952, Hotel Fort Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, lodging; \$35.36, October 9, 1952, Hotel Morrison, Chicago, Ill., lodging; \$47.50, November 6, 1952, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone, etc.¹

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
 D. (6) \$6,750.

E. (6) \$41.52; (7) \$1,285.14; (8) \$7.50; (9) \$1,334.16; (10) \$2,769.07; (11) \$4,103.23; (15) \$12.33, November 11, 1952, Saxony Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., luncheon conference; \$70, November 10, 1952, Red Coach Inn, Miami Beach, Fla., dinner conference; \$54, November 11, 1952, Hurricane Inn, Miami, Fla., dinner conference; \$10.50, December 6, 1952, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon conference.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
 D. (6) \$750.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
 D. (6) \$29,484.33.

E. (2) \$15,986.92; (4) \$3,766.79; (5) \$1,323.12; (6) \$136.81; (7) \$485.89; (8) \$605.88; (9) \$22,305.41; (10) \$61,578.15; (11) \$83,883.56.

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H. R. 2423, H. R. 6228, H. R. 2422, S. 510, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2345, H. R. 1313, S. 1125, Public Law 234, Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, and all legislation pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act, and to secure additional benefits for the rank and file employees covered by the Railroad Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.
 D. (6) \$1,320.

E. (1) \$214.50; (2) \$1,320; (4) \$1,400; (6) \$38.20; (7) \$143.19; (9) \$5,115.89; (10) \$8,237.55; (11) \$11,353.44.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. Numerous House and Senate bills dealing with the subject of bonding of Federal employees and bills reactivating War Damage Corporation.
 D. (6) \$150.

E. (10) \$15.25; (11) \$15.25.

A. Charles I. Stengle, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
 D. (6) \$1,403.80.

E. (7) \$11.20; (9) \$11.20; (10) \$99.90; (11) \$11.10.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, L. P. N., Post Office Box 6261, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (a) To license all nurses alike—national and all United States Territories and District of Columbia.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street., Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) \$3,911.90.
E. (7) \$459.83; (8) \$152.07; (9) \$611.90;
(10) \$687.11; (11) \$1,299.01.

A. Erskine Stewart, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (8) \$1.25; (9) \$1.25; (10) \$39.55; (11) \$40.80.

A. Wilson E. Still, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$900.
E. (7) \$352.94; (9) \$352.94; (10) \$711.27; (11) \$1,064.21.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) \$2,965.17.
E. (7) \$495.25; (8) \$44.92; (9) \$540.17; (10) \$132.96; (11) \$673.13.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American Merchant Marine and transportation generally.

D. (6) \$1,000.
E. (7) \$19.84; (9) \$19.84; (10) \$54.57; (11) \$74.41.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) National Services for Disabled Persons Amendments of 1951 (introduced March 22, 1951, by Senator Douglas and others)—opposed; to establish the Federal agency for handicapped—an act to increase defense manpower, and help preserve our Nation, by establishing the Federal Agency for Handicapped—for; tax exemptions for handicapped and for those who support handicapped who cannot care for themselves—for; National Leprosy Act—for.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,625.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Assn., 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) All legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that

has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits.

D. (6) \$1,340.46.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See page 3).¹

D. (6) \$625.
E. (10) \$18.50; (11) \$18.50.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal Valley Authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin. For legislation to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quietclaiming title to tidelands to the several States.

D. (6) \$1,500.
E. (2) \$44; (5) \$20.92; (6) \$10.26; (7) \$912.25; (8) \$680.26; (9) \$1,667.69; (10) \$2,920.80; (11) \$4,637.49; (15) \$44, October 3, 8, 10, 17, 31, November 7, 14, 22, 28, December 5, 12, 16, 23, Billy White, Austin, Tex., janitor service; \$65.68, October 24, November 24, December 29, Austin Club, Austin, Tex., dues, locker rental, entertainment; \$10, November 1, Texas Friends of Conservation, Inc., Houston, Tex., membership dues; \$11.04, December 1, Eldon Powell, florist, flowers for Judge Clifford H. Stone's funeral, etc.¹

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before the Senate Finance Committee; Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee; House Veterans Affairs Committee; 2 Post Office and Civil Service Committees; 2 Armed Services Committees.

D. (6) \$2,906.60.

A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.

B. Louis Cary, successor trustee of Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bond holders of Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank, of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) For H. R. 6813.

E. (10) \$59; (11) \$59; (12) \$59.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.

C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, IRC.

D. (6) \$640.50.

E. (2) \$521.25; (4) \$99.81; (5) \$160; (6) \$11.30; (7) \$98.75; (8) \$22.84; (9) \$913.95; (10) \$2,594.39; (11) \$3,508.34.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C. (formerly 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.)

B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C. (formerly 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.).

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

D. (6) \$2,362.50.
E. (10) \$16.45; (11) \$16.45.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.

C. (2) Mutual Security Agency; Department of Agriculture.

D. (6) \$2,500.
E. (7) \$338.09; (8) \$42.39; (9) \$380.48; (11) \$380.48.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

D. (6) \$2,462.37.
E. (5) \$484.71; (6) \$41.64; (9) \$526.35; (10) \$1,789.90; (11) \$2,316.25.

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (See attached statement).¹

A. John U. Terrell, 424 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) S. 75 and H. R. 1500.
D. (6) \$3,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th (Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station), Austin, Tex.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. For legislation to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quietclaiming title to tidelands to the several States.

D. (6) \$6,713.
E. (1) \$661.66; (2) \$1,894.54; (4) \$942.07; (5) \$625.88; (6) \$289.20; (7) \$1,619.62; (8) \$2,640.17; (9) \$8,673.14; (10) \$15,663.89; (11) \$24,337.03; (15) \$10.50, November 15, J. R. Raley, Austin, Tex., 6 months' subscription to Dallas Morning News; \$11.90, November 15, Curry Office Supply, Austin, Tex., mimeograph supplies; \$142.85, November 15, L. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Smith & Corona Typewriters, Inc., typewriter, etc.¹

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev. (one-third each): The Union Pacific Railroad Co., the Western Pacific Railroad Co., Southern Pacific Co.

C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads. The St. Lawrence Waterway; H. R. 7888, Comer bill.

D. (6) \$675.

E. (10) \$423.64; (11) \$423.64.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.

D. (6) \$6,166.66.

E. (7) \$30.50; (9) \$30.50; (10) \$439.75; (11) \$470.25.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.

D. (6) \$2,500.

E. (10) \$33.75; (11) \$33.75.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street, Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interest. (For specific legislative interests, see p. 3, attached.)¹

E. (10) \$98.75; (11) \$98.75.

A. Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, 322 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) \$3,750.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market milk.

D. (6) \$2,178.72.

E. (10) \$123.68; (11) \$123.68.

A. John H. Todd, 1008 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.

E. (10) \$15.58; (11) \$15.58.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.

C. (2) My only interest has been in the size of the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.

D. (6) \$600.

E. (6) \$1.46; (9) \$1.46; (10) \$1,000; (11) \$1,001.46.

A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Provisions of agricultural legislation, repeal of resale price maintenance; immigration regulations, farm labor; selective-service regulations, Mexican farm labor importation; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; transportation legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing.

D. (6) \$1,687.50.

E. (10) \$144.38; (11) \$144.38.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry. Specifically, in the 82d Congress: H. R. 1755 and S. 1693; S. 2325 and S. 2714.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Ore.

B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Ore.

C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. Unemployed Service Association, 623 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) No specific bill but various proposals for unemployed people.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 50 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) \$1,000.03; (7) \$200.35; (9) \$1,200.38;

(10) \$3,507.93; (11) \$4,708.31.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See appended statement A).¹

D. (6) \$82,441.36.

E. (1) \$1,196.69; (4) \$1,377.58; (9)

\$2,574.27; (10) \$15,216.08; (11) \$17,790.35;

(15) (see appended statement D).¹

A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

C. (2) All Federal legislation relating to equality of taxation, governmental economy, and tax reduction.

D. (6) \$1,198.68.

E.¹

A. Vitriified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Mutual security; military manpower.

A. H. Jerry Voorhis.

B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the health, welfare, and safety of the American people.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. James A. Waggener, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. John E. Walker, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Engaged to advocate, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).¹

D. (6) \$6,999.94.

E. (7) \$654.03; (8) \$84.65; (9) \$738.68; (10) \$1,642.62; (11) \$2,381.30.

A. Thomas G. Walters, Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.

D. (6) \$2,277.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.

B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

D. (6) \$3,500.

E. (6) \$35.24; (9) \$35.24; (10) \$1,185.35; (11) \$1,220.59.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 616-623 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Kefauver bill (S. 1976), Home Rule for the District of Columbia.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

E. (10) \$500; (11) \$500.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio- and television-broadcasting industry.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.

E. (10) \$146.71; (11) \$146.71.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and, incidentally, organized labor in general.

D. (6) \$1,999.98.

E. (7) \$25; (9) \$25; (10) \$75; (11) \$100; (14) \$25.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (See preliminary report.)¹

A. William E. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) \$1,050.50.

E. (3) \$61.60; (5) \$18.65; (6) \$38.53; (7) \$161.88; (8) \$351.56; (9) \$652.42; (10) \$2,100.39; (11) \$2,752.81; (12) \$10; (15) \$20, October 13, December 12, LaD. McG. Kriner, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., petty cash fund; \$42.53, October 17, November 18, the Mayflower, Washington, D. C., charges, September 10, 1952; \$32, October 17, November 21, the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues and tax, fourth quarter; employees' Christmas fund, and tickets for country store night, etc.¹

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.)¹

D. (6) \$1,350.

A. Charles F. West, Jr., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) \$500.

A. Edward K. Wheeler, Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.

C. (2) Measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question.

E. (8) \$1.25; (9) \$1.25; (10) \$19.88; (11) \$21.13.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.

E. (10) \$83.50; (11) \$83.50.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carrier Act.

D. (6) \$1,500.

E. (8) \$1.25; (9) \$1.25; (10) \$25.70; (11) \$26.95.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.

D. (6) \$3,125.02.

E. (2) \$31.25; (4) \$11.40; (5) \$15.98; (6) \$3.99; (7) \$7.12; (9) \$59.74; (10) \$197.53; (11) \$267.27.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$750.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.

D. (6) \$1,702.89.

E. (2) \$1,200; (5) \$278.55; (6) \$8.88; (7) \$165.51; (8) \$50; (9) \$1,702.89; (10) \$2,199.83; (11) \$3,902.72.

A. Franz O. Willenbacher, 161 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) \$1,800.

A. C. J. S. Williamson, 421 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) General major legislation and specific bills or regulations of interest to California economy.

E. (2) \$6,680; (7) \$1,881.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.

D. (6) \$3,750.

E. (7) \$974.78; (9) \$974.78; (10) \$1,195.51; (11) \$2,170.29.

A. Frank J. Wilson, 1246 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) The Annuitant.

E. (10) \$100; (11) \$100.

A. Everett T. Winter, Mississippi Valley Association, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislative matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American Merchant Marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

D. (6) \$3,000.

E. (10) \$1,489.43; (11) \$1,489.43.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.

B. The International Council for Exceptional Children serving as a department of the National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the education and well-being of the exceptional child, both the handicapped and the gifted. (3) Monthly section in the journal, Exceptional Children.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.¹

C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.¹

D. (6) \$4,894.32.

E. (6) \$56.01; (7) \$411.51; (9) \$467.52; (10) \$4,937.78; (11) \$5,405.30; (15) \$14, October 21, Hotel Adolphus, Dallas, Tex., hotel expense; \$14.40, October 25, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., football tickets; \$37.50, November 6, Shamrock Hotel, Houston, Tex., hotel expense, etc.¹

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) (See attached.)¹

D. (6) \$2,109.38.

E. (7) \$8.95; (9) \$8.95; (10) \$98.09; (11) \$107.04.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Mr. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (10) \$406.78; (11) \$406.78.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) \$60.

E. (7) \$159.91; (9) \$159.91; (10) \$272.89; (11) \$432.80.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE 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	<table border="1" style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th colspan="5" style="padding: 2px;">QUARTER</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="padding: 2px;">P</th> <th style="padding: 2px;">1st</th> <th style="padding: 2px;">2d</th> <th style="padding: 2px;">3d</th> <th style="padding: 2px;">4th</th> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="padding: 2px;">(Mark one square only)</td> </tr> </table>	QUARTER					P	1st	2d	3d	4th	(Mark one square only)				
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 or 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. Carlisle Barger, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to St. Lawrence waterway and power project. (Opposed). (4) \$1,500 per month and reimbursement for traveling and out of pocket expenses.

A. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Clive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislative interests consist of advocating, before appropriate members and Committees of the Congress and Administrative Agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2). (4) \$200 per diem.

A. Col. H. A. Cole, 2011½ Jackson Street, Dallas, Tex.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Repeal of section 1700 (a) as amended by section 1650 IRC (20-percent tax on theater admissions). (3) "Your Plan for Tax Repeal." (4) Traveling and miscellaneous expenses estimated \$500 per month.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) "The Retired Officer." (4) Anticipated expenses: None. Monthly salary \$400.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Repeal of section 1700 (a) as amended by section 1650 IRC (20-percent tax on theater admissions). (3) "Your Plan for Tax Repeal." (4) Salary and expenses approximately \$500 a week; estimated time spent on this drive 10 percent per month (allocation \$200 a month).

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn. and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting copper.

A. Wallace G. Dempsey, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are limited to advising and assisting the Ambassador of Denmark in securing a legislative lump sum

final settlement of unsatisfied claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States Government in 1941. No bills for such a settlement have yet been introduced.

A. Doherty, Rumble, Butler & Mitchell, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) See legislative policies, page 106 of agenda, attached to employer's return for third quarter, 1952. (4) Expenses covering travel and entertainment, estimated \$50 monthly. Annual salary \$9,000 covering all duties—unknown portion of time to be devoted to legislation.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwolson, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislative matters concerning agriculture. (4) Annual salary: \$9,000.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

A. Charles W. Jones, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized. (4) (See attached statement.)¹

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Zionist Council, 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) American assistance to Israel. (4) Monthly compensation of \$1,120. Expenses for travel, publications, etc., estimated at \$600 per month.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are limited to advising and assisting the Ambassador of Denmark in securing a legislative lump sum final settlement of unsatisfied claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States Government in 1941. No bills for such a settlement have yet been introduced.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

A. Pat McGee, 1441 Welton Street, Denver, Colo.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

¹ Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Repeal of section 1700 (a) as amended by section 1650 Internal Revenue Code (20 percent tax on theater admissions). (3) Your Plan for Tax Repeal. (4) Traveling and miscellaneous expenses estimated \$500 per month.

A. Leslie T. Mahurin, 5001 Battery Lane, Bethesda, Md.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interests are the same as those of the organization which are in large part but not exclusively exemplified by the bills which are indexed in the Digest of Public General Bills issued by the library under the captions, "Public Officers and Employees," "Retirement," and "Taxation, Exemptions to Annuity." (4) \$110 per month.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii. (4) Actual out-of-pocket expenses \$200 per month retainer.

A. Howard E. Munro, Room 607, A. F. of L. Building, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.

C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. union members employed on the Canal Zone. (4) \$600 per month salary plus \$20 per day expenses.

A. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.

A. Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Home Laundry Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Repeal of manufacturer's excise tax on electric and gas dryers and mechanical ironers. (3) Petition for submission to the Congress (in the forms of brochure) setting forth arguments why excise tax should be repealed. (4) Total anticipated expenses (including monthly compensation), \$17,091.95. Monthly compensation, \$750.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting Guam. For omnibus bill making certain legislation applicable to Guam. Against legislation that would adversely affect Guam and for legislation that would be of assistance to Guam. For an act making National Guard Act applicable to Guam. (4) \$2,500 every 3 months for fees and \$625 every three months in lieu of expenses plus actual traveling expenses. It is expected that this and \$600 for traveling will cover all expenses. This covers legal work other than legislative but difficult to separate.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests of American Trucking Associations, Inc., include all bills, resolutions, and investigations affecting the trucking industry. (3) Special Legislative Bulletins, Transport Topics,

Truck Beat. (4) Anticipated expenses: Nominal, taxi fares, etc.; annual compensation: \$14,000 per annum.

A. Murray Preston, 901 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of certain legislation to be introduced on construction and operation of a St. Lawrence seaway. (4) \$75 a day in Washington; \$100 a day, plus expenses while traveling and away from Washington. (None specifically anticipated at this time.)

A. William M. Rice, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Engaged to advocate, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2). (4) Anticipated expenses consist of telephone, travel, food, lodging and entertainment and are not expected to exceed an aggregate of \$500; daily rate of compensation for services will be \$200.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.

C. (2) Mutual Security Agency; Department of Agriculture. (4) Salary \$10,000 per annum. Actual expenses, principally for travel and expenses incident to travel.

A. Seeve Toney, 600 57th Avenue, Capitol Heights, Md.

C. (2) 25 percent tax cut; \$2,400 exemption for married couples; \$800 exemptions for dependents. Eliminate inheritance taxes. Make deductible all medical, dental, and hospital expenses.

A. John E. Walker, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Engaged to advocate before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2). (4) Anticipated expenses consist of telephone, travel, food, lodging, and entertainment and are not expected to exceed an aggregate of \$500; daily rate of compensation for services will be \$200.

A. Oliver Francis White, 418 Third Street, Stambaugh, Mich.

C. (2) Against any legislation legalizing developed, "Thought and Nerve Impulse Transmitters," which are also Telecremators and Teleportage devices. Lobby for an open committee investigation of the organization working the above-mentioned devices. (4) Printing and postage, \$75 per quarter.

A. John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rifle Association, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General interest in firearms legislation.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, with minds burdened for the Nation and for the world we turn to Thee, in this baffling hour, praying that in this fear-haunted earth the flame of our faith may not grow dim. Unworthy though we are, Thou hast made us keepers of the holy torch of freedom the fathers kindled with their lives. We would share that sacred fire until tyranny everywhere having been consumed, all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.

Steel our wills and steady our hands with power and wisdom, that with eager joy we may dedicate the Nation's strength to throw open the gates of a new life for Thy children everywhere. We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 7, 1953, is dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that, without the Senator from Texas losing the privilege of the floor, Members may be permitted to introduce bills, submit resolutions, and present other routine matters which would be in order if there were a morning hour, their remarks, however, in any case, not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MARTIN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Shortage of Ammunition of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MARTIN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to continue hearings for the remainder of the week during sessions of the Senate.

ANNUAL-LEAVE LAWS FOR CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES—PETITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition signed by 47 employees of the Veterans' Administration at Fort Snelling, Minn., relating to the annual-leave laws for civil-service employees.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION FROM VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, FORT SNELLING, MINN.

We, the Federal civil-service employees of the State of Minnesota, do hereby petition Congress to amend existing annual-leave laws for the following reasons:

1. Government agencies are affected by changes in economic conditions and political parties. While new agencies are born, others die. This creates a degree of instability and insecurity. Government employees lack unemployment compensation. A sudden, unexpected reduction in force creates in numerous instances undue hardship. Immediate employment is sought without regard to choice of position. Former Government employees, realizing the value of unemployment compensation, soon become alienated by shortsighted Federal employment practices. A fixed leave accumulation would remedy this "no leave" situation.

2. Annual leave accumulated during a given year must be consumed by the first day of the succeeding fiscal year. This ruling constitutes a hardship, especially so in the case of new employees, because of the fiscal June-July severance. Vacation must either be taken before the end of June or annual leave must be rebuilt during the months of July, August, and September. In a cold climate such as Minnesota's, this is far from an ideal situation. It defeats the purpose of a revitalizing 2-week vacation. A calendar year severance would remedy this poor vacation condition.

CONCLUSION

It is requested therefore that 480 hours annual leave be established as a reasonable maximum leave accumulation within a given calendar year and that any annual leave in excess of said 480 hours shall be subject to forfeiture at the end of any given calendar year.

We, the undersigned, therefore resolve that the above amendments be given due consideration for enactment into law.

(Signatures omitted.)

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the so-called submerged lands joint resolution Senators are debating a measure applicable to the waters of the ocean. At this time let me say that I have prepared a statement regarding the St. Lawrence Waterway and power project. I look forward to hearing the same Senators state their positions about that project, which will be before the Senate a little later.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement which I have prepared on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the need for urgent action on the so-called