election was held under conditions which Iacobucci claimed were fraudulent. In any event, he was defeated. He was then summarily expelled from the union. Without membership, he is unable to work in most Philadelphia theaters. To ply his trade, he has had to buy an interest in a theater—using borrowed money—and hire himself as a projectionist.

Our committee learned that a local of the United Steel Workers had expelled two of its members after they filed and supported a petition to decertify the union as the bargaining agent with their employer—although the privilege of filing such a petition is guaranteed by our labor laws. Because of the union's action against them, the men lost their jobs under the union-shop contract. Clearly the right to democratic dissent is meaningless if you lose your job for exercising it.

The spending of union dues to aid political candidates is another outrageous practice which dilutes the citizenship rights of those compelled to pay union dues in order to work. Federal law forbids unions to contribute dues funds directly to support candidates for Federal office. But dues money is directly, and liberally, employed in non-Federal elections. It is also used indirectly in Federal elections.

When I asked witness Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel for the Teamsters, if union funds were used to support candidates for State and local offices, he expressed an attitude that is typical of many union leaders: "I say we would be derelict in our duty to our membership if we didn't."

The records of a major union, the United Auto Workers, were included in the hearings and provided further evidence of the abuse of the political freedoms of workers for whom union membership is compulsory. The report shows, for example, that in 1960 the UAW contributed to many campaigns. Some of the funds went to help Orville L. Freeman run for Governor of Minnesota, some to help Otto Kerner in his campaign for the Illinois governership. Well over $100,000 went to the union's voluntary political arm, the Committee on Political Education—COPE—which operates in Federal elections.

Even more dramatic is the plight of workers whose religious beliefs prevent them from joining an organization such as a labor union. For example, among the Plymouth Brethren, a fundamentalist sect, some members have lost job after job because they refused affiliation with a union. In many parts of the country there are such groups which are opposed to union membership as a matter of conscience. Their members constantly have trouble finding—and keeping—jobs.

Countless stories of this kind cry out the need for reform within the American labor movement and, more specifically, for an overhauling of the union-shop provisions of the law. A simple repeal of section 14(b) would undoubtedly increase the violation of constitutional rights, for union shops would quickly be organized in the States that now forbid them. On the other hand, the mere retention of right-to-work laws will not cure many of the abuses either.

My proposal, embodied in a bill I have introduced, would eliminate the section 14 (b), thereby extending the privilege of negotiating union-shop contracts to unions in all 50 States—but at the same time safeguarding the rights of union members. This bill would make it unlawful for a union entering into an agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment (1) to discriminate on account of race, color, or creed; (2) to fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States; (3) to use dues or assessments for political or other nonunion purposes; (4) to cause the discharge of genuinely religious objectors to union membership.

Of course, it would be meaningless to recite fundamental individual rights without means for enforcement. Under my bill, a compulsory-membership clause in any collective-bargaining agreement would become void if the union involved should disregard any of the law's provisions.

Some of the problems of democratic rights in unions were faced in 1959 by the Landrum-Griffin labor-reform law, which I cosponsored in the House and which then-Senator John F. Kennedy sponsored in its Senate version. This was a valid first step, but experience since then proves that further steps are needed.

The basic safeguards I have outlined must be coupled with any repeal of section 14(b)—for the special privileges enjoyed by unions are linked both in fact and in the public view with special responsibilities. I am convinced that the American people would not long allow Federal sanction for compulsory membership in unions which abuse the rights of their members. This would amount to second-class citizenship for millions of workers. Before long the public would demand much stronger remedies—such as the application of antitrust laws to labor organizations.

It is high time to put aside the hollow clichés that permeate debate over this subject. It is time for all factions of industry to recognize that collective bargaining is a way of life in this country. And it is time for union leaders to recognize that special responsibilities must accompany union authority to require membership as a condition of employment. This, and not emotional arguments over the right to work, is the real issue in the right-to-work battle.

Blackmail in Home Rule Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, according to the press, a group calling itself the Free D.C. Movement was launched yesterday. It is apparently an offshoot of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. One Marion Barry, Jr., director of the Washington office of SNCC in speaking for the new organization announced plans for a consumer boycott against all Washington merchants who refuse to support District home rule. The support demanded from Washington merchants will be to sign petitions, wire the President and Members of Congress, display a "Free D.C." sticker in the window of his business establishment and contribute financially to the treasury of the "Free D.C. Movement." Those who refuse to meet these demands will be blacklisted and boycotted. It is further reported that one cleric who has pledged support to the new movement said he was "sorry that this kind of militancy is necessary" but all other methods have failed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak from the premise of one who is fundamentally opposed to home rule. However, I am shocked that the advocates of home rule are now going to resort to the unconscionable methods of blackmail recited above. This goes far beyond the legitimate pressures that should be applied to gain political ends. Steps such as those requiring people to sign petitions, to make financial contributions, and display window stickers are offensive to my sense of fair play. They violate freedom of conscience and the right to freely petition without duress. Indeed they are totally repugnant to the precepts of a free and open society. This kind of blackmail campaign is not going to win any friends for home rule among Members of Congress. It will be completely counterproductive and alienate support now existent.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that before we take up home rule legislation again perhaps we had better investigate the need for another type of legislation. Perhaps we should investigate the need to outlaw conspiracies to frighten, intimidate, and threaten under the guise of an economic boycott. This pernicious philosophy that the ends justify the means can be completely destructive of the fabric of a democratic society. Mr. Speaker, I do not like totalitarian and dictatorial methods even when practiced in defense of a good cause. And I repeat that I speak as one who is not opposed to home rule. The people who intend to resort to these tactics are a disgrace to the legitimate cause of home rule for the District of Columbia. They will fail as the forces which seek to employ tyrannical methods always fail when within the context of a democratic society they seek to substitute the weaponry of blackmail for the rule of reason.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Frank W. Blackwelder, All Souls Memorial Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.—Isaiah 40: 3.

Almighty and indestructible Heavenly Father, awaken our minds this day to the significance of the Lenten season.

As the word "lent" means "springtime," so may our minds and spirits be renewed, reborn, and refreshed during this religious interval.

Allow this spiritual season to be both an interim of deleting wrong attitudes and of augmenting our lives with sound principles. Help us to remove the inertia which impedes spiritual progress and to add to our natures evidences of increased devotion and loyalty to Thee.

May these 40 days of discipline of body, mind, and spirit enlighten, inspire, and stimulate our wills to serve Thee and magnify Thy glory.

We thank Thee for Thy servant, our beloved Chaplain, with whom we walked and worked for a little while upon this earth. Thou hast received him into Thy

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

nearer presence. Give unto his family and loved ones the consolation of Thy grace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate in due form of law showing the election of THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN as a Representative-elect to the 89th Congress from the 17th Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of John V. Lindsay, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PRESERVATION OF OUR NATURAL HERITAGE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 387)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Albert Schweitzer said:

Man has lost the capacity to foresee and to forestall. He will end by destroying the earth.

The most affluent nation on earth may feel that it is immune from this indictment. A nation that offered its people—a century ago—uncharted forests, broad sparkling rivers, and prairies ripe for planting, may have expected that bounty to endure forever.

But we do not live alone with wishful expectations.

We live with history. It tells us of a hundred proud civilizations that have decayed through careless neglect of the nature that fed them.

We live with the certain future of multiplying populations, whose demands on the resources of nature will equal their numbers.

We are not immune. We are not endowed—any more than were those perished nations of the past—with a limitless natural bounty.

Yet we are endowed with their experience. We are able to see the magnitude of the choice before us, and its consequences for every child born on our continent from this day forward.

Economists estimate that this generation has already suffered losses from pollution that run into billions of dollars each year. But the ultimate cost of pollution is incalculable.

We see that we can corrupt and destroy our lands, our rivers, our forests and the atmosphere itself—all in the name of progress and necessity. Such a course leads to a barren America, bereft of its beauty, and shorn of its sustenance.

We see that there is another course—more expensive today, more demanding. Down this course lies a natural America restored to her people. The promise is clear rivers, tall forests, and clean air—a sane environment for man.

I shall propose in this message one means to achieve that promise. It requires, first, an understanding of what has already happened to our waters.

THE POLLUTION OF OUR WATERS

Pollution touches us all. We are at the same time pollutors and sufferers from pollution. Today, we are certain that pollution adversely affects the quality of our lives. In the future, it may affect their duration.

These are the words of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee. They were written in November 1965.

At that time, every river system in America suffered some degree of pollution.

At that time, discharges into our rivers and streams—both treated and untreated—equaled the raw sewage from almost 50 million people. Animal wastes and waste from our cities and towns were making water unfit for any use.

At that time, rivers, lakes, and estuaries were receiving great quantities of industrial chemicals—acids from mine runoff—detergents and minerals that would not break down in the ordinary life of the water. These pollutants were reentering domestic and industrial water supplies. They were killing fish. They posed hazards to both human and animal life.

By that time, on Lake Erie 6 of 32 public recreation and swimming areas had been closed down because the water was unsafe for human beings. The blue pike catch in the lake had fallen from 20 million pounds in 1937 to 7,000 pounds in 1960. The oxygen that fish need for life was being rapidly devoured by blooms of algae fed by pollutants.

At that time, in the lower Arkansas Red River Basin, oil field development and irrigation were dumping salt into rivers. The result was an additional annual expense of $13 million to bring in fresh water.

I have placed these comments in the past tense not because they are no longer true. They are more tragically true today than they were 4 months ago.

I seek instead to make them a benchmark in restoring America's precious heritage to her people.

I seek to make them that point in time when Americans determined to resist the flow of poison in their rivers and streams.

I seek to make them ancient history for the next generation.

And I believe the conditions they describe can become just that—if we begin now, together, to cleanse our rivers of the blight that burdens them.

A START HAS BEEN MADE

The 1st session of the 89th Congress launched a major effort to save America's water resources.

It authorized quality standards for all interstate waters.

It provided—in the Water Pollution Control Act of 1965—new resources for treating the wastes from our cities.

It created the Water Resources Council to coordinate all aspects of river basin planning. This unified effort promises to make the work of pollution control more effective.

We mean to make full use of these new instruments. They will require increased expenditures, in a year of few increases for urgent domestic programs. We shall make them.

Yet at this point the development of new knowledge, and new organizations to carry on this work, is as crucial as our dollars.

We must combine all the means at our disposal—Federal, State, local, and private—progressively to reduce the pollution of our rivers.

A CLEAN RIVERS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

I propose that we begin now to clean and preserve entire river basins from their sources to their mouths.

I propose a new kind of partnership—built upon our creative federal system—that will unite all the pollution control activities in a single river basin. Its task is to achieve high standards of water quality throughout the basin.

The clean rivers demonstration program I recommend has four requirements:

1. Appropriate water quality standards—authorized by the Water Quality Act of 1965—must be adopted for every part of the basin.

2. The States and local communities must develop long-range plans to achieve those standards and to preserve them. The plans must be comprehensive, and they must be practical.

3. Where it does not already exist, a permanent river basin organization must be created to carry out the plan. It must represent the communities and the States. It must work closely with the Federal Government. The organization must be prepared to revise the plan as conditions require, so that new threats to the quality of the river may be turned back.

4. Communities must be willing and able to contribute funds necessary for constructing facilities. They must be prepared to levy charges for their use—charges adequate to maintain, extend, and replace them when needed.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

Federal financial assistance will be necessary if the clean rivers demonstration program is to succeed.

In most watersheds there are communities wholly without treatment facilities. There are some with only the most basic means for removing solid wastes.

Substantial funds will be necessary to construct the initial facilities. I therefore propose to:

Eliminate the dollar-ceiling limitation on grants for sewage treatment facilities in these clean river demonstrations—but only in the demonstrations.

Provide special funds to finance both planning and project costs in clean river demonstrations.

In the first year, I am asking $50 million to begin this program.

To administer the program most effectively, we must reorganize the Federal effort. In the past, the Federal antipollution effort has been organizationally separate from water conservation and use programs.

One agency should assume leadership in our clean water effort.

That agency should be the Department of the Interior.

Today the Department's water management programs range from saline water research to irrigation. It is responsible for wildlife preservation, and for administering the national park system. Its Secretary serves as Chairman of the Water Resources Council. Thus its present task, and the logic of good government, require that it be entrusted with an important new effort to clean and preserve entire river systems.

I shall shortly submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Water Pollution Control Administration now housed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BENEFITS OF THE PROGRAM

The program has one ultimate goal: to clean all of America's rivers. This year we shall start with those few basins whose States and communities are prepared to begin. As additional organizations are formed and their plans drafted, more basins will qualify.

The projects will be self-sustaining. Federal assistance is planned for the initial construction of local treatment works. Thereafter, local communities will collect revenues from users sufficient for the operation, expansion, and replacement of the facilities. Continuing responsibility will reside where the benefits accrue—with local authorities.

The projects will allow experiment with new forms of organization. State and local participation may be based on an interstate compact, a river basin commission, or even a conservancy district. The central requirement is for sufficient jurisdiction and authority to develop and carry out the long-range plan.

These projects will enable us to curtail and control pollution in entire river basins. Broad-scale planning of water standards in broad stretches of a river can achieve substantial economies. More efficient plants can be built to treat the wastes of several communities and nearby industries. Integrating the control of streamflow and treatment plant operation can reduce costs—for example, by fitting the type and amount of day-to-day treatment to varying stream conditions.

OUR ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS

The clean rivers program now holds great promise for restoring and preserving water quality. But in the beginning it can affect only a few areas.

Our existing programs must continue. They must be improved—not only to help rescue other rivers from pollution, but because they provide the foundation for the river basin demonstration projects.

Federal grants for waste treatment plants now total more than $725 million. More than 6,000 projects are under construction or already completed. For fiscal 1967 I have requested the Congress to appropriate $150 million, the full authorized amount, to continue this vital effort.

Under last year's act, the initiative for water quality standards rests, until July 1967, with the States. State governments now have an obligation to demonstrate their willingness and ability to control pollution. Some have already done so. The Federal Government must extend all possible help to enable the States to meet this responsibility.

I am therefore recommending that support for State water pollution control agencies be doubled. The added amount should be used at the Secretary's discretion to assist States in devising effective water quality standards. It should be used to prepare plans for abating pollution.

ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY

Standards, however, mean little without the power to enforce them. Existing Federal authority to abate water pollution is unnecessarily time consuming, complex in procedure, and limited in jurisdiction. Steps must be taken to simplify and strengthen these procedures.

I recommend that—

1. The Water Pollution Control Act be amended to eliminate the two mandatory 6-month delays that unnecessarily burden its procedures;

2. The Federal Government have authority immediately to bring suit to stop pollution, when that pollution constitutes an imminent danger to public health or welfare;

3. More weight be given by the courts to the evidence produced in administrative enforcement hearings;

4. The Federal Government have the right to subpena witnesses to appear at administrative hearings;

5. The Secretary be given the right to initiate enforcement proceedings when pollution occurs in navigable waters, intrastate or interstate;

6. Registration be required of all existing or potential sources of major pollution, and U.S. officials be given the right to inspect such sources; and

7. Private citizens be allowed to bring suit in Federal court to seek relief from pollution.

These are strong measures. But the menace of pollution requires them.

It poses a major threat to the quality of life in our country.

RESEARCH FOR COMPREHENSIVE POLLUTION CONTROL

The river basin proposals I am submitting take advantage of the best techniques available today. They apply new concepts of efficient organization. But if pollution control is to cope with increasing volumes of waste from our growing industry and population, new knowledge and technology are required. It is a challenge to research organizations, both private and public, to develop these technologies.

1. There must be new integrated systems of disposal. Many liquid wastes can be transformed to solids or gases—or vice versa. Research can show which form is least harmful and least costly. Research can reduce costs through combined solid-liquid disposal systems.

2. The technology of water treatment must be improved. We must find ways to allow more reuse of waste water at reasonable costs. We must remove or control nutrients that cause excessive growth of plant life in streams, lakes and estuaries. We must take steps to control the damage caused by waters that heat up after cooling generators and industrial engines.

3. More must be learned about the effects of pollutants and the present level of pollution. Better equipment must be developed to measure pollution load and movement. We must assess the results of particular pollutants on plant, animal, and human populations. We should continually monitor the quality of our environment, to provide a yardstick against which our progress in pollution abatement can be measured. We must apply the most modern techniques of systems analysis.

Such research will lead to pollution standards suited for each location and type of pollutant. It will permit us to direct our control efforts more efficiently. I am proposing that we spend over $20 million next year on this research.

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The Clean Air Act of 1963 and its 1965 amendments have given us new tools to help attack the pollution that fouls the air we breathe.

We have begun to counter air pollution by increasing the tempo of effort at all levels of government.

In less than 2 years Federal financial assistance has stimulated a 50-percent increase in the air pollution budgets of States and local governments. Federal standards for the control of automobile exhausts will apply to the 1968 models. The Federal interstate abatement program will significantly supplement State and local efforts to deal with air pollution.

I am heartened by the progress we are making. But I am mindful that we have only begun our work. I am forwarding to the Congress proposals to improve and increase Federal research, financing, and technical assistance to help States and local governments take the measures needed to control air pollution.

POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

The Federal Government is rightly expected to provide an example to the Nation in pollution control. We cannot

make new demands on State and local governments or on private industry without putting the Federal house in order. We will take the necessary steps this year to insure that Federal activities do not contribute to the deterioration of our water and air.

Last November I signed an Executive order requiring that all new Federal installations include adequate water pollution control systems. Agencies are required to submit long-range plans to bring existing installations up to the high level of pollution control required of new facilities. These plans are to be submitted by July 1 of this year. We are providing the funds necessary to implement them.

I also intend to issue an Executive order dealing with air pollution from Federal activities. The potential dangers of air pollution have only recently been realized. The technical and economic difficulties in conserving the purity of our air are, if anything, greater than in protecting our water resources. Nevertheless, I intend to see that the necessary steps are taken to curtail emissions from Federal installations.

HUMAN RESOURCES FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

New projects and new technology are of little value without skilled people dedicated to putting them to effective use.

I propose to enlist the services of those in industry and the universities.

I propose to attract skilled administrators and scientists to the challenges of full-time occupations in pollution control.

Critical skills are in short supply in all public pollution control operations. We need to train scientists and social scientists in these activities, and to demonstrate the advantages of Government service as a lifetime occupation. I propose to establish traineeships, fellowships, and an internship program in Federal pollution control activities. The participants will be in residence in Federal pollution control programs throughout the country.

IMPACT ON OUR CITIES

The pollution control programs I have recommended will benefit all Americans.

But nowhere will the impact be greater than on our cities.

These steps can clean the air that is today blighted by smoke and chemicals.

These steps can bring to growing urban centers abundant supplies of pure water to sustain today's prosperity and to satisfy tomorrow's needs.

These steps can enrich the daily life of the city dweller and his children by restoring surrounding waterways to their unspoiled natural beauty. For we know that ugliness is degrading and costly, but that beauty can revive the human spirit and enlarge the imagination.

NATIONAL WATER COMMISSION

In no area of resource management are the problems more complex—or more important—than those involving our Nation's water supplies. The water shortage in the Northeastern United States is a dramatic reminder that we must take every possible step to improve the management of our precious water resources.

I propose the establishment of a National Water Commission to review and advise on the entire range of water resource problems—from methods to conserve and augment existing water supplies to the application of modern technology, such as desalting, to provide more usable water for our cities, our industries, and our farms.

This Commission will be composed of the very best minds in the country. It will judge the quality of our present efforts. It will recommend long-range plans for the future. It will point the way to increased and more effective water resource measures by the Federal Government, working in close cooperation with States, local communities, and private industry.

SAVING OUR FORESTS

Since the century's beginning the National Government has labored to preserve the sublime legacy that is the American forest.

Time after time public intervention has prevented the destruction of irreplaceble forest lands.

Our national park and forest systems are America's principal trustee in the vital task of conservation. The task cannot be accomplished in a single stroke. It requires patient determination and careful planning to secure for our people the beauty that is justly theirs. It merits careful planning.

I propose that we plan now to complete our national park system by 1972—the 100th anniversary of Yellowstone, the world's first national park.

Substantial progress has been made during the last 4 years. Yet many scenic masterpieces remain unprotected and deserve early inclusion in the national park system.

A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK

I propose the creation of a Redwood National Park in northern California.

It is possible to reclaim a river like the Potomac from the carelessness of man. But we cannot restore—once it is lost—the majesty of a forest whose trees soared upward 2,000 years ago. The Secretary of the Interior—after exhaustive consultations with preservationists, officials of the State of California, lumbermen and others—has completed a study of the desirability of establishing a park of international significance.

I have reviewed his recommendations, and am submitting to the Congress legislation to establish such a park. This will be costly. But it is my recommendation that we move swiftly to save an area of immense significance before it is too late.

OTHER OUTDOOR RECREATION PROPOSALS

Other major outdoor recreation proposals which should be approved in 1966 are:

1. Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.
2. Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.
3. Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.
4. Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.
5. Great Basin National Park, Nev.
6. Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.
7. Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont.-Wyo.
8. Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah-Wyo.

For a region which now has no national park, I recommend the study of a Connecticut River National Recreation Area along New England's largest river, in the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

I propose the early completion of studies and planning for two new parks—the Apostle Isles Seashore along Lake Superior and North Cascades in Washington State.

NATIONWIDE TRAIL SYSTEM

In my budget, I recommended legislation to extend Federal support to the Appalachian Trail, and to encourage the development of hiking trails accessible to the people throughout the country.

I am submitting legislation to foster the development by Federal, State, and local agencies of a nationwide system of trails and give special emphasis to the location of trails near metropolitan areas.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

Historic preservation is the goal of citizen groups in every part of the country. To help preserve buildings and sites of historic significance, I will recommend a program of matching grants to States and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

WILD RIVER SYSTEM

I am encouraged by the response to my proposal for a national wild rivers system, and I urge the Congress to complete this pioneering conservation legislation this year.

COSTS OF LAND ACQUISITION

The spiraling cost of land acquisitions by the Federal Government, particularly for water resource and recreational purposes, is a matter of increasing concern.

Landowners whose property is acquired by the Federal Government are, of course, entitled to just compensation as provided by the Constitution. At the same time, land for the use of the general public should not be burdened with the increased price resulting from speculative activities.

I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, together with the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the heads of the other agencies principally concerned, to investigate procedures for protecting the Government against such artificial price spirals.

A CREED TO PRESERVE OUR NATURAL HERITAGE

To sustain an environment suitable for man, we must fight on a thousand battlegrounds. Despite all of our wealth and knowledge, we cannot create a redwood forest, a wild river, or a gleaming seashore.

But we can keep those we have.

The science that has increased our abundance can find ways to restore and renew an environment equal to our needs.

The time is ripe to set forth a creed to preserve our natural heritage—principles which men and women of good will will support in order to assure the beauty and bounty of their land. Conservation is ethically sound. It is rooted in our

love of the land, our respect for the rights of others, our devotion to the rule of law.

Let us proclaim a creed to preserve our natural heritage with rights and the duties to respect those rights:

The right to clean water—and the duty not to pollute it.

The right to clean air—and the duty not to befoul it.

The right to surroundings reasonably free from manmade ugliness—and the duty not to blight.

The right of easy access to places of beauty and tranquillity where every family can find recreation and refreshment—and the duty to preserve such places clean and unspoiled.

The right to enjoy plants and animals in their natural habitats—and the duty not to eliminate them from the face of this earth.

These rights assert that no person, or company, or government has a right in this day and age to pollute, to abuse resources, or to waste our common heritage.

The work to achieve these rights will not be easy. It cannot be completed in a year or 5 years. But there will never be a better time to begin.

Let us from this moment begin our work in earnest—so that future generations of Americans will look back and say: 1966 was the year of the new conservation, when farsighted men took farsighted steps to preserve the beauty that is the heritage of our Republic.

I urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to the proposals I have recommended in this message.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1966.*

CLEAN RIVERS DEMONSTRATION BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President's clean rivers demonstration proposal offers us an opportunity to halt and, ultimately, to reverse the trend toward pollution in America's rivers. A piecemeal approach by separate communities has long since proven inadequate. The pollution problems of any community can only be dealt with in the context of the problems of all the other communities within the same river basin. Only when each of our river basins is considered as a whole can pollution be brought under effective control.

This bill will permit the Federal Government to join with the States and local agencies in a broad-scale plan to clean up entire rivers. The cost of the program is too great for local agencies to bear alone, and so the Federal Government must participate. Federal participation, however, will be based on the willingness of the local agencies to assume full responsibility, without further Federal assistance, for operating, replacing, and expanding the pollution control facilities once they have been constructed. This means that local agencies will have to find the funds to finance the ongoing needs of their projects. The goal is to provide a financing system, based upon revenue bonds and user charges, that will place the burden of pollution control on those who cause the pollution.

The clean rivers restoration bill is not a substitute for existing Federal pollution control programs. It supplements those programs by providing for an intensive Federal-State approach on selected rivers that will point the way toward a long-range solution to the pollution problem on those and other rivers. Until a river basin plan is in effect, the other programs will continue to operate. Once a river basin plan is in effect, however, all pollution control programs of the Federal Government must then be administered in a manner that is consistent with the plan.

This is a farsighted and well-planned program which needs our urgent support.

MOVE WATER POLLUTION TO INTERIOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposal to transfer responsibility for the national effort against water pollution to the Department of the Interior is a wise move.

In saying this, I do not wish to detract from the valiant efforts made, first by the Public Health Service alone, and then by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in initiating the Federal antipollution program.

It was natural to begin this effort with the Public Health Service, for originally its most dramatic impact was in the field of health. But as time passed, it became apparent that it was both unfair to the Public Health Service, and inefficient for the Nation, to insist that scientists and medical personnel concerned with the war on disease also become river basin planners and water control experts.

The President's proposal, therefore, seems to me to be eminently sound. Coupled with his recommendation for legislation that will place the war on pollution on a river-basin basis, we have been given the basis for a powerful two-pronged weapon which to mount an effective attack on one of the most pressing of our domestic problems.

I believe these measures will greatly speed our efforts to end the grave and growing pollution in our streams and rivers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 17]

Baldwin	Gubser	Powell
Blatnik	Hagan, Ga.	Rivers, S.C.
Bolling	Harvey, Ind.	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Hosmer	Roudebush
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Scott
Cabell	Jones, Mo.	Senner
Cederberg	Kee	Slack
Chelf	Mailliard	Smith, Iowa
Cohelan	Martin, Ala.	Steed
Conyers	Matthews	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Miller	Toll
Dowdy	Moorhead	Walker, N. Mex.
Ellsworth	Morris	White, Idaho
Fallon	Murray	Willis
Farnsley	Ottinger	Zablocki
Fuqua	Patman	
Garmatz	Pool	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING OF REPORT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PARKS ON THE NORTHEN COAST OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am joining the President of the United States in proposing the creation of a Redwood National Park in my district along the northern coast of California. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill developed for this purpose by the agencies of the Federal Government.

To me and all of my constituents—620,000 strong—the strip of coastline from San Francisco north to the Oregon border is among the beauty spots of the world. It amazes me that it took until 1962, when the Point Reyes National Seashore was created, to recognize this area for national status. Now it has become clear that one of the rarest resources in the world—the tall coast redwoods—should be recognized as one of our great national assets and that suitable redwood forests be set aside under the care of the National Park Service. By my words and action today, I fully endorse this concept.

But while I endorse the concept, I must be frank to say that I cannot endorse all of its parts. There are a number of reasons for this:

The first is that I saw the completed bill for the first time only last night. While I am well aware of its main provisions, I have not had time to study the small print nor otherwise learn the details.

Second, this is just as well because I think it mandatory that extensive committee hearings be held in the National Capital and in the redwood empire, as we call it, to weigh the values of this bill and sort its facets. I have consulted the gentleman fom Colorado and, in his wisdom, he agrees.

Further, I hope to be in a position to offer any improvements necessary to perfect the proposal. More than 400 Members of this honorable body may find it hard to question the protection of beautiful redwood forests, and it is understandable. But there is only one—the Congressman from the First District of California—who has the direct responsibility to protect also the legitimate interests of all of the people who live there.

Rightly or wrongly, there is a great deal of opposition to a Redwood National Park within my district. Many people are critical that the State of California has not developed the recreational potential of the more than 100,000 acres of cathedrallike redwood forests it has held in State parks for many years. Because the timber products industry represents more than 70 percent of the local economy, others fear for their jobs. And still others, who pay property taxes, fear that the tax base will be seriously eroded by Federal acquisition of private lands, thereby increasing their own tax load. These are reasonable concerns that I, as their Representative, also must voice.

As the Members may be sure, some 30 bills to create a Redwood National Park have been introduced in this House. Still others discussed the situation with me and asked me about it; for this I will be eternally grateful. My own effort has been to work with the National Park Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and the Bureau of the Budget up to and including a final meeting last night. I personally flew Government officials over mile upon mile of redwood forests, introduced them to local officials, lumber workers, and other citizens and otherwise acquainted them with the area and the problems major new Government acquisitions would cause.

As a result, I present to you today what I consider to be an honest attempt at compromise. It is an effort to fully recognize an esthetic obligation to the future while meeting the mundane obligations of today. It attempts to solve the economic problems such a park would create while others would shrug them off as a necessary sacrifice to the preservation of beauty. The main provisions of the bill are these:

First. Creation of a Redwood National Park by acquiring Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Parks from California and acquiring other virgin redwood forests to connect the two into one large park. Although the bill also includes acquisition of the entire Mill Creek watershed, much of which is nonpark quality, I intend to propose some other method of watershed control—perhaps by contract with the private owner—to protect the virgin groves downstream and maintain a major employer in business.

To do this, I am irrevocably committed to introduce a second bill creating a National Redwood Park that contains the description of a corridor tying the Jedediah Smith and the Del Norte State Parks together as requested by some of the people of the area directly involved.

Second. An economic adjustment payment to local governmental bodies to not only offset property tax losses but to assist in other areas of economic adjustment, such as job retraining.

Third. An immediate crash program for development of the park to provide jobs and speed the expansion of the tourist industry. Coupled with direction to proper Government agencies to exert every effort in the areas of manpower retraining and relocation, this again is an honest effort to solve a major problem.

There are other proposals now pending before the Congress. Also, many varied opinions on the size and location of the proposed National Redwood Park are held by many constituents of my congressional district and many conservation organizations outside of the area involved.

I believe everyone agrees that the final recommendations will be made by the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate, and only after detailed hearings are held and evaluations made of the various proposals.

While I am quite naturally concerned about the effect any proposal will have on the landowner, I am more particularly concerned about the people involved—the men and women who work in the forest products industry, the people who are in service jobs or businesses that will feel the economic impact, the overall effect on the tax base of school districts, the county of Del Norte and any other political subdivision.

I think this bill is a reasonable starting point, and I submit it to the Congress for its serious consideration.

In conclusion, I feel it incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of the Congress another conservation matter that is of great importance to the people of my district and the Nation.

The Point Reyes National Seashore in Marin County, just north of San Francisco, was authorized prior to my arrival in Congress. The original authorization was for $14 million. This amount has been funded by the Congress.

The problem now confronting us is the fact that the Park Service now estimates an additional $30.5 million will be required to complete the land acquisition originally recommended for inclusion in the project.

While consideration is now underway for the creation of the Redwood National Park, I wish to remind the Members of Congress that we have an additional responsibility to complete the authorization and financing of this very important national seashore project which is immediately contiguous to the major population communities of the San Francisco Bay area. This is my first priority conservation project for our congressional district. I have committed myself to see it through.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as one who for a long time has supported some type of self-government for the District of Columbia, I was amazed yesterday to read in the newspaper and to observe on television last night some recent proposals that have been made.

Every individual has a right in good conscience to take his position upon an issue, and certainly this is an issue that has been controversial.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years the economic boycott has been used in many instances and has come to be a way of life in this country. But the proposal which was brought forward yesterday goes far beyond anything of that type. It proposes that any merchant in the District of Columbia who does not support home rule all out will be listed and economically boycotted. But, in addition, he will be assessed a portion of a $100,000 kitty to fight for home rule in this District.

In other words, this is the most glaring example of outright blackmail that it has ever been my opportunity to observe. As one who supported very strongly the bill which this House passed for home rule for the District, I have been continuing my efforts to get favorable action on that bill and to get it to the President.

Such exhibitions of misguided and half-baked leadership in the District of Columbia make far more difficult the task of those of us who are sincerely attempting to give an opportunity for home rule to the people of the District.

THE 17TH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the 17th annual running of the International Pancake Day race was held yesterday in Olney, England, and Liberal, Kans.

I had the pleasure of being in Liberal and witnessing the record performance of Miss Rachel Crites, age 18, of Liberal, Kans. The new record time for covering the 415-yard course is 1 minute 4.5 seconds.

The winner in England was Miss Janet Bunker, 16, who covered the course in 1 minute 5.1 seconds, which equaled the old record held by Mrs. Binnie Dick, of Liberal. Timewise, the race in Liberal,

Kans., is subsequent to the race in Olney, England, and therefore, Miss Crites knew in advance the challenge she faced.

The International Pancake Day race has become world famous and as it now stands, Liberal contestants have been victorious nine times, those in Olney, eight. Everyone who participates in Pancake Day activities in Liberal, in our Nation's Capital, and in Olney, England, deserves a great deal of credit.

What started in 1950 on a rather small scale has become an annual event, attracting thousands of people and, needless to say, it does much to stimulate good will throughout both countries.

I congratulate Rachel Crites, the new champion, and also pay special tribute to the Liberal, Kans., Junior Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring this spectacular event.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks that have just been made from the well by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. I composed some remarks yesterday and inserted them in the Appendix of the RECORD because there was no opportunity, it being Washington's birthday, to address the House on this subject.

As one who is not opposed fundamentally to home rule, I do want to declare my complete distaste for the methods of economic blackmail that apparently now would be substituted for the rule of reason in dealing with this very important proposal.

I congratulate the gentleman from California for taking the floor to express his sentiments in this respect.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 736 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 736

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] representing the minority, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House for a very few minutes, I should like to discuss in those few minutes this new revenue bill. Permit me to say in the first instance that, like every Member of this House, I am opposed to raising taxes. There is only one thing that I am more opposed to as a Member of this House, and that is to this Government going deeper and deeper and deeper into debt every year.

Now, taxes are always burdensome and are ever increasingly becoming burdensome, but, as I indicated, we have to look at the long-range program and we have to weigh and evaluate the question of which is the worse evil, the raising of more revenue or the increasing of our national debt. Above all this, of course, is the ever-present and ever-increasing danger of ruinous inflation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would change the method of collecting taxes, which the committee estimates would bring in considerable revenue. The other provision of the bill would not repeal but, rather, reinstate or reauthorize the collection of certain excise taxes. It would reimpose these excise taxes, which were scheduled under the bill passed last year to expire and which would therefore under this bill add additional revenue.

Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to the repeal of these taxes on previous occasions on the same theory and on the same philosophy that I am now stating here; namely, that you have to have some semblance of fiscal responsibility. I just belong to that old-fashioned school that believes somewhere down the line there has to be a day of reckoning and that you just cannot keep on spending, spending, and spending, and keep adding and adding to the national debt. So I reluctantly take the unpopular position here of supporting this bill—no man in public life likes to take an unpopular position, particularly the one of raising the burdens of taxation—and I take this position upon that theory and upon that philosophy of fiscal responsibility.

Now, what is the situation here? We owe—and I have the most recent figures—a little matter of $320 billion. This is the figure that the Treasury comes up with. But if all of the obligations of the Government were added it would be many times that figure. In fact, it would be in the astronomical figure of trillions. The interest on that acknowledged figure of $320 billion is $12.8 billion annually.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Roosevelt came here in 1933, Mr. Hoover was spending approximately one-third of that amount of money to run the entire National Government—everything; armed services, welfare, and everything else.

Now the proponents of the Great Society tell us that we have the greatest era of prosperity we have ever had in this Nation. I believe that is true. I do not believe there is any question about it. The Nation is enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

But, Mr. Speaker, I come back to the point that a large portion of that prosperity is the result of governmental spending, and that if the Government keeps accelerating the spending which we are now experiencing, we will have just that much more of this artificial prosperity.

However, somewhere—and I come back to my original point—down the line there has to be a day of reckoning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another reason I go along with this tax bill is, to lessen the deficit that we are facing—is because of the retarding effect that it will have upon inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood in the well of this House at least 20 times in the last 20 years and made the statement, that I feared inflation worse than I feared communism; that we were in more danger of destroying ourselves from within than we were from without.

Mr. Speaker, we have inflation today. Would anyone deny that? If you are not familiar with it, ask your wife about it when she goes shopping. It is increasing all the time. This will serve to place a little brake upon that evil of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, there is an additional reason: We are fighting a war over there in Vietnam. We do not call it a war, but the boys over there in the jungles and the rice paddies will tell you that it is a war. The mothers scattered throughout your districts who are sending their boys over there, the casualty lists, will all tell you that we are in a war. And, Mr. Speaker, we are coming in here tomorrow, or the next day—in the next few days, at any rate—with authorization for additional billions of dollars because of that war that is going on over there. Whether we should be there or not is another question. The fact is that we are there and we have to support our boys who are there.

Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in this House today—and if so I shall yield to him—who will differ with me when I say that the end of that war is not in sight; that it could well last for 5 or more years? It could well last for 10 or 20 years, if we do not fight an all-out war, if we follow the appeasement policy permitting the Communists to call the signals and we run only the defensive plays.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a situation here where we have got to maintain some sense of responsibility on the domestic front.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just happen again to be old-fashioned enough to believe that we can not have our pie and keep it too—or to put in conversely, we cannot have both butter and guns.

But yet I see no indication whatever upon the national horizon to cut down on this domestic spending. On the contrary, we are authorizing more and more and more new programs that are going to cause greater and greater and greater deficits, and further debase our currency and hasten that day of confrontation when we have to realize what is going on.

Would it not seem the prudent thing to do—would not private business or private enterprise or the private individual who has some sense of responsibility and prudence—would he not try, if he got into trouble on one side—would he not try to retrench on the other? Oh, but no, not the Government—not the Federal Government. We are going to continue both the domestic spending and the acceleration of the welfare state and at the same time furnish more and more of the sinews of warfare which come, incidentally, very expensively.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the future of this country. I am very much concerned about the perpetuation of the Republic with its cherished institutions. I think it is time to stop, look, and listen a little bit and try to get back on an even keel.

I do not like this bill—I repeat. I do not like this rule. Because traditionally I am opposed to closed rules, but I think we have to have this or some other method of stabilizing our fiscal situation. Therefore, like most of you, I am going to go along reluctantly with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when my friends, the able gentleman from Arkansas—and there are very few in this House, if any, who are more able than he is—comes before the Committee on Rules again—which I anticipate, before too long, and asks for another increase in the debt limit—and you remember we had two or three last year and we will probably have at least—I know we will have at least one more and possibly two or three more before this Congress is over—or certainly before this situation is solved—I am going to be against it.

As one Member of this House of Representatives, I am trying to call the attention of the American people to our financial situation.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa, who I might say is not responsible for our unfortunate debt situation.

Mr. GROSS. There is one figure that I would like to add to the figures that the gentleman has given and that is the figure of $1,206 billion of public and private debt in this country as of December 31, 1965. That is an increase of between $88 billion and $89 billion over the figure for 1964. Somehow or other, as the gentleman has said, we have to stop spending. But like the gentleman, I see no evidence of it. Already in this session of Congress I have seen millions voted for Interama. I have seen more millions for a National Air Museum voted through Congress and the $1 billion Southeast Asian Development Bank went through as if the skids were greased. I see no evidence of anyone trying to cut back on spending. It is going to be hard for me to reconcile a vote for this bill here today in the light of the spending that has already been authorized for projects that could and should have been deferred.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He usually makes a valuable contribution. I can understand how he will find it difficult to vote for this tax bill even as I have already stated I am finding it difficult to do so.

I have a great admiration for my friend from Iowa, as he knows, and I am not trying to put words in his mouth. I am sure that, knowing him as I do, he will evaluate this situation, and that, at least in my judgment, he will come up with the conclusion that I have reached that, as bitter as a pill may be, some medicine must be taken at this time.

I express the hope that the administration and the Congress will act prudently and responsibly and curtail these new programs in the interest of giving the necessary support to the war effort and in the interest of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I am no newcomer to the philosophy which I have just enunciated. As a matter of fact, I have been hoisting the danger signals on this floor for many years. Not in the sense of "I told you so," but because I think it is worth repeating. I shall submit, in the nature of an appendix to my remarks here today, a statement that I made upon this floor on March 19, 1952, some 14 years ago.

The title of that speech was, "High Taxes Result in Unbridled Spending," and is as follows:

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 578 and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen], and pending that, I yield myself 15 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, for the past two decades this splendid young Republic has been going through one crisis after another; some were real, others mere political creations advanced to perpetuate those in control of the government in power. Today we are faced with another crisis, a real crisis, a crisis that threatens to destroy the fiscal foundation of the Republic. We are on the brink of the precipice of national bankruptcy. More and more thoughtful citizens throughout the country are realizing and fully appreciating the dangers ahead if this unbridled governmental spending is permitted to continue.

Today we, the representatives of the people, are given an opportunity to apply the brakes and thus make a further contribution toward reversing the trend in extravagant governmental spending.

This rule makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7072, the annual independent offices appropriation bill, a bill appropriating funds for the next fiscal year for most of the Federal bureaus. The President, through his Budget Bureau, requested of the Congress a total of $2,085,097,390 for these bureaus. The Appropriations Committee, under the able leadership of its subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has cut that request by a total of $700,048,695. In every case the committee has made substantial reductions excepting, of course, such items which are fixed and not susceptible to reduction.

As one who has long been interested in this economy drive, I desire now to express, in the premises, on my own part and on the part of my coworkers, the gratitude of all economy-minded Members of this body for the committee's efforts. While further efforts will be made in the form of appropriate amendments to make even further economies, I apprehend that determined efforts will be made by those Members of the House who consider themselves liberal minded to restore the reductions made by the committee in an effort to continue the spending spree. This effort must not prevail. The line must be held.

BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, I have been alarmed for the past several years over the dismal picture presented of the country going deeper and deeper each year into the red while the Federal Government digs deeper and deeper into the pocket of the American taxpayers. More than a year ago a little band of southern Democrats, with the aid of others, in this body got together and agreed to accept the President's challenge to cut his budget. Last year we succeeded in trimming that budget several hundred million dollars. This year others have joined our group and the work continues. We have reason to believe that, with the addition of more and more converts to the cause, the budget can be balanced this year in spite of the $82,000,000,000 request of the President with the resultant $14,000,000,000 proposed deficit. If the economy line is held on this bill and the succeeding appropriation bills yet to come before us, there will be no necessity for any deficit. We can place ourselves on a pay-as-you-go basis. Therefore our immediate objective this year should be a balanced budget.

It is as obvious as the noonday sun that if we cannot balance the budget now, with an alltime high national income of cheap money together with an alltime high taxing program, the hope of ever balancing the Nation's budget is indeed dim. In fact, prudence suggests that under such conditions we should be retiring a part of our gargantuan debt and fortifying our fiscal condition for the eventual rainy day.

FANTASTIC GROWTH OF NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. Speaker, the growth of our national debt and the fantastic amount of taxes extracted from our people has caused me to do a little research. I thought it might be well to call the attention of the Congress and the country to some comparative figures of taxes and expenditures by our Federal Government at 25-year intervals over a period of the past 160 years of the country's history. The startling results are as follows:

Period	Total expenditures	Net receipts	Change in public debt
1789 to 1813	$219, 233, 000	$221, 816, 000	[1] $6, 024, 000. 00
1814 to 1838	534, 759, 000	644, 634, 000	−71, 053, 000. 00
1839 to 1863	2, 232, 812, 000	1, 130, 702, 000	1, 109, 339, 000. 00
1864 to 1888	8, 833, 181, 000	8, 881, 529, 000	264, 858, 000. 00
1889 to 1913	12, 701, 857, 000	12, 787, 468, 000	−191, 584, 000. 00
1914 to 1938	124, 883, 429, 000	89, 393, 932, 000	35, 971, 693, 000. 00
1939 to 1952 [2]	638, 131, 389, 000	419, 494, 298, 000	260, 193, 628, 740. 39

[1] 1790 to 1813.
[2] To Mar. 13, 1952.

To say that the figures are startling is an understatement. It is significant to note that in the first period of the country's existence, when the Jeffersonian principle that the people who are least governed are best governed was in full bloom, and prior to the growth of the doctrine of paternalism that the poor young striving Republic actually had a substantial balance of more than $6,000,000 in the Treasury. Compare that figure with the national debt of more than $260,000,000,000 today and one is compelled to question the oft-repeated statement that the country today is more prosperous than ever before in its history. Moreover, I desire to again call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Government is no different in its fiscal affairs from the individual or a corporation. The management of Government is a business matter. The fact that Government is big business makes no difference. And I repeat what I have often stated on the floor of this House, "There is a bottom to the Government's meal barrel as well as to the individual's or the corporation's."

INCONCEIVABLE DEBT

Mr. Speaker, we have been lulled into complacency so long by the so-called liberal thinkers and have been so accustomed to appropriating the taxpayers' money in denominations of billions that it is impossible to comprehend what a billion really is. Some mathematician, in an effort to comprehend a billion dollar figure, has come up with this startling illustration:

"If a person had started in business in the year A.D. 1 with a billion dollars capital, and if he had managed his business so poorly that he lost $1,000 each day, in 1952 he still would have enough capital left out of his original billion to continue in business, losing $1,000 a day, for almost an additional 800 years, or until the year 2739."

Now in order to attempt to get some conception of how long it will take us to retire the present national debt of over $260,000,000,000 let us assume that we are frugal and prudent and start retiring that debt at the rate of $500,000,000 a year; 520 years would be required to retire the debt.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, if further emphasis is desired on our financial status one needs only to refer to the fact that it now requires more than $6,000,000,000 per annum in the form of interest to service this enormous debt. The Treasury has now asked for and we appropriated last week an increase of $300,000,000 to take care of the increased interest on that debt over last year. In other words, the interest alone on our national debt is costing the taxpayers now about one and one-half times as much as the total expenditures for 1 year of the Federal Government in the period 1914–38.

DARK BUT NOT HOPELESS

Mr. Speaker, that, sir, is the fiscal condition of the greatest business in the world, the United States of America. It is an unpleasant picture. It cannot be passed off lightly with the explanation that we are in a global warfare against communism, another crisis. Neither can we comfort ourselves into further complacency by adding to that the fact that we have recently emerged victoriously from a global strife with Nazi Germany and totalitarian Japan. The fact is that the country has been victorious in other contests at arms and through other crises throughout its history without serious impairment of its financial structure. Those crises, prior to World War II and prior to the Soviet Russian menace, were serious too in their day. Can it be logically reasoned that the situation in this country for the past 6 years has been so grave as to require the extraction of more taxes from the American people than was taken from them in the first 156 years of the country's existence? I think not.

Permit me to again point out to my colleagues what I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the House during the past 6 years that so far as the masters of the Kremlin are concerned they want neither war nor peace. Their main purpose, in my humble judgment, is to conquer this country, as they have conquered all others, by the simple procedure of bleeding us white in the destruction of our economy. They would accomplish this here as elsewhere through fear, infiltration, by prodding us into national bankruptcy, and taking over in the resultant confusion of chaos and hunger. No one realizes more than the Kremlin strategists that a hungry belly cares little about the type of government it lives under. In substantiation of this I call your attention to the well-known fact that more than 600,000,000 peoples have been drawn behind the Iron Curtain without the firing of a single gun by a Russian soldier.

When the blank checks, running into untold billions, are requested of the Congress for national defense and military and economic aid to foreign countries, we of the Congress, the representatives and spokesmen for the American taxpayers, must stop and ponder. We must approach these requests realistically, giving due weight to the probability of the correctness of this view. For, it must be obvious to all that we Americans cannot indefinitely continue to arm and feed half the world. America is a rich nation but there is a limit even to the resources of this great Nation. As one who made an on-the-spot study of world conditions in 13 foreign countries immediately following the war, I have always recognized the necessity for a helping hand to those who were making an honest effort to resist the plague of communism. But I have always consistently opposed the enormous amounts involved and advocated a more realistic contribution. It is unthinkable that we should now comply with the President's request for another $8,000,000,000 contribution.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, the solution to our financial problem and the responsibility therefor are strictly up to the Congress. More than that it is up to this House to see that the dangerous trend is reversed. I need not remind you that the wise men who founded this Government provided that because we of the House must originate all taxes and appropriations we should be elected every 2 years. We cannot hide behind the Chief Executive or complain of the traditional policy of the other body to increase appropriations. Certainly, at best the responsibility is twofold, the President and the Congress. Furthermore, I should like to refresh your memories today by calling your attention to the fact that the people of America are tax conscious as never before. The income tax, originally designed and practiced as a soak-the-rich tax, has become so enlarged that it now digs into the pockets of the smallest businessman, the white-collar worker, and the day laborer. The policy, under the Fair Deal program, of everybody touching the Federal Government has likewise developed into the policy of the Federal Government touching everybody. Even the humblest citizen now realizes that the Federal Government is no Santa Claus. In fact, we have reached the saturation point in taxation. With the tax rate as high as 90 percent in the upper brackets, the incentive for businessmen to make money scarcely exists, while the day laborer and the middle class find it difficult to live under the high rate of their own taxes.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people, the overburdened taxpayers of this country, are looking to us, as their representatives, to at least balance the budget. In fairness to those who founded this Republic and to the generations of future Americans yet unborn, we can do no less.

SOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, I fear that I have been boresome, and that I may even be charged with pessimism, in this long recital in an effort to emphasize the seriousness of the situation. It is serious. America is at the crossroads in its fiscal policy. If we do not change that policy we became a bankrupt people. If we destroy the faith and credit of the Government we lose everything, our economy, our standard of living, yes, even our cherished liberties.

If the Congress is to regain its constitutional control of the purse strings; if the budget is to be balanced; if we are ever to liquidate this enormous debt, I respectfully suggest and urge that the following formula be adopted:

First. Our legislative committees, as well as committees on appropriations, must cease reporting out bills except those which are absolutely essential to our economy and national defense.

Second. Every Member of this body must recognize that the objective of balancing the budget is his most important assignment.

Third. Sectionalism, partisan politics, responsiveness to highly organized minorities, must give way to the national need for a sound financial policy.

Fourth. Every dollar appropriated must be considered as carefully as if it were coming out of the pockets of the Members themselves, as indeed the Members' proportionate share is.

Fifth. Our congressional committees, particularly the appropriation committees, must be staffed with an adequate staff of experts equal in efficiency to the staffs of the various governmental agencies who appear before them seeking appropriations.

Sixth. The Congress and the country must recognize that financial solvency is as important as military might in preparing ourselves against any potential foreign aggressor, a fact which our military captains should be made to understand.

Seventh. Our foreign friends must be made to understand that there is a limit to the resources of America.

Eighth. The system of permitting the carryover of unspent funds from the current fiscal year into the new year must be abandoned. A meticulous study of the 1,200 pages of the President's budget this year will show that the carryover of unspent funds from the current fiscal year will exceed $60,000,000,000.

Ninth. The procurement of military requirements, which constitute more than 50 percent of our expenditures, must be placed in the hands of trained civilians who appreciate the value of the dollar.

Tenth. And finally, the citizens of the Republic, now conscious as never before of the burdens of taxation, must practice the doctrine of States responsibility as well as States rights. The practice of looking to Washington for Federal aid in civil responsibilities of their own must cease. They must realize that there is no State, county, or city whose financial statement is not sounder than that of the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this budget can be balanced and must be balanced this year. Whatever it takes to balance it must be done. A $14,000,000,000 deficit under the President's budget recommendations is unthinkable. If this country, the last fortress and haven of a free people, is to survive our fiscal policy must be placed on a sound basis. The time is now. Next year may be too late. Now is the time to place the country above party.

In the name of the Founding Fathers who gave the country its birth, in the name of the untold thousands who have died to preserve it, in the name of free peoples every-

where, I beseech you to save the Nation from bankruptcy and thus perpetuate this, the most glorious form of free government ever conceived by the minds of men.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

First, may I commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], on the very fine statement that he has made. I find myself in complete agreement with his statement and wish to concur in his remarks.

I cannot help but feel that some of us have a right to feel a little foolish and maybe a little embarrassed here today in connection with this bill.

Last year I remember that we had quite a tax cut. We supported it. We were all pleased to go and tell our constituents that after all these years we were able to do away with many of the wartime excise taxes and reduce others, particularly in the case of the telephone excise tax, as to which many of us had bills in. That tax was reduced. We glowingly reported it to our constituents. Even in some areas the various telephone companies sent notices with their bills to telephone users commending those who supported that particular bill.

Now we find that that particular reduction has lasted less than 2 months, and we are back in here today asking for certain changes in those taxes and others.

At the same time it was my understanding last year, when we voted these heavy tax cuts and reductions, that we had assurance from the administration that the budget to be presented for 1967 could be handled within our income without the necessity of increased taxes or, for that matter, could be handled with the tax bill as passed last year. At least that was my understanding.

Apparently that has not taken place at the present time. Even today, as we are about to consider this bill today, we do not know what the cost of the continuance of the war will be. We have no idea of determining that as of now. It is much more than it was last year. I still feel that we should in some way give thought to curtailing some of these programs, not extending existing ones and starting new ones until we get this war over and find out what the cost will be.

I anticipate that before the first of July we will again be asked to increase the debt ceiling. At the same time we seem to be fighting three wars—a war in Vietnam, a war on poverty, and a war on inflation—and then, on top of that, we are being asked by the administration to spend for international health and international education. It does not seem to make too good sense to me. I think we are definitely going to have a day of reckoning. I think it could be very serious when it comes, because the taxpayers of the United States of America will not be able to feed and clothe the entire world and to fight everybody's war.

So far as the resolution under consideration today, House Resolution 736, it does provide a closed rule, with 4 hours of debate, and points of order are waived. The rule is closed, of course, because once again, the entire tax code would otherwise be open. Points of order are waived in order to comply with the Ramseyer rule. The bill would provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I reserve the balance of my time but, as I have said, I have no requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BOYCOTT OF THE MERCHANTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I shall consume the 5 minutes, but something occurred yesterday in the District of Columbia, a report of which appeared in the local newspapers, of such an extraordinary nature that I do not think we ought to ignore it. I think it is a historic thing that ought to be brought to the attention of the Congress and at least put into the RECORD.

The gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] referred to it briefly in a 1-minute speech this morning. I wish to read a newspaper clipping that appeared in the Washington Star last night. I have never known of anything of the nature proposed that has ever been suggested before in the history of our country—a threatened boycott of the whole merchant population of the District of Columbia.

This is the threat that that community of business people in the District, unless they change their views and go along with this proposal to have this type of home rule in the District, shall be required to contribute to a fund of $100,000 to promote the piece of legislation that a certain private organization is trying to put across. They are perfectly bold, and frank and serious.

I am going to read you this article, and it speaks for itself. It is a pure threat of blackmail, blackmail of a business community to the extent of $100,000. I am going to read this article because I want to make it a matter of record as to who is behind it.

This is from the Washington Star of February 22.

Details of a plan to coerce District businessmen into supporting home rule legislation by threatening them with a boycott were announced yesterday by three local civil rights groups.

Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Suffragan Episcopal bishop, joined spokesmen from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the D.C. Coalition of Conscience—

Whatever that is—

in urging support of the campaign among 7,000 District merchants.

That is the campaign to raise $100,000.

"We are sorry this kind of militancy is necessary to bring to people the right to vote," Bishop Moore declared, "but all other methods have failed. We have tried lobbying, police talk, and even picketing and demonstrations."

Banding together as the "Free D.C. Movement," spokesmen for the groups said businessmen will be asked to—

And here are the four things that they are going to be forced to do—

(1) sign petitions for home rule, (2) send telegrams to the President and Congress urging passage of home rule legislation, (3) display "Free D.C." emblems—

Whatever they are—

and (4) raise $100,000 in contributions to a new "Merchants and Businessmen's Committee to Free D.C."

Now, that is the blackmail.

John W. Diggs, a northeast barber and chairman of the committee, said the first targets of the boycott will be announced Thursday after a conference with representatives of a major department store and a large grocery chain.

All merchants who fail to participate in all four steps of the campaign will be listed in some 100,000 leaflets to be distributed in the District, and residents would be asked to boycott them "step by step," Diggs said.

Diggs said the $100,000 was being sought to run advertisements in newspapers across the country "to counteract" a Board of Trade campaign against home rule.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the House. I do not think that this needs more argument, but I think everybody in the United States ought to know when a bold blackmail attempt is made out in the open in the Nation's Capital. It ought at least to be known by the people of the United States.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, nays 50, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—327

Abbitt	Bandstra	Brock
Addabbo	Barrett	Brooks
Albert	Bates	Brown, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Battin	Broyhill, Va.
Anderson, Tenn.	Beckworth	Burke
Andrews, George W.	Belcher	Burton, Calif.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bell	Burton, Utah
Annunzio	Bennett	Byrnes, Wis.
Arends	Berry	Cabell
Ashley	Betts	Cahill
Ashmore	Bingham	Callan
Aspinall	Boggs	Callaway
Ayres	Boland	Cameron
	Bolton	Carey
	Bow	Carter
	Brademas	Casey

Celler
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Michel
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy Ill
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Race
Randall
Redlin
Rees
Reid, Ill
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Watts
Whalley
White, Tex.
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—50

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Baring
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Conyers
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Duncan, Tenn.
Erlenborn
Fino
Griffiths
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jones, Mo.
Kupferman
McClory
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Quillen
Reid, N.Y.
Roncalio
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Stalbaum
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whitten
Williams

NOT VOTING—55

Adams
Baldwin
Blatnik
Bolling
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cederberg
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Cramer
Dowdy
Downing
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farnsley
Fisher
Garmatz
Goodell
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Kirwan
Leggett
Lennon
McCarthy
Mailliard
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Morris
Murray
Ottinger
Patman
Pool
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Scott
Senner
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Walker, N. Mex.
White, Idaho
Willis
Zablocki

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Patman with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Goodell.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Walker of New Mexico.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Rogers of Texas.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Cohelan.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Willis.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Farnsley.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be allowed to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12752), to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12752, with Mr. HANSEN of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 12752, is intended first and foremost to provide additional revenues to help finance the expenditures required to sustain our operation in Vietnam. In large part it does this without increasing tax rates.

Raising revenue is the sole purpose for the three major provisions of the bill—the acceleration of estimated income tax payments by corporations and the 2-year moratorium on rate reductions in the excise taxes on passenger automobiles and telephone service. The remaining provisions of the bill—while they entail revisions in tax collection procedures which stand on their own merits—are proposed at this time because they too will raise revenue. These latter provisions include graduated withholding, quarterly payments by the self-employed of their estimated social security tax, and an increase in the percentage of tax to be paid currently through withholding, estimated taxpayments, or both.

THE BUDGET WOULD BE BALANCED BUT FOR VIETNAM

Mr. Chairman, it is not a very pleasant responsibility that we in the Committee on Ways and Means have, coming to our colleagues in the House from time to time asking for support with respect to problems of debt management and asking for support with respect to tax bills. On the other hand it was a pleasure for us in 1962, in 1963, and again in 1965 to be in a position of suggesting to you that it would be well for us to reduce some of the taxes that had been levied or increased in World War II and levied or increased again in the Korean war and continued for all of this period of time.

Before I explain the various provisions of this bill I would like to make some observations about our budgetary and fiscal situation. First, were it not for the special costs connected with our operations in the defense of Vietnam, the budget for the current fiscal year would be much closer to balance than was an-

ticipated in the January 1965 budget message of the President. Furthermore, in the coming fiscal year, the budget presented to us, were it not for the Vietnam expenditures, would show a surplus in the administrative budget.

I requested that our staff people go through the budget to determine wherein increases were occurring over the January 1965 estimate in the budget for fiscal 1966. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a table which I will insert in the RECORD setting forth the source of these increases. In addition I have a table showing for 1967 the extent to which the deficit is attributable to the increases arising from the conflict in Vietnam:

TABLE 1.—*Fiscal 1966 expenditures*

[In millions]

1966 budget in January 1965	$99,687
Major increases, not including Vietnam:	
Commodity Credit Corporation ($3,680 to $4,142)—mainly feed grains and cotton production increases and advance payments offset by lower level of outstanding certificates at end of 1965 that had to be repurchased	462
Military pay increases—Larger increases and earlier effective date than had been proposed by the President	743
Interest on the Public Debt ($11,500 to $12,000)	500
NASA ($5,100 to $5,600)—Accelerated deliveries by contractors	500
Veterans' benefits—Primarily effect of new laws increasing compensation, pensions, and death benefits over amounts recommended by the President, with some overrun in caseload estimates as well	288
Post Office ($714 to $878)—Resulting from 5-day work week for postmasters and increased volume of mail	164
Subtotal, major increases, not including Vietnam	2,657
Major decreases:	
HEW ($7,776 to $7,662)—Mainly in education (slower start than budgeted) offset by congressional increases in NIH, social security, etc. The education reduction is mainly in the new program for elementary and secondary school assistance which is off to a slower start than has been anticipated	114
AEC ($2,530 to $2,390)—Due to congressional reductions, construction delays, program slippages, cost reductions, etc	140
Allowances for contingencies and Appalachia (estimated last January in lump sum and now distributed among the component elements)	432
Subtotal, major decreases	−686
All other changes, net ($1,971+$31)	2,002
Subtotal, 1966 expenditures not including Vietnam increases	101,689
Increases, Vietnam	4,739
Total, administrative budget expenditures fiscal 1966 in 1967 budget	106,428

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of administrative budget receipts and expenditures in fiscal 1967 with and without H.R. 12752 and with and without Vietnam expenditures*

	Billions
Administrative budget expenditures:	
Total	$112.8
Without Vietnam (−$10.5 billion)	102.3
Administrative budget revenues:	
Total	111.0
Without H.R. 12752 (+$4.8)	106.2
Administrative budget deficit (−) or surplus (+):	
Deficit (including special Vietnam costs and H.R. 12752)	−1.8
Deficit without H.R. 12752 (with special Vietnam costs)	−6.7
Deficit without special Vietnam costs or H.R. 12752	+3.9

The growth in Federal revenue attributable solely to the growth of the economy would have reduced the deficit for the current fiscal year from the $5.2 billion estimated in January 1965 to $2.9 billion, were it not for the unanticipated increases in expenditures for Vietnam of $4.7 billion. The continuing growth of the economy—growth due largely to the tax reductions enacted in recent years—is expected to produce a further increase in revenues of $7.5 billion in the upcoming fiscal year. Since the increase in expenditures unrelated to Vietnam amounts to only $0.6 billion, this revenue increase would have been sufficient to provide a substantial surplus in the Federal accounts in fiscal 1967, were it not again for Vietnam. Even with these Vietnam costs, however, the year-to-year increase in revenues—due to growth—exceeds the $6.4 billion increase in proposed expenditures, so the budget deficit would be narrowed even in the absence of this bill.

The Members will recall that prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, former Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon stated that despite the $11.5 billion tax reduction provided in that legislation, he felt it would be possible to balance the budget in the fiscal year 1967. This goal would have been achieved in the coming fiscal year if we were not faced with the extraordinary developments in Vietnam, developments which could not be anticipated when the Revenue Act of 1964 was under consideration by the Congress.

I believe that it is clear that it is the Vietnam, and only the Vietnam, operation which makes this bill necessary.

H.R. 12752 WILL IMPROVE THE 1966 AND 1967 BUDGETS

The second observation I would like to make concerns the improvement this bill will bring about in the budgetary outlook for both the fiscal year 1966 and the fiscal year 1967.

Its provisions will increase revenues in the current fiscal year by an estimated $1.2 billion on an administrative budget basis. They will increase fiscal 1967 revenues by $4.8 billion over the revenue that would be generated under existing tax rates.

As a result, the administrative budget deficit for the fiscal year 1966 will be reduced from $7.6 to $6.4 billion and will fall sharply to $1.8 billion in the fiscal year 1967. Without the bill, the administrative budget deficit in the coming fiscal year would be $6.7 billion, $0.9 billion less than the 1966 deficit, but still too far from balance.

The revenue effects of the bill will be even more significant in their impact on the consolidated cash budget which is useful in understanding the economic impact of the budget. The deficit anticipated in this budget in the fiscal year 1966 will be reduced from $8.1 to $6.9 billion by this bill. In the fiscal year 1967, it is expected this deficit will be eliminated and a small surplus achieved as a consequence of the approximate $5 billion added to cash receipts by this bill.

The bill will produce the significant revenues I have outlined without increasing income tax liabilities and without raising the two excise tax rates above 1965 levels. The various changes in collection procedures will speed up the collection of liabilities. This change in the timing of tax collections will result in the collection of some revenues in fiscal 1966 that would not otherwise be collected until fiscal 1967. It will also result in the collection in fiscal 1967 of even larger amounts that would not otherwise be collected until 1968 and later fiscal years. The moratorium on the two excise tax rate reductions will not increase rates above their 1965 levels but will merely freeze them at these levels for 2 additional years.

The revenue impact of this bill is temporary in the sense that the new collection procedures will not increase revenues once the transition to the new payments basis has been completed. Furthermore, the moratorium on excise tax rate reduction is set to expire on April 1, 1968.

The figures I have presented to you are based on expenditure estimates appearing in the President's budget document. We all know the uncertainty which surrounds these expenditure figures. I know that many of you hope to see some of these expenditures reduced and I hope we can. There is nothing on the domestic scene I would like to see better, for example, than to eliminate entirely the 1967 deficit of $1.8 billion.

On the other hand we also know the uncertainty of the expenditures for Vietnam. We all hope that they do not have to be substantially increased but we certainly are not sure that this may not occur.

While recognizing the uncertainties in our present expenditure situation we concluded the only responsible position we could take at this time was to take the expenditure totals as they appear in the budget and base the current revenue program on them. I know of no other basis for determining revenue needs under present conditions.

Let me tell you about this, my friends. We do not know whether this is the only request that this Congress may be considering in the field of taxes. That will depend upon what we do with domestic spending. That will depend upon what happens in Vietnam.

But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot let our management of fiscal affairs be such as to jeopardize our stability here in the United States, and if subsequently it takes further action in this field, I believe that the membership of this great

body will not shirk its responsibility. But let us now look at the situation as it is before us.

A TIME FOR MODERATION

The third observation I would like to make relates this bill to our present economic position.

The expenditures of individual households and business firms will be moderated as a result of the increasing taxpayments required by this bill. I purposely use the term "moderate" because that best describes the impact I believe this bill will have. This effect is entirely appropriate at this time. After 5 years of continuous expansion, the longest such period of peacetime expansion on record, little slack remains in the economy.

At the start of the expansion in 1961, nearly 7 percent of the civilian labor force was unemployed and 22 percent of manufacturing capacity was idle. Under these circumstances, the expansion could, and did, proceed with little pressure on prices. The wholesale price index remained virtually unchanged during the years 1961 to 1964 while the expansion created jobs for the unusually large number of new entrants to the labor force as well as for many of those formerly unemployed.

Now, however, for the first time in 9 years, the unemployment rate stands as low as 4 percent of the civilian labor force. Manufacturing capacity is being utilized at very nearly the rate businessmen prefer. Some pressure on prices is already evident as a result. After 4 years of stability, the index of wholesale prices increased by 2 percent in 1965. The percentage increase in the consumer price index was 1.7 percent as compared to an average increase during the years 1960 to 1964 of 1.2 percent a year. Furthermore, but for the effect of excise tax reductions enacted in 1965, the increase would have been 1.9 or 2 percent.

If further expansion continues at too rapid a pace, bottlenecks will develop in areas where manpower with the required skills is scarce and severe pressures will be placed on the industries which produce machinery and other capital goods. In the past, similar developments have served as a breeding ground for inflationary price increases. The needs of Vietnam, coming at a time of prosperity, could force too vigorous an expansion if they are not financed through added revenues.

At the same time I do not believe we should choke off our economic growth with measures that are too severely restrictive. We still continue to need a moderate expansion in investment and in incomes to provide for our capital needs and for our raising labor force. We will also need the revenue growth these factors will bring.

The provisions of this bill will help to moderate demands on available capacity. The most important provision from the standpoint of tax collection is the one requiring the further acceleration of corporate estimated tax payments in excess of $100,000. While many of the 16,000 large corporations affected set aside funds to meet tax liabilities as those liabilities accrue, some corporations will postpone planned investment outlays as a result of the bill. Such postponement will be favorable to continued economic stability, since business expenditures for new plant and equipment capacity are currently at very high levels. After increasing at an annual average rate of 7.5 percent a year in 1962 and 1963, business-fixed investment expenditures increased by 11.5 percent in 1964 and by 15.4 percent in 1965. Announced plans for the first half of this year indicate that investment spending will again rise substantially. A postponement of some planned investment by business firms, therefore, may well promote better balance between investment in new capacity and the rate of growth in demand for the products for such capacity.

The revised method of withholding will moderate consumer expenditures. Following the enactment of this bill the amount of tax withheld from wages and salaries will be increased by about $100 million a month, or by $1.2 billion a year at annual rates. These additional amounts withheld will be offset as far as individual taxpayers are concerned by lower tax payments in the spring of 1967 or by higher refunds. Nevertheless, they will reduce disposable incomes, and, therefore, consumer spending, during the rest of 1966 and the early part of 1967.

The bill will also make an important contribution to the effort to reduce the deficit in our balance of payments. If inflationary pressures are permitted to develop, U.S. exports will be placed at a competitive disadvantage in world trade and much of the substantial gain made in recent years will be lost. A source of strength in the U.S. balance-of-payments outlook for several years has been the fact that the prices of U.S. goods have remained relatively stable while the prices of goods produced by other nations have risen.

THE BILL IS FAIR

A fourth observation I would like to make concerns the broad distribution of the burden imposed by this bill. The revenues provided by this bill will be collected in a fair and equitable manner from a broad cross section of the population. The provisions which will raise the most revenue—accelerated corporate payments—affect the Nation's largest corporations. Graduated withholding affects over 60 million of the Nation's wage earners. The self-employed, who will not be affected by graduated withholding, will be affected by the revised requirement for declarations and by provision for the quarterly payment of estimated self-employment tax. Finally, the excises on passenger automobiles and telephone service are broadly based. Restoring the rates of these taxes to December 1965 levels will not impose hardship on the companies involved or on particular consumers. A very broad group of our consumers will be affected by the moratorium on the excise reduction on the telephone tax and the tax on the purchase of new cars.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Let me now turn to the specifics provisions of the bill. The six provisions of H.R. 12752 are grouped under two titles. The first of these titles embraces the provisions which adjust tax collection procedures. The second superimposes a moratorium on rate reductions scheduled under present law with regard to the excises on passenger automobiles and general and long distance telephone services and teletypewriter service.

Three of the four provisions regarding tax collection procedures are measures which will bring about desirable adjustments and should be approved on their own merits. The fact that they involve a change in the timing of tax collections which will provide a temporary increase in tax receipts merely enhances their importance under present circumstances. The remaining provisions, that is, the acceleration of corporate tax payments and the excise tax moratorium, are proposed solely on the basis that they will provide needed revenues.

DIFFERENCES FROM PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

The provisions differ in three important respects from the recommendations of the President. In the first place, your committee's bill merely imposes a 2-year moratorium on the excise tax rate reductions scheduled under present law in the case of the tax on passenger automobiles and the tax on telephone service. When the moratorium expires on March 31, 1968, the rates of these excises will fall to the levels scheduled for those years under the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965. This treatment stands in sharp contrast to the administration's proposal. The latter would have delayed the entire schedule of reductions until 1968. That is, it would not have returned the rates to the level scheduled for 1968 under present law but would have provided only the reductions scheduled under present law for 1966. Thereafter, further reductions would follow the schedule set down in the Excise Tax Reduction Act at the intervals specified. Thus, under your committee's bill the automobile excise will reach the permanent level of 1 percent and the telephone excise will be repealed beginning in 1969. Under the administration proposal this position would not have been reached until 1971.

The second major differences between your committee's bill and the President's recommendations concerns graduated withholding. The administration proposal made no provision for persons with large amounts of itemized deductions. Thus, while it would have reduced underwithholding substantially, it would also have increased overwithholding, particularly for families with incomes of $5,000 to $10,000. Your committee felt the latter result was inconsistent with the objective of greater accuracy sought through graduated withholding and that it might impose a hardship on a number of families of average or below-average means. Therefore, your committee has approved a provision, which I will describe in more detail shortly, which permits individuals with large itemized deductions to adjust their withholding to reflect this fact.

The third major difference between the bill and the President's program is in the area of declarations of estimated tax. The President proposed no change

here while the bill tightens up on the filing requirements by moving the minimum requirement for current payment from 70 percent to 80 percent of tax liabilities.

GRADUATED WITHHOLDING

The first provision in this bill relates to graduated withholding.

The bill replaces the present flat 14-percent rate withholding system with a more accurate system which will aline tax withholding more closely to the final tax liability for the majority of wage earners. The present withholding system takes only three determinants of tax liability into account: the number of exemptions, a 10-percent allowance for deductions based on the standard deduction, and the average of the tax rates in the first four taxable income brackets. It does not take into account the graduated tax rates which apply when taxable incomes exceed $2,000 for single persons and $4,000 for married couples. Nor does it take account of the minimum standard deduction, itemized deductions, or marital status. Because these widely used features are not taken into account, the amount withheld often differs widely from the taxpayer's final liability.

The Treasury estimates that 63.1 million returns will be filed for the year 1966, including both taxable and nontaxable returns, which will indicate that tax was withheld but that no payments were made on declarations. On only 10.8 million of these returns would the tax withheld come to within $10 of the final liability if the present system is continued. On 39.8 million returns—20 million of them with incomes of $5,000 or less—overwithholding would be shown; that is, the amounts withheld from wages during the year would exceed tax liability. On 12.5 million other returns underwithholding would be shown; that is, not enough tax would be withheld to meet the full liability.

When a taxpayer is underwithheld, he must pay the balance of his liability at the time he files his final return for the tax year. If this balance due amount is unexpected or large, as it was for many taxpayers in the spring of 1965, it may cause the taxpayer financial hardship. When the taxpayer is overwithheld, he must file a return at the close of the tax year to obtain a refund. The procedure forces him to apply for, and wait to receive from the Government, a portion of his wages. This can be a hardship, particularly when the excess withholding is large relative to income.

Your committee's bill substitutes six graduated withholding rates which range from 14 to 30 percent for the present single rate of 14 percent. These rates reflect, in full, the tax rates which apply to the first $12,000 of a single person's taxable income and the first $24,000 of a married couple's taxable income. These rates are included in two separate schedules and two sets of withholding tables, one for single persons and heads of households, and the other—with wider brackets to take account of the split-income provisions—for married persons and surviving spouses.

The structure of the withholding rates and brackets incorporates a 10 percent allowance for deductions and the minimum standard deduction. The latter is reflected by increasing the amount of a withholding exemption to $700 and by providing that the first $200 of annualized wages is to be exempt from withholding. The minimum standard deduction, members will recall, is equivalent to a basic $200 amount for married couples, heads of households, and single persons plus $100 for each exemption.

The graduated rates will apply to wages paid on or after May 1 of this year. Married persons will be required to file new withholding exemption certificates between the time the bill is enacted and May 1 if they want to be withheld on under the schedule applicable to married persons. Many wage earners, both married and single, will want to file new certificates in any case, however, since those who now deliberately understate their exemptions for withholding purposes will probably want to claim all their exemptions. Under the bill, voluntary adjustments to increase withholding will not be necessary in most cases.

Beginning in 1967, wage earners with large itemized deductions relative to their income will be able to adjust their withholding by claiming special withholding allowances which will be treated like exemptions for withholding purposes. The allowances will be optional. They will be given with respect to estimated itemized deductions in excess of 12 or 15 percent of estimated wage income depending on the amount of this wage income. One withholding allowance—over and above the exemptions for dependents, and so forth—will be given with respect to each full $700 of excess itemized deductions, with the exception that one withholding allowance can be claimed if excess itemized deductions exceed $350 but are less than $700. As a safeguard, estimated itemized deductions for this purpose cannot exceed the amount listed on the tax return for the previous year and estimated wages cannot be less than the wages received in the preceding year. It is expected that the computations indicated here will not actually have to be made by taxpayers but that they will be able to determine the number of withholding allowances from a simple table.

If the more accurate withholding procedure provided in this bill applied throughout 1966, approximately twice as many tax returns would show tax withheld that came within $10 of the liability. Moreover, the amount of overwithholding would be reduced by more than $650 million while the amount of underwithholding would be reduced by roughly $1 billion.

ESTIMATED SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAX

The second provision in the bill requires self-employment social security taxes to be paid on declarations of estimated tax.

Wage and salary earners covered by the social security system have their annual social security tax withheld from their wages according to the rate specified. This is not true, however, for self-employed persons. Presently they are not required to pay their tax during the current year, but instead can wait until the following spring.

This bill places self-employed persons on the same current-payment basis with respect to their social security tax liability which employees already are on. It does so by requiring them to pay quarterly payments of estimated self-employment tax beginning in the year 1967.

These quarterly payments will be correlated with the quarterly payments of income tax self-employed persons currently are required to make. The rules presently applicable to the declaration and quarterly payment of estimated income tax will, beginning in 1967, simply apply to the total of the estimated income tax and the estimated self-employment social security tax.

UNDERPAYMENTS OF INSTALLMENTS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The third provision in the bill relates to the provisions for filing declarations of estimated tax.

Prior to 1954, taxpayers who failed to pay at least 80 percent of their final liability currently, either through withholding, quarterly payments, or both, unless certain exceptions applied, were subject to a penalty equal to 6 percent interest calculated on the difference between the amount paid currently and 80 percent of the liability. In 1954, the percentage limit for defining underpayments of installments of estimated income tax was reduced from 80 to 70 percent. Your committee's bill restores the percentage to 80 percent. It also makes a comparable increase in the percentage applying where a taxpayer for one or more quarters computes his estimated tax by annualizing his income received to date.

This action is consistent with the other adjustments in collection procedures contained in this bill. Except for the one change I have already noted, it does not change the special provisions which excuse persons who underpay their installments from penalty if they meet one of several alternative tests. This provision will apply for 1967 and later years.

ACCELERATION OF CORPORATE TAX PAYMENTS

The fourth provision in the bill relates to the acceleration of corporate income tax payments.

Corporations with an estimated tax liability in excess of $100,000 presently are required to pay a part of their estimated liability in excess of $100,000 during the current taxable year. The portion to be paid currently is being increased from year to year in accordance with a schedule set down in the Revenue Act of 1964. Under this schedule, corporations will be fully current with respect to the estimated tax in excess of $100,000 by 1970. Your committee's bill simply accelerates the transition to full current payment so that it will be completed in 1967 rather than 3 years later.

Under the present schedule, corporations using a calendar year accounting period would file their initial declaration and pay 9 percent of their estimated 1966 liability in excess of $100,000 on April 15 of this year. On June 15 they would pay an additional 9 percent of the estimated liability and on September 15 and December 15 they would pay installments of 25 percent on each date. Under the bill, the payments due in April and June, 1966, will

be increased to 12 percent of the estimated liability and the amounts due in April and June 1967 will be increased from 14 to 25 percent of the estimated liability.

THE EXCISE TAXES ON PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES AND TELEPHONE AND TELETYPEWRITER SERVICE

The fifth and sixth provisions in the bill relate to the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger cars and the tax on communication services.

Congress provided for the outright repeal or eventual repeal of almost all of the then-existing excise taxes in the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 except the sumptuary taxes on alcohol and tobacco.

Of the many taxes affected only three were not scheduled for outright repeal during 1965 or on January 1, 1966. One was the stamp tax on transfers of real property whose repeal was scheduled for 1969 to accommodate State and local government property tax collection procedures. The other two were the excise tax on passenger automobiles and the excise tax on telephone and teletypewriter service.

The tax on passenger automobiles was reduced from 10 to 7 percent upon enactment of the bill and to 6 percent on January 1, 1966. The tax on telephone service was reduced from 10 percent to 3 percent on January 1, 1966. Further reductions were scheduled which would have repealed the telephone tax by 1969 and reduced the automobile excise to a permanent level of 1 percent in the same year.

Your committee's bill provides a moratorium on the rate reductions scheduled for these two excises but only for a 2-year period. The rates will be held at 7 percent for automobiles and 10 percent for telephone service until April 1, 1968, when they will be reduced 2 percent and 1 percent, respectively. These are the rates scheduled for that time under present law.

I realize that a number of Members are asking why did we select these two excise taxes for temporary retention rather than others. This was a decision that none of us wanted to make because as we indicated in our report on the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, we do not believe that selective excises represent a good tax source.

However, faced with the revenue requirements that we were, I believe we had valid reasons for making the selections we did.

First. These are the two largest single revenue producers. For example, all four of the former retail taxes put together yielded only slightly more than the extra revenue we are obtaining from the automobile tax in 1967 and considerably less than the additional revenue we are obtaining from the telephone tax in 1967. Thus we would be faced with the problem of selecting a combination of a large number of other taxes if we did not rely on these two.

Second. It is also evident that Congress considered the outright repeal of these two taxes was less urgent than in the case of the numerous other excises which it did repeal outright by or before January 1, 1966.

Third. It is a much simpler matter administratively, for both business firms and the Government, to increase a tax on a commodity or service for which the payment and collection machinery is still in effect than it is to reinstitute a tax previously repealed.

Fourth. These two excises affect a broad cross section of the population. Thus their burden is borne more generally than is true of most of the other excises.

The 10-percent rate on telephone service will go into effect with respect to bills which are rendered after the first day of the first month which begins 15 days or more after the date of enactment. The excise tax on automobiles will be restored to 7 percent on the day after the day this bill is enacted. On the same day the 7-percent rate becomes effective, dealers will be liable for a tax on the cars they have in inventory equal to 1 percent of the manufacturer's price of these cars. The tax will be collected from dealers by manufacturers.

CONCLUSION

In concluding I would like to say that in my opinion you should vote for this bill—

If you are interested in seeing that we pay for our operations in Vietnam on a current basis;

If you are interested in bringing our budget as nearly into balance as possible; and

If you are interested in preventing the development of serious inflationary pressures.

I have no doubt that this measure is needed now and I urge you to vote favorably on it.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the tax reduction bill was enacted in 1964, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] very properly warned the House that it could not travel two roads.

Mr. MILLS. That is right. I am warning again.

Mr. GROSS. And you are doing the same again.

Mr. MILLS. Right.

Mr. GROSS. But the warning did not seem to take effect.

Mr. MILLS. Let us go back to that, if the gentleman will bear with me just a minute. Actually, if you analyze the budget and extract from the budget these extra Vietnam costs that we are adding in 1966 and in 1967, as set forth in the budget, whether they are right or wrong, and take them out of the bill——

Mr. GROSS. And they are not all war costs.

Mr. MILLS. No, not all of the increases are Vietnam expenses but if we take these alone out of the spending, and look to our budget receipts for 1967—in spite of any other increases which have occurred—there would be enough revenue without this bill to have a balanced budget on the basis of the budget projection for fiscal year 1967.

Therefore, I have stated, and I state it again, that it is the extraordinary expenses attributable to our operation in Vietnam that are responsible for the Ways and Means Committee reporting this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I wish I could agree with the gentleman, but I am afraid that it goes beyond that, far beyond Vietnam.

Mr. MILLS. My friend is a good mathematician. Just take the budget. If you will look at the table I inserted in the RECORD in my remarks you will see the figures that enabled me to reach that conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just briefly?

Mr. MILLS. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned withholding. If my memory serves me correctly, the warning was out when the tax bill was passed in the House that it would result in exactly what it did in 1965, but by virtue of a closed rule nothing could be done about it at that time.

Mr. MILLS. No. It is my recollection as the bill passed the House in 1963 we had a 15-percent withholding rate in effect for 1964 which was the correct rate for that entire year, on the basis of the tax rates applicable in that year. The Senate, however, did not complete action on the bill in 1963—and it became known as the Revenue Act of 1964 because they passed it sometime in February 1964. Anyway, there was an argument at the time as to whether we should apply the 15-percent rate of withholding or the 14-percent rate of withholding which was the appropriate withholding rate for the rates applicable in 1965. The decision was reached to apply the 14-percent rate in 1964 since 2 months had gone by. This was not high enough but 15 percent probably would have been too high.

Mr. GROSS. I will leave it to the memory of the other Members.

Mr. MILLS. I agree with the gentleman that it would have been well to have had graduated withholding at that time.

Mr. GROSS. But we were locked up then, as we are again today.

Mr. MILLS. This did not arise in our initial consideration but in the conference.

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

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman from Arkansas almost got to the point where he was looking into a crystal ball as to what we might expect in the future as to any tax bill. From the testimony before your committee, would you care to project what you think might happen with respect to a meaningful tax bill in this session of Congress or shortly thereafter, as to what we might expect as we look down the road?

Mr. MILLS. Let me say to my good friend from Illinois that I do not have a crystal ball in the first instance. Fortunately, I do not think one has to have a crystal ball in order to answer your question.

I believe commonsense requires of us to exercise great restraint at this particular time. The important thing to me, in times such as this, is to try to get the economy and the budget as nearly into balance, if it is possible to do. While, of course, I would not want now to bring to the floor of the House a bill providing for a general increase in taxes, I think it is premature to reach a decision on that matter now. First, I want to find out what a majority of this Congress wants to spend in fiscal 1967—not what the administration wants to spend but what the Congress wants to spend. Then we must find out what the actual Vietnam expenses will be.

Mr. ARENDS. I may say to the gentleman that is exactly what is worrying me. Is there any evidence of restraint in this House? We have had only a few small noticeable opportunities to reduce expenditures of the Government during this session and immediately we failed to take any action that would indicate the Congress would move toward less spending. That is what worries me. There is not, in my humble opinion, any restraint being shown toward reducing expenditures. Unless we do stop spending, we will have additional tax raising bills before us.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arkansas are not talking about any broad attempts to reduce spending. However, whenever we know unexpected emergencies may arise, then we have to take notice of this possibility. If we can hold down other areas to accommodate the unexpected, we may be able to live within the revenues we have, but if we do not succeed in doing it and we want taxation to be used in the way to more nearly bring about a balance in the budget and the economy, then obviously we would have to make some further effort and search for additional revenues. But I am not prepared to go into that until after I have found out what the Congress itself will do with respect to spending.

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

Mr. MILLS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Arkansas and for the distinguished committee that he chairs, but could the gentleman explain to me why when the committee is bringing to the floor of the House a bill to reduce taxes they call it the excise tax cuts or income tax reductions but when you are bringing a bill to the floor which does in effect increase taxes, instead of calling it a tax increase, you call it a Tax Adjustment Act of 1966?

Mr. MILLS. I hope the wording did not mislead my friend. Most of this bill raises revenue by adjusting collection procedures. This part does not raise tax rates but there is no doubt that we are going to collect more from the American people in fiscal year 1967. Actually when we refer to revenue acts in the normal nature of things we refer to tax rate increases, such as where we raise a bracket rate from 14 to 15 percent, and so on.

Mr. RUMSFELD. If the gentleman will yield further, that is an increase.

Mr. MILLS. We are not increasing the tax of anyone over what the individual had to pay in calendar year 1965.

Mr. RUMSFELD. But this is calendar year 1966.

Mr. MILLS. That is right, but this year has just begun and not much in taxes has been paid by most people.

Mr. RUMSFELD. And is not true that the automobile taxes of the individual will be increased?

Mr. MILLS. Well, now, let me tell you about the automobile tax. The rate went from 7 to 6 percent on January 1, 1966.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am asking the gentleman from Arkansas if this is not true, that this is calendar year 1966?

Mr. MILLS. I will not argue on that point.

Mr. RUMSFELD. And that there are some taxes that are going up and up, which means an increase?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes; the auto tax will go up 1 percent from what it was on January 1, 1966. The telephone tax also will go up from what it was on January 1, 1966. I believe I explained that.

Mr. RUMSFELD. All right.

Mr. MILLS. But they are not up over what they were in 1965.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my concern is that the people are going to have to make some decision in November, and I hate to have them be confused by words. It seems to me that this does represent a tax increase.

Mr. MILLS. The restoration of the pre-January 1, 1966, excise rates is a minor point in this bill. The adjustment in collections is the main thing and not to take this into account in the title of this bill would be misleading. If the gentleman from Illinois can give me complete assurance that when we reduced the automobile tax on January 1 from 7 percent to 6 percent, that it was reflected in a reduction in sales price, then I can answer the gentleman's question as to whether the tax is going to have any effect when it goes back up 1 point.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, I certainly cannot give the gentleman any figures on that.

Mr. MILLS. Of course not, and I do not believe anyone else can.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The Department of Commerce does not seem to want to discuss this angle of the situation. Now, if Congress sees fit to increase the excise taxes on automobiles, does the gentleman have any information as to whether this money will be earmarked for Mrs. Johnson's highway beautification program?

Mr. MILLS. It would take subsequent action by the Congress to accomplish any such result. There is nothing contained in this bill that would do it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, it would take subsequent action and it could not be earmarked?

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the membership for having listened to me, and I hope they will follow the committee's lead in voting for the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, our able chairman, has put this debate in the proper context.

This is an issue that involves the fundamental fiscal policy of our country, and it represents the first opportunity that this House has had this year at any rate, to zero in on these questions.

Mr. Chairman, Congress indeed has the burden and the basic responsibility for making fiscal policy. I believe it is well that we understand what we are doing.

First, I would like to correct something that I believe might have created a misapprehension, when the chairman said that the corporate speedup was essentially a revenue measure. I believe that this is accelerating a reform that the committee has long been confronted with. It is an acceleration, all right, but I would like to regard it more as a reform.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly agree with my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. It is fortunate that it comes at a time when it produces $3.3 billion in revenue.

Mr. CURTIS. I feel that it is a fortunate time, and I would refer all members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to the table which appears on page 4 of the committee report which shows the breakdown of these revenue measures.

Actually, there is only $60 million additional revenue from tax increases for fiscal 1966, and only about $1.2 billion in fiscal 1967. The balance as provided for in the bill, or some $1.2 billion for fiscal 1966 and $4.8 billion for fiscal 1967, represent one-shot operations which are in the nature of reform in accelerated payment of taxes and are not tax increases.

Mr. Chairman, President Johnson in his economic report to the Congress on February 16, on page 29, makes this remark:

> Perhaps our most serious economic challenge in 1966 will be to preserve the essential stability of costs and prices which has contributed so significantly to our balance progress.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, would emphasize this, but I would also emphasize his choice of words where he says "perhaps."

Apparently President Johnson and this administration are still not convinced that this is an actuality, in spite of the fact that the consumer price index has gone up 2.2 points from December to December, and the wholesale price index, from December to December, has gone up 3.4 points. In the month of January alone, for which we just now have the figures, it has gone up an additional 0.5 point, which represents an annual rate of a 6-point increase in the wholesale price index.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, this bill now pending before us represents taking a tack hammer to hit at a major fiscal problem, and let us not kid ourselves about it. The President has not addressed himself in his budget message to this Congress, or at this session, to the fundamental problems that this country faces as a result of the expenditure policies of this administration.

And I emphasize, it is expenditure policies—which is a part of fiscal policy. I think it is about time that this administration woke up to the facts of life and looked at the economic indicators. This administration defended itself through its spokesmen, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and others before the Joint Economic Committee in regard to these economic indicators. They said to me, "Well, Congressman, after all most of this consumer price index has been in the agricultural area. It is not a general thing. This is an agricultural cyclical problem."

I said, "How do you figure?" They said, "Well, look at the industrial price index—it has held steady."

And, indeed, it had. But this is the very area I pointed out where the administration sought to impose, and I say illegally, its wage price guidelines in aluminum, copper and steel. The President's Council of Economic Advisers said to me—and this is all a matter of public record—"Well, why do you talk about those three—they have been publicized. There are all sorts of other instances where we moved in which were not publicized." I said, "Well, I am interested in that."

But let us get to the key point. What would have happened to the industrial price index if wage price guidelines and these strong arm techniques had not been employed? Where would the consumer price index be? As I said to the Secretary of the Treasury, "What forces were you resisting that brought you to use these pressures to hold to the wage price guidelines? Were these not inflationary forces?" I think it is clear that this is what the picture is.

We are in a serious situation. People for years have asked me—What is the matter with deficit financing? I have sought to reply that it creates such problems as we are now seeking to grapple with. Now one of the great achievements of the Eisenhower administration—and it was a difficult matter to achieve—was to break the inflationary psychology that had gripped this country after World War II. It is not easy to break that psychology once it takes hold and it creates an inflation that feeds on itself. Purchasing agents of the various corporations, of course, try to build up inventories if they are anticipating inflation that will create price increases in the future. All sorts of economic maladjustments occur when business decisions are made on the basis of anticipating inflation.

As a result of policies carefully followed and sometimes not so carefully, some of it was luck—but as a result of policies followed in the late fifties, this psychology of inflation was broken and the Kennedy administration retained or gained the benefits to a large degree. With propriety, the Kennedy administration and, at the beginning, the Johnson administration talked about how they were able to hold the wholesale price index and consumer price index. Indeed, we had a great record of price stability. This must be the context in which we view this recent increase of 3.4 points in the wholesale price index, in context of no increase for the past 6 or 7 years. But what happens when the inflationary psychology begins to build up again? Then we have this feeding on itself and it is hard to reverse. This is some of the damage being created by the Johnson administration temporizing with this very serious problem.

I would like to direct attention to another quotation from the President's economic report of 1966. The first quotation was on page 20 in respect to inflation. On page 151, where the President is talking, or rather his Council of Economic Advisers are talking, about the deficit in our international balance of payments. Note this well:

> Nevertheless if a deficit continues too long or becomes too large, the strength of the country's currency can be impaired. There is in fact an absolute limit of any country's ability to continue in deficit. Eventually it must run out of reserves as well as borrowing capacity.

The question is, Has not the United States reached this point? On page 163 of this same report we find a startling figure which is not mentioned let alone pointed up in the President's messages or in the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury about our international balance of payments: net sales of U.S. gold jumped from $0.1 billion in 1964 to nearly $1.7 billion in 1965—the greatest sale of gold going out from the United States in 1 year since back when the gold rush began in 1958.

This administration just mentions this. It does not dwell on it. It does not relate it to these serious fiscal problems. As Chairman MILLS pointed out, this problem of inflation bears directly on our international balance of payments. One of our great assets in the international balance of payments is our plus in trade, our exports over our imports. Inflation hurts exports and increases imports.

This administration in its economic messages last year was talking about how it was counting on increasing our balance of trade to further lower this international deficit. And yet here is another statistic that this administration has been ignoring. Our surplus of exports over imports, instead of increasing, as the administration had planned and hoped in calendar year 1965, decreased by $1.9 billion.

This, I might say—and this is something that this House might think about and our Committee on Ways and Means—is to some degree the result of the very shortsighted policy, I would argue, of the interest equalization tax, which seeks to put a curb on the amount of private investment that may go abroad. There is no question that exports depend upon capital investment abroad, and when we curtail our investment we are bound to be cutting in at the base of the increase of our exports.

The Secretary of the Treasury has reiterated before our committee that it is true that the interest equalization tax, if imposed at any length, is damaging to the United States. The administration recognizes it must be only temporary and each month it continues it creates damage, and yet here we are moving into the third year. Each year that this is on it creates this further kind of damage.

So here we are with a choice before us, because we are not meeting the basic problem, restraining expenditures. I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, that when we are confronted with Hobson's choice, inasmuch as expenditures are not being curtailed, there are only two basic ways—there are some others that I want to mention, too—but only two basic ways in which we can finance this increased expenditure: One is through increasing taxes; the other is increasing debt. What is the choice? We reduced excise taxes and corporate and individual income tax rates on the theory that those rates were so high they were impeding economic growth.

I am pleased that the committee report uses that very language in referring to the subject. At page 7:

> The Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964 and the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 were in large part directed at the removal of restraints to growth in the private sector of the economy arising from tax rates that were too high.

They are still too high, I think most people would agree. So there is damage when we increase these rates again. Let us not kid ourselves.

But what is the alternative? What is the damage that is created if we put a further burden in the field of debt management? There is one small consolation—and it is very small—I derive from the administration's suggesting to the Congress that we increase taxes and not increase debt further, at least to this small degree.

The administration spokesmen, the Council of Economic Advisers, are still talking in terms of the "new economics." They are still saying, "What is the matter with debt?"

Publicly they express no concern about increasing the amount of the Federal debt further, but obviously the administration, by recommending this bill, is in effect saying to the Congress, "Look, you had better create the damage in the field of taxes, by increasing these taxes, than by putting a further load on the debt."

I am so pleased that this is out in the open. At least I hope it gets out in the open, because we do have a serious problem in debt management. We have a ceiling on long-term debt of 4¼ percent interest. Long-term Government securities are being sold in the marketplace at a discount today which makes the actual yield about 4.7 percent. This administration cannot market any more long-term debt under these circumstances.

We have a turnover of about $90 billion of debt this year which we have to refinance, and much of the refinancing is

in short-term Federal securities, near money. These create highly inflationary forces. This is what Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board was trying to point out to the country and to the Congress—this is one reason the Federal Reserve Board took action by increasing the interest rate or discount rate, not because they wanted interest raised, but because the Federal Government had no way to market its debt in an orderly fashion. Of course, we should not put a further burden on our debt managers.

I want to point out the facts about this increased deficit which Chairman MILLS directed attention to in his presentation, and rightly so. We are in fiscal year 1966. Fiscal year 1966 does not end until July 1 of this year. The budget that was presented to us in January relates primarily to fiscal year 1967, but it also includes a major revision in fiscal 1966. The new budget does not go into effect until July 1, 1967, and the Congress has not acted upon it, but Congress has already acted in regard to the power to spend that is granted to the President for fiscal year 1966. These are the months that we are in right now. But Congress still can say something about the revised and increased expenditures levels for fiscal 1966 set out in the 1967 budget message.

The deficit which was presented to us for fiscal year 1966 a year ago January was $3.9 billion, and the revision in the budget that was presented to us this January—not for 1967, the revision of 1966 budget—shows a deficit of $6.9 billion.

President Johnson keeps talking about 1967, that the budget is only going to be out of balance by $1.8 billion. What about the increase deficit from $3.9 to $6.9 billion? Actually, the figure should be about $11.1 billion, because $1.2 billion is this revenue that he hopes to get from the bill that we have right before us. So he is compensating from anticipated action of the Congress. $3 billion is from selling Federal assets. About $1.7 billion is converting our silver coins to copper—seigniorage. These are one-shot propositions.

Now I am getting to another basic problem I see facing us, aside from the fiscal aspect. Our military leaders have told us this is not a short war—that is, if we intend to attain our objectives.

To come in with a fiscal program like this, relying on one-shot propositions for financing—such as sales of capital assets, acceleration of taxpayments, seigniorage, and things of that nature—is irresponsible. To finance a war that is not going to end in 1967—if we attain our objectives in this fashion is no way to get across to the people abroad, particularly to our enemies, that we do intend to stay until we get results.

I know if I am evaluating my enemy I do not listen to what he says. I look to see what he does. If I see that he is running his fiscal affairs in such a way that he is not planning on a long-range basis, but is planning on a hand-to-mouth basis, I am not so convinced he means business.

I am deeply concerned about these shortcomings that are revealed in this kind of fiscal program that this administration has presented to us.

My concluding remarks are these. There is a remedy. It lies in expenditure reform. This Congress should exercise some leadership in bringing forth some recision bills. If the Executive will not stop spending, let us start bringing in some recision bills in the areas where we think these expenditures should be curtailed.

Finally—I would say this—I honestly believe we can finance this war and have butter, too. I think we can have guns and butter, but we cannot have rancid butter, as I have described it. Many of these Federal programs we have are redundant, duplicating, unduly costly, not attaining their stated objectives.

This is particularly true in this great area of manpower training, which is one of our crucial problems. There is redundancy all over the place. There are programs interfering with each other. In another tremendous area we have redundancy, costliness, and ineffectiveness in one that bears on this problem of international balance of payments—our foreign aid programs.

If we would get around to intelligent expenditure policies and efficient administration of them I believe that we can finance our Federal programs and get the results that we are seeking. This can be a great society; or it is a great society, if we can only keep it.

We have got to start out developing recision bills. In our minority views or supplemental views, we point out—six of us—that we agree with Chairman MILLS that under these circumstances, with Hobson's choice before us, the thing to do is to put the added economic burden in the field of taxation, damaging as it may be, rather than to put it in the field of Federal debt, which would cause greater damage.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I was pleased to hear the gentleman refer to this as a tax increase, because, as I referred to earlier in this regard, the title of the bill, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, distresses me, because I do not believe that this title is totally accurate.

Later on in the report, it says that the tax adjustment bill is designed to contribute revenues to aid and finance the increased costs of Government associated with operations in Vietnam.

Is that a totally accurate statement, or does it in fact really only tell part of the truth? How can you earmark funds? Is it not true there are domestic increases it will finance?

Mr. CURTIS. It is only partly true. Chairman MILLS presented statistics that developed this point. About $2 billion of this is for the so-called Great Society programs and only a part of it is for Vietnam.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does anyone have the slightest idea of how many commitments have been made around the world by some of our galloping emissaries?

Mr. CURTIS. You mean the Vice President, for example?

Mr. GROSS. You can use him as an example.

Mr. CURTIS. We have no idea, but we will probably find out someday when maybe someone in the House will rise to say, "Well, are we not going to stand behind our executives?" That will be another question.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to call the attention of the House to the fact that there are some minority views, dissenting views, on this bill. As usual, they appear in the classified section. Maybe you have not gotten that far, but I would suggest they be read because they do give some very potent arguments against the bill.

I take this time also to advise the House that I will offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to the committee in order to eliminate title II, which are the excise taxes that we are restoring in the bill. This will not be a straight motion to recommit. I am unhappy that at this time again our committee brings legislation to the floor in a package form covering two or three different subjects, many of which I am oftentimes in support and maybe one of which I am against, so I never have an opportunity to vote my position on the various parts of these bills.

My motion to recommit will divide this legislation into the parts which I happen to favor, which are outlined by the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, and give me and the Members of the House an opportunity to vote against the excise tax increase on automobiles and telephones. I am opposed to the excise tax increase for two reasons: At the time we voted this reduction into effect a year ago we were facing a smaller deficit in fiscal 1966 than we are now facing for fiscal 1967. Certainly if, when we were facing that great deficit a year ago, we could repeal the excise taxes, then certainly today, facing a very small deficit as forecast by the President of $1.8 billion, we have no excuse for replacing those taxes except to condition the American public for a substantial increase in income taxes both corporate and personal. In the last 2 years our excesses of spending outside of Vietnam have gone mainly into what they call the Great Society, which is not in my estimation a free society. It is an enforced welfare state which has failed in every country which adopted it. Besides that, there has not been one welfare program or one program initiated by the Federal Government that will create in the American people the one thing that is necessary to make a great and free society. This one thing is motivation. You cannot legislate motivation. The more money we give to people not to do something the less they do and the less creative they will be and the less contribution they are going to make to the Great Society of America. So I think it is well

to understand that our welfare costs have doubled, from $6 billion in 1964 to over $12 billion by 1967. Instead of bringing more prosperity, this is going to bring more indolence and we are going to take from the thrifty and give to the shifty.

For these reasons I will offer a motion to recommit this bill so as to eliminate the excise taxes. Then let us come back with a bill later in the session distributing the tax over the entire American public, not a selective tax. Let us have a 5-percent increase on top of the amount of taxes we have to pay. Call it any kind of a tax you want to, in order to finance the war, but let us wait until the end of the session before we even increase this tax and let us find out if this Congress will use the restraint that it should necessarily have in order to reduce spending. It would be very easy to reduce our spending and our appropriations between $1 and $2 billion if we will simply take the bull by the horns and practice a little financial discipline.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to ask the gentleman a question which I think is bothering every American who has a telephone, and that includes practically every American. As we go back to the excise tax reduction bill of last year, we notice that we repealed the excise taxes on furs, jewelry, air conditioners, cameras, and so forth. It goes through quite a list of luxury items in this category. Then we get over into matters dealing with bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables and coin-operated amusement devices, cabaret taxes, general admissions taxes on horseraces and dograces, and so forth. I notice we are not reimposing these luxury taxes in this bill but we are reimposing the tax we removed last year on our telephone users.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LATTA. This administration bill is reimposing the tax on telephones. The tax applies to the high income and low income groups alike. Some can afford to pay this tax and others cannot.

Can the gentleman from California give me the logic used by his committee in following this course of action?

Mr. UTT. I can say to the gentleman from Ohio that it represents a rather torturous bit of logic, but there is some logic to it; that is, that the other taxes to which the gentleman referred had been repealed completely. These taxes which we are increasing are still administratively on the books. The item of increasing them does not present as much of an administrative problem to those who are paying them as would be the case with respect to the other taxes. Yet I might say to the gentleman that the telephone company and the automobile companies will not pay the tax. They will pass it on. So they do not care one way or the other whether this tax bill passes or not.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is the same reasoning that the very honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means used before the Committee on Rules when I propounded this question to him, but it just does not seem very logical. It does not seem like much of an argument to me to be attaching this additional telephone tax to users just because the telephone tax was not completely eliminated last year. Thought should have been given to the matter of which excise taxpayer could afford to pay an additional tax more.

It seems to me that it would have been much less burdensome to our lower income groups—and just as easy from a tax writing standpoint—to have reimposed the luxury taxes that I have previously named, rather than attaching this tax increase to the telephone tax just because all of it was not completely eliminated last year. Until this bill is amended, which can only be done on the motion to recommit, to tax these luxury items rather than the telephones, I cannot support it.

Mr. UTT. I would agree with the gentleman from Ohio, but I simply tried to give the gentleman the tortuous logic which was used in the committee in order to arrive at this point.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when this debate opened I thought that I might have the good fortune of following not only the distinguished chairman of our committee, but the equally distinguished and capable gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and I decided that I would tell the members of the Committee that I was doubly fortunate in following two such men.

But by reason of the change in the program, I confess to being trebly fortunate, for not only do I follow the chairman, who in his usual gracious, capable, and nonpartisan way, presented the merits of the pending bill, not only was I able to look forward to following the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who did his usual magnificent job exploring in an obviously nonpartisan way the economics of the situation, but I have the treble good fortune of following our good and sturdy Member, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate somewhat lest I disturb these placid nonpartisan waters that have obtained through this afternoon, for I am exceedingly pleased that the majority of the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means have indicated their support for the measure now under consideration, even though their support is characterized by them as "reluctant" in their separate views.

Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at their reluctance, for that is not uncharacteristic of the support for many of the measures and programs that have been advanced and enacted and successfully established over the years in which I have served in the Congress. I am not a little bit surprised, however, that the minority's expressed reluctance, while not of a measure sufficient to cause them to vote against the pending bill has its basis in their concepts and convictions with respect to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KEOGH. I have no alternative but to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I just want to express to the gentleman from New York that I hope he will not go so far as to force any of us to change our mind.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I pondered that very possibility greatly.

I was on the verge of simply extending my remarks. But the whole tenor of this debate followed the chairman's statement on such a high, nonpolitical, nonpartisan basis that I was impelled to take the floor. But accepting the advice of my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from New York is granted and the gentleman yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, the reports of the press in recent days are replete with references and articles to the effect that an attempt will be made to make this overall issue—fiscal responsibility—a primary topic of debate in this very important year.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. Chairman, my esteem and commendation for the minority's expressed concern for fiscal responsibility scarcely knows bounds. I congratulate them warmly and enthusiastically for their expressed endorsement of responsible action in fiscal matters. Certainly no one could be critical of such pronouncement.

I think, however, Mr. Chairman, that even a cursory scanning of the RECORD reveals some variances in the armor of fiscal prudence that has come from orators of the minority in recent weeks. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly call attention to the subway strike and settlement in the city of New York only last month. This is a geographical area in which the minority is not presently without considerable power and responsibility for the caliber of fiscal responsibility manifested in the affairs of that great city. This settlement has been criticized as inflationary and very considerably and noticeably beyond the wage-price policy of the present administration.

I should like to quote briefly from excerpts of the statement of Mr. Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in this matter:

> I deeply regret that the New York transit strike had to be settled on terms that far exceeded the Government's wage guideposts.

The strike and the terms of its settlement were costly not to New York alone. They constitute a serious violation of the wage-price policy of the Federal Government designed to protect a whole Nation from destructive inflation.

Mr. Ackley's statement goes on and concludes with this very significant final sentence:

The public interest has been adversely affected both by the strike and by the terms of its settlement.

So, Mr. Chairman, while I am delighted to have the minority, even with their characteristic reluctance, in support of the measure, I am somewhat disappointed that their reluctance on this occasion is assigned to supposed deficiencies in the bill from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, our actions here in the Congress by necessity and nature are many times based on comparisons. I would, therefore, as graciously and sincerely as I know how, invite a comparison between the President's tax program in this bill with the wage settlement in New York. Let the minority use their own expressed yardstick or dimensions of fiscal responsibility and let them tell us which is the more fiscally prudent action in our present economic situation—this bill or the wage settlement in New York.

If such an examination is objectively made, Mr. Chairman, I am confident that whatever reluctance there might have been will disappear and this legislation and the other measures that the President has taken and is taking will receive the wholehearted—not reluctant—support of my good friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that this is fiscally prudent legislation worthy of the strong and enthusiastic endorsement of all of my colleagues. The President in a letter on January 19 to our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said he was faced, as the Nation's Chief Executive, with three choices.

The President made this prefatory comment:

The moneys that will flow into the Federal Treasury under present tax laws will not be sufficient to maintain the right fiscal balance during the coming year. Without any changes in the tax laws, budget receipts will rise sharply in response to the sustained economic expansion. But they still would be too low to maintain our economic growth and prosperity without running the risk of inflation.

Then the President turned to the three choices he faced: A deficit in excess of $6.5 billion, which would require the Government to borrow the additional money; an increase in corporate and personal income tax rates, or other new taxes; or temporary restoration of certain excise taxes, and adoption of graduated withholding of individual income taxes and current payment of corporate income taxes to put the American people on a pay-as-you-go basis without increasing the total tax bill due.

The President chose the third alternative—which he called—and note these adjectives—"moderate, equitable, responsible, and essential." And he also assured us:

If our needs in Vietnam require additional revenues, I will not hesitate to request them.

If this tax bill—one that is designed to withdraw about $2.7 billion from private purchasing power in calendar 1966—were the only force in the direction of economic restraint, I might be tempted to give more weight to the views of those who tend to grasp at one small component of current economic performance and regard it as sure proof that the U.S. economic machine is overheating.

But think back a bit on fiscally prudent measures that have already been taken.

The Federal Reserve Board last December 5 boosted the discount rate from 4 to 4½ percent.

And President Johnson put his Federal budget for fiscal 1967 together in such a way that the added costs of the Vietnam situation received top priority.

In conclusion, the President and his advisers have defined the aim of fiscal policies over the next 18 months as follows:

To preserve the sound economic expansion we enjoyed in 1965 and earlier years—to maintain a strong and healthy prosperity—and to move toward lower levels of unemployment but neither so far or so fast that bottlenecks and inflationary pressures arise.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is an essential part of the moderate, equitable, and responsible course that is being followed at this time. Therefore, I urge its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the precedent set by my illustrious colleague, the gentleman from New York, I intend to make only a few observations and to submit my remarks.

Mr. KEOGH. I am confident that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, will maintain the high plane of debate that I sought not to disturb.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the motion to recommit to be offered by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT]. If this motion is adopted, I would support the bill, because the most objectionable part would be stricken.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to House passage of the bill now before us known as the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, H.R. 12752. The reasons for my opposition are set forth in the separate views in the accompanying committee report in which my esteemed committee colleague from California [Mr. UTT] and I joined. I also concur for the most part in the well-considered separate views of my other Republican colleagues who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means.

In an important sense the bill before us today is not just a tax bill; it is a spending bill. The bill is before us because we have spent too much in the past, we are spending too much in the present, and we propose to spend too much in the future. And the truth of the matter is that if this Congress acquiesces in the fiscal policies of this administration, the bill now before us will not be the last tax bill that we will be requested to approve this year.

The alleged justification for this increase in tax burden on which we will vote today is the recognized need to finance fully the cost of our defense commitments in southeast Asia. But the truth of the matter is that our necessary defense spending could largely be met out of existing revenues if the administration would only agree to defer some of its grandiose Great Society spending programs. My assertion in this regard can be demonstrated by reference to the administration's own figures. An analysis of the budget figures reveals that increases in Great Society costs will amount to at least $3.5 billion for fiscal year 1967. The budget also anticipates an increase in revenues under existing law of $6 billion in fiscal year 1967 resulting from growth in the level of economic activity. If the revenue increase is realized as projected and the expansion of the Great Society was deferred until it could be afforded, we would have budget adjustments that would come close to compensating for the estimated buildup in Vietnam costs for fiscal year 1967 of $10.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that it was only last June that we were told it was fiscally prudent and economically desirable for the Congress to approve sweeping excise tax reduction legislation. It was also last June amid great fanfare that the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 was signed into law. I cannot help but wonder what kind of ceremony will be arranged to attend the signing of the bill now before us when it passes the Congress. I cannot help but also wonder how many months will elapse before the administration will be back with the Second Tax Increase Act of 1966.

The off-again, on-again approach to tax policy pursued by the administration constitutes a dangerously unsettling attempt to attain an aura of fiscal responsibility at a time of soaring extravagance, intolerable waste, alarming inflation, and stifling debt. The administration's fiscal maneuvers which are charted in an obscure way in the budget message can only lead to distrust of our policies and declining confidence in the integrity of our Government. Time magazine for February 18, 1966, contains an essay captioned "Reading the Budget for Fun and Profit" which states:

Lyndon Johnson, who delights in making use of every available lever of power, has used the budget to further his own ends more than any of his predecessors.

Mr. Chairman, rather than charting a responsible fiscal course in his budget message, the President has outlined an uncertain and contradictory collection of spending programs that is devoid of any evidence of fiscal discipline or expenditure restraint. The bill now under consideration is intended to further these confused purposes.

Mr. Chairman, table B–9 on page 394 of the budget message provides the shocking information that the gross expenditures of the Federal Government in fiscal year 1967 will be $175 billion—or approximately 25 percent of our gross

national product. This is $12 billion more than is contemplated for the current fiscal year and $30 billion more than was spent as recently as 1965. Is national defense the category in which the largest increase over 1965 has occurred? Not at all. The increase for national defense, comparing 1965 with 1967, is $10.8 billion but the increase for the category health, labor, and welfare is $11.2 billion. This spending trend makes it inescapable that we ask ourselves the fundamental question, "Should the Great Society have priority over our endeavors in Vietnam?"

Our last budgetary surplus was in fiscal year 1960. Since then Federal spending has increased 47 percent and we have added $35 billion to the public debt with what will be seven successive deficits at the end of fiscal year 1967. During the course of the debate today we will undoubtedly hear attempts to rationalize this record of fiscal profligacy on the grounds that as a percent of our gross national product our debt is not growing. Several observations can be made about this fallacious rationale. First, Government spending is a part of our gross national product and therefore as spending grows so does our gross national product. Second, such an assertion implicity assumes that we do not intend to retire or pay off the debt. Third, the contention ignores the fact that the growing debt carrys with it growing interest charges which in the 1967 budget will be the largest single nondefense expenditure item in the amount of $12.8 billion. And, fourth, the contention fails to take account of the fact that rising debt tends to severely restrict the flexibility and resources that will be available to deal with future contingencies.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated I am opposed to the enactment of H.R. 12752. I believe the measure is a breach of faith with the Nation's taxpayers. Six months ago the American people were told it was good economics to cut taxes on such items as sales of automobiles and telephone services. I believe it is still good economics and it would also be good economics to provide for our increasing expenditures in Vietnam by practicing economy at home on nonessential programs of the Great Society. I disapprove of the fiscal manipulations of the administration as evidenced by its 1967 budget and I intend to manifest that disapproval by voting "no" today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I supported this legislation, H.R. 12752, when it was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. I also support this legislation on the floor of the House today.

I do so, however, with a reasonable degree of reluctance, hesitancy, misgiving, and regret.

No one, of course, likes to increase taxes. There is nothing politically popular about a tax increase bill, and this is a tax increase bill. Make no mistake about it.

I recognize the fact that it has been called by other titles. In fact, the official title of the bill is the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. It has often been referred to in the press as a restoration of certain taxes or an adjustment or acceleration of collection of revenue. I admit that these references do no sound quite as bad as the phrase "tax increase," but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that just like the phrase, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet," this bill raises revenue, and you cannot make its effect any different by using other labels. This bill will impose additional taxes on the American people, taken from the fruits of their labor, $1.155 billion in fiscal year 1966 and $4.830 billion in fiscal year 1967.

In other words, without this bill the American people would have more money to provide for the basic necessities of life, and even some of the conveniences of life. Without this bill American industries would have more capital under which to conduct their operations and more surplus from which to pay dividends to stockholders.

Regardless of what name we assign to this legislation, the fact of the matter is that we do need additional revenue, and we may as well face up to it. And this is the reason why I am supporting this legislation.

It has been pointed out by some, that the primary purpose of this legislation is to help pay for the increased costs of the war in Vietnam. It is true that the cost of the war in Vietnam is increasing. But, by the same token the revenue under present tax laws is increasing and our economy is expanding and increasing also. If the cost of the war in Vietnam was the only expenditure increasing, and we were not receiving any other increases in revenue, there would be no argument whatsoever as to the necessity and fairness of this legislation.

When American men are fighting and dying on foreign soil, it is the duty of the U.S. Congress and the American people to back them 100 percent. Regardless of how they got there; regardless of whether we approve of our foreign policy in its entirety, it is our duty to stand behind American troops wherever they represent us in any part of the world. I am confident that all good patriotic American citizens feel that way, and in that light, would be willing to support this bill. The American people are willing to sacrifice, and I use that word advisedly, for I do not mean we will have to sacrifice the hungry and poor. But the American people are, as a whole, willing to work a little harder, to tighten up their belts, and to make whatever extra contribution is necessary to help insure the freedom of our country.

The thing that causes many of us a great deal of concern about this legislation, however, is the belief that this tax bill in the final analysis will be used for other purposes. Many of us feel that we should be making every effort to delay and hold up, if not completely eliminate, some of these nonessential programs, rather than accelerating them as has been proposed by the President.

We have all heard much about guns and butter. I think our economy is strong enough to provide some butter along with the guns, and I am, therefore, not advocating eliminating butter in its entirety. I do feel, however, that we must eliminate the gravy—and the gravy train.

What we are doing is paying, in many instances, millions upon millions of dollars for people to be worthless and no good; while good and industrious young men are fighting for us in Vietnam. The American people are wondering why we are doing this, Mr. Chairman; and they are entitled to know. They want us to justify this legislation and to be sure it will serve the purposes we are told it is designed to serve.

Mr. Chairman, the real reason for this bill, then is to try to halt inflation, and to try to bring the Federal Government costs into balance. If we have failed to halt or reduce our expenditures in other areas we will be compounding the error if we fail to meet our financial responsibilities by raising the revenue to pay for them.

We therefore have two choices to make as to the real reason why increases in expenditures are necessitating this tax bill: It will pay for either first, the war in Vietnam; or, second, the war on poverty. Or, to put it in even more descriptive language, as it is actually being applied today we have a choice between jungle warfare in Vietnam and jungle warfare in the United States of America.

And now, for comments on a few of the provisions of the bill itself:

The most unfortunate part of the entire bill is the fact that we have found it necessary to raise some of the excise taxes so soon after having found it desirable to reduce them. We have always agreed that excise taxes were among the most undesirable forms of taxation. They have been under constant criticism for years, and were only meant to be temporary taxes when they were first enacted. But, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, nothing seems to be more permanent than a temporary tax, unless it is a temporary Government building in Washington, D.C.

In increasing these taxes, however, we took the most convenient items to increase. Or, it may be more appropriate to say we took the least inconvenient items upon which to increase the tax. These, of course, were the taxes on the telephone and automobiles. These taxes had not been completely eliminated. Therefore, the bookkeeping mechanisms did not need to be reestablished.

A second reason for choosing the automobiles and telephone was the fact that they would bring in more revenue than the other items reduced last year. In fact, these two items will bring in revenue for fiscal year 1967 in the amount of $1.205 billion.

We did make three major changes in the excise tax proposals as presented by the administration which I feel are substantial improvements.

First of all, we limited this increase to 2 years rather than postponing the present law which calls for a gradual reduction of these taxes for 2 additional years. In other words, the committee provided that in 1968 the taxes on automobiles

and telephones would revert to the same level that they would be under existing law in the absence of this bill. The administration, on the other hand, proposed that we start all over again with the present schedule at today's rates in 1968.

The second change was an attempt by the committee to eliminate, as much as possible, the hardship on the automobile dealers of the 1-percent increase in excise taxes for automobiles in stock at the time of the passage of this bill. There was $25 million additional revenue involved by adding the 1-percent increase to the floor stock. Since the dealers in many instances did not know what the manufacturer's cost of the automobile was, the committee provided that the manufacturers would be designated as the collection agents for these taxes and would therefore bill each dealer for the amount he would owe on the automobiles he had in stock at the time of passage of the bill.

The third change, and improvement, to the existing law was to exempt nonprofit hospitals from the telephone excise tax in its entirety. Under existing law, Government-owned hospitals, whether they are city, Federal or State, are now exempt from payment of an excise tax on telephone service. Educational institutions, both Government and nonprofit, are likewise exempt from excise taxes on telephones under existing law. It was felt by the committee that the noprofit nongovernment hospitals should receive the same treatment as Government-owned hospitals, particularly since many of these nonprofit hospitals had already prepared their budgets counting on the 7-percent telephone tax reduction of January 1 to offset increased costs to them of social security taxes and other expenditures. Rather than impose this economic hardship on them, the committee felt the existing law should be amended so as to eliminate the telephone excise tax for them.

In the section of this bill involving graduated withholding taxes and speedup in payment of certain corporation taxes, we find that we have a one-shot tax advance of about $1.1 billion in fiscal year 1966 and $3.6 billion in fiscal year 1967. This is one of the reasons the bill has not been called a tax increase bill, but it does mean additional money from the pockets of the American people this year.

And the advance they are making to the Government will continue to be advanced year after year ad infinitum. They will never get it back. But, on the other side of the picture, is the fact that this procedure does not provide the Federal Government with additional revenue in later years, since it is a one-shot step-up procedure. If additional revenue is needed in future years, an additional tax increase will be necessary.

There are two problems involved in this withholding tax and speedup collection proposal to which the committee gave a great deal of attention. One is in the area of overwithholding by virtue of the graduated withholding tax proposal. One of the purposes of the graduated withholding tax proposal, in addition to advancing the collection of revenue, was to bring collection more in line with the actual tax liability of the individual. Yet, we found that the graduated withholding tax proposal provided for an increase in overwithholding to $6.050 billion. In fact, for the wage earners in the $5,000 to $10,000 income bracket, there was still $3.5 billion overwithheld. While we all realize we cannot eliminate all underwithholding and all overwithholding, the committee did want to reduce the inconvenience of overwithholding as much as possible. With this in mind, we came up with a seemingly complicated formula which would permit an additional $700 exemption to each employee whose deductions in the preceding year exceeded 12 percent of the first $7,500 of his income and 17 percent of income over $7,500. He will get an additional $700 exemption for withholding tax purposes for each $700 of deductions over the percentages I have just stated for calendar years beginning after December 31, 1966.

As I said before, this is a rather complicated formula, but it represents the best efforts of the committee in trying to eliminate as much as possible the hardship which may have been caused by increased overwithholding.

The other problem involved in this adjustment of taxes was the effect the additional $1 billion tax collection in fiscal year 1966 and the additional $3.2 billion collection in fiscal year 1967 would have on our Nation's corporations.

It was pointed out to the committee by the Secretary of the Treasury that since this acceleration of tax payments only applied to corporations earning over $100,000 a year it would involve the type of businesses which normally made provision in advance for setting funds aside for their tax responsibility as it accrued. Corporations do in many instances buy short-term bonds or certificates of deposits in order to obtain interest income from these funds so set aside.

It should, therefore, cause no great shock to these corporations to make tax payments early. On the other hand, however, it is obvious that the advance payment of their tax liability will reduce the cash capital they will have on hand. It could, in fact, reduce their operating funds wherein these corporations could be using their funds set aside for tax payments rather than having to make short-term loans from the bank or selling their own bonds for interim operating capital.

This bill, then, could be costly to some corporations even though they have made provision for payment of taxes when they come due under existing law. They may have to sell bonds in the month in which they would be paying interest rather than receiving interest, and this could cause some reduction of dividends to the stockholders by virtue of their having to use surplus capital which they would have had on hand if this legislation had not passed.

The Secretary of the Treasury assured the committee, however, that all of these contingencies had been taken into consideration and that it should have no visible effect on the revenue received from these corporations in the future.

So let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that by and large after recognizing that the need for additional revenue exists, this is a well worked out piece of legislation. The Committee on Ways and Means, and particularly the chairman, has done a commendable job.

This is my 14th year as a Member of the House of Representatives. I had served for 11 years before I had the privilege of being assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means. I had been a Member of the Congress long enough for most of the novelty and awe to wear off. In fact, I am reminded of the story many of us have heard concerning the young Congressman who, when first elected to the House of Representatives, walked through the august halls of Congress looking around at his colleagues in amazement and wondering how he ever got here. But, when he quickly caught on to the hustle and bustle of our daily operations and became acquainted with his colleagues, he began to wonder how the rest of us ever got here.

But, regardless of having been here for a number of years, I am indeed impressed with the thoroughness and the meticulous detail with which all bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means are deliberated and explored. Such is the case with this bill. The chairman was extremely fair as he always is. The suggestions of every committee member were thoroughly considered. And, as I pointed out, some changes were made as a result of these suggestions. Mr. Chairman, this bill was, I believe, the best that could be produced at this time concerning this subject.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I am not opposed to the acceleration of tax collection, but I am opposed to deferring the reduction of the auto excise taxes and telephone excise taxes. Unlike the gentleman on the other side, I find this bill, however, neither illogical nor tortured logic. It is simple logic and untortured tax collection. The way you run this bill is to pick up the taxes from four payers in the State of Michigan, the automobile industry, which causes more employment in this country than any other one industry. One person in every six gainfully employed persons in this country is employed either directly or indirectly because of the automobile industry. Therefore, I feel that industry is not the proper industry to have the excise tax reductions deferred. I think we should have looked a little further and done a more equitable job in the taxing of all of the industry of the country for the payment of those things that are necessary for our people.

I oppose this bill, Mr. Chairman, and I want to make it quite clear, even if this bill passes, I trust this House returns again and reduces the excise taxes on telephones and automobiles.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a sense of regret that I rise to protest the proposed reimposition of excise taxes requested by the President. I say regretfully for two reasons. First, because, as I told the members of the Committee on Ways and Means last month, I had looked forward to 1966 as the first year in the 10 years I have been in Congress when it would not be necessary to protest against the continuance of these so-called temporary taxes in general and the discriminatory levy on automobiles in particular. I am certain that not only members of the committee, but of the House at large, looked upon that prospect with equal pleasure.

Second, I would regret very much if my words today were so interpreted as to suggest an unwillingness on my part to support our fighting men in South Vietnam. Nothing could be further from my intentions. We obviously need more funds to do the job there. I recognize this and am ready to do my part. The question before us today is simply whether the reimposition of these excise taxes, admitted by the President to be unfair and burdensome is a just and proper means to raise these needed revenues. I submit that it is not.

In his message to the Congress on May 17, 1965, the President proposed the program of excise tax reduction on the grounds that it would—

Lower prices to consumers;

Lessen the burden of regressive taxes on low-income families;

Raise business profits by expanding sales and cutting costs of tax compliance;

Cut the Government's costs of tax collection and enforcement;

End an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation;

Free consumers from the distorting effects of these taxes on their market choices.

It is true, of course, that the administration initially only wished to reduce the automobile excise tax from 10 to 5 percent. However, when the committee insisted that the rate be dropped to 1 percent the President agreed saying:

While I prefer the program I recommended, I feel that if the tax is to be removed the Ways and Means Committee program represents a prudent way of doing so.

Last year a significant chapter in legislative history was written when these selective excise taxes were cast out, in principle and in fact, from our overall tax structure. The committee, after months of study, and Congress have done their work and done it well. These excises were found guilty as charged as being inherently discriminatory and a drag on the economy. Today, however, we are being asked to set aside much of last session's good work. The President has recommended that the reduction in the automobile and certain telephone excise taxes, made law only a few months ago, be "temporarily" postponed for 2 years.

I believe that the 2-year extension provision would set a bad precedent. During the Korean war emergency the excise tax on automobiles was raised from 7 to 10 percent. This increase and other ones were lent some credibility for being temporary by the fact that they required an annual affirmative action by Congress to their continued life. Mr. Chairman, it took over 12 years after the Korean war to remove these so-called temporary taxes even with this annual review requirement. I am not at all optimistic that this temporary restoration will be any shorter by a 2-year extension. While I was somewhat encouraged by the action of the committee in insisting that after this 2-year period the schedule of staggered reductions be accelerated, it would come as no great surprise to me if 2 years from now we were asked to extend these temporary taxes for another 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how the military situation changes in the months immediately ahead, it appears likely that our presence in South Vietnam will be required for a period considerably longer than 2 more years. The President himself has warned us of a long period of involvement. That being the case I would respectfully suggest that instead of seeking what may be the quickest and easiest method for increasing tax revenues we should strive to obtain what is the fairest and best form of taxation. I am not satisfied that the reimposition of these taxes, which no one here, I believe, would deny are burdensome and discriminatory, represents the fairest or best means to obtain the money we may need. Why should two sectors of our economy be made to shoulder such a heavy share of the added cost of our military effort?

It is highly unjust to arbitrarily single out the automobile excise tax as a possible source of additional revenue simply because automobile sales are high, or because restoration of this tax could be accomplished with little administrative difficulty. In all fairness, can we reimpose this tax on a highly necessary and useful consumer product while allowing the purchase of luxury items such as mink coats and diamond rings to go untaxed?

It may well be, Mr. Chairman, that the restoration of these taxes is the most expedient thing to do, but that is not the question. Rather we should be asking, Is it the right thing to do? For the present I have yet to be convinced that the administration cannot solve our fiscal problems without resorting to these admittedly discriminatory measures. I am satisfied that we are going to need a good deal more money for our efforts in Vietnam in the months ahead, and I will support increasing such taxes as may be found to be required. We cannot cut back where it reduces our military effectiveness, especially at a time when American soldiers are in daily combat. Nevertheless, I am convinced that these added tax revenues can be and should be collected on a fair basis.

Therefore, let us not act hastily and undo what has been successfully accomplished by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, but let us carefully explore possible areas of Federal expenditure where economies might be achieved or look to other more equitable sources for additional tax revenues.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this bill with some reluctance, because I have reacted to its provisions with conflicting thoughts.

I accept the fact that we need additional revenues to finance the Nation's military operations in Vietnam. In this respect I favor the effort being made to secure these revenues through changes in the tax laws. But, after considerable consideration of the situation that faces us, I disagree with a part of the method employed to obtain the revenues.

My comments on the bill have been set forth in separate views published in the report on H.R. 12752 by the Committee on Ways and Means. Let me outline these for you.

The Revenue Act of 1964 gave the American taxpayer the largest tax cut in the history of our country, and in doing so, the Congress acted in a fiscally responsible manner. That act, which I wholeheartedly supported, was designed to bring about a balance of our Federal budget, and I certainly think we would have accomplished that goal except for the Vietnam conflict.

We have seen the very favorable economic improvements that have resulted from the 1964 act. Unemployment is down to 4 percent and all indications are that we will continue to have a high rate of economic prosperity.

Before enactment of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, I cautioned that each measure must be judged in terms of its impact on the Federal budget and in the light of our defense posture in Asia, and elsewhere. Fiscal responsibility should be stressed, I said, and should be the guiding force and dominant feature in any future tax legislation.

In his budget message to the Congress this year, the President estimates a budget deficit of $6.4 billion for fiscal year 1966 and a deficit of $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1967. These deficits will exist although the Congress has been asked to approve a tax measure which will result in a revenue increase of $4.8 billion when the measure is fully effective.

In this connection, we should ask ourselves whether we, as representatives of the people, have accepted fully our responsibilities. Our goal under present circumstances should be one of achieving a balanced budget, and our efforts should be aimed in that direction.

American lives are being sacrificed on the battlefields, and I am convinced Americans at home are willing to make the necessary sacrifice to pay for the support of our forces in Vietnam.

This is confirmed by personal discussions with many of my constituents and from the general nationwide support given the President in this unfortunate situation.

This legislation is titled the "Tax Adjustment Act of 1966." But, in my estimation it fails to meet the needs. It is unfair in the treatment of the excise taxes. I believe the American people

would desire that our revenues be obtained in a different manner.

The bill makes several adjustments in tax collection procedures that will speed up income tax payments by individuals and corporations. No additional tax burdens are imposed. These provisions I favor. It restores the excise tax on automobiles and communications to the levels of January 1, 1966. It delays the scheduled reductions in the taxes on automobiles and telephones—which apply to essentials for the American people. I believe it is unfair to restore and delay further cuts in the excise taxes on automobiles and telephones and not restore the cuts on the luxury and other items not as essential to the people.

Why raise and maintain excise taxes on automobiles and communications and not restore the excises on such items as furs, jewelry, luggage and handbags, and toilet preparations in the retail field? Why not restore manufacturers' taxes on such items as television sets and sporting goods, just to name two items on the list reduced last year. And, what about restoring the taxes on cabarets and clubs?

Personally, I do not wish to restore any of these excise taxes, which are considered regressive in nature. I reiterate that we should not raise the excise rates that affect automobiles and telephones, however, unles we turn to other less essential items.

It seems to me that it would be more fiscally responsible to ask the American taxpayers—both individuals and corporations—to give up half of the income tax received under the 1964 act as his contribution to the war effort. This would result in revenue increases, at a minimum, of more than $5.5 billion annually. The American public, I am sure, would support such a "victory tax." It would bring about a balance in the Federal budget, and in my judgment would be a much more fiscally responsible approach to our domestic and world situation today.

Needless to say, the income tax applies greatest to taxpayers who can best afford it. The excise, or "nuisance taxes," apply to those least able to afford them—except in the so-called luxury items.

There have been recent reports in the press that the Administration is, in fact, considering other measures designed to keep down inflation and to obtain the revenues needed for military and domestic programs. We may be called upon within the next few weeks or months to adopt income tax legislation that I believe is needed now, and which we could be considering today.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to act properly in giving our Government the funds it needs to support our fighting men in Vietnam. I disagree with the excise tax provisions we have in H.R. 12752. I believe the American people would want us to simplify the whole procedure through the income tax laws, and I favor the "victory tax" plan I have suggested.

Finally, the "victory tax" increase would be eliminated swiftly and we could all feel much better over the results—revenues to finance the Vietnam war and a balanced budget.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, the American people are not being told the truth by this administration. They are not being told about the accounting tricks and budget gimmicks in the fiscal 1967 budget. They are instead being told that the budget is almost balanced. I think this Congress ought to make certain that the truth gets before the people. This is a good place to start.

Part of this tax package is a tax hike, let us make no mistake about it, and part of it is a glorified accounting trick to shift future revenues into the coming fiscal year. The tax hike is one of the most unfair I have ever seen and the accounting tricks are multi-billion-dollar deceptions designed to beef up fiscal 1967 revenues.

Now I would go along with this sort of thing to some extent if we needed the money for a 1- or 2-year war effort, but that is not the case here. We have enough money for the war effort—even if it drags on for as long as this administration would seem to indicate. The President wants these extra revenues so that the American people can be tricked into thinking we can afford his wild-eyed and extravagant world-saving programs. The tax package we are voting today is a piece of wool to pull over the eyes of the American taxpayer. This is not the function the Congress ought to fulfill.

I think that Congress should tell the American people that this tax package represents a tax on the President's rose-colored glasses. Last year, the President put on his rose-colored glasses to tell us that nothing foreseeable in Vietnam could jeopardize the proposed excise tax cut. Those were great rose-colored glasses. The reason given for this tax package is the cost of Vietnam—although the budget could easily be cut in nondefense spending so that we might avoid the need for this tax package.

The American people are going to pay for this tax package so that the President's misjudgment in Vietnam does not put any real dent in the proposed expenditures for his wild-eyed, world-saving programs.

The most unjustified thing in this tax package is the reimposition of the telephone excise tax. As the AFL-CIO said last year, this is a tax on low- and middle-income families. The typical telephone-owning family will pay $5 or $10 a year to the Government because of this tax. I think that this tax is 100 percent unnecessary.

There are dozens of reasons why this particular tax should not be reimposed even if we had an overwhelming legitimate need for increased tax revenues. Let me give a few. The telephone excise tax is the only excise on an essential household utility. It falls directly on the consumer and if eliminated, benefits only the consumer by its removal, not some middleman. The most emphatic reason for removal of the telephone tax is that it will fall on 8 million families with incomes under the national $3,000 poverty line. Certainly we have programs that could be sacrificed to avoid this kind of a tax boost.

I would like to suggest that we cut out part of the "poverty" program to make up for the telephone tax hike. I understand that only 1 family out of 10 among our Nation's poor will collect anything from the so-called poverty program this year. More than half of these families would profit if the Congress threw out this telephone tax hike. Forgetting about this telephone tax hike would be a better "poverty" program than Sargent Shriver has ever come up with. It would help poor people, not social workers.

I urge the Congress to reject the telephone tax boost. It is a tax on the poor to pay for waste. It is a tax on free speech to underwrite secrecy and misrepresentation.

I am glad to see that the excessive withholding rates for middle-income families have been reduced. Otherwise, under administration proposals, millions of middle-income taxpayers would have been indirectly taxed through unfair excessive withholding.

As I have already said, this country is not so badly in need of money that we have to resort to the telephone tax. It is the most unfair of the excise taxes. There are many programs that should be cut before an unfair tax like this is imposed. It is not as if we need the money for desperately essential war-related programs—we have enough revenues for those programs. This revenue being sought today is being sought to pay for grandiose global and domestic giveaways that would be out of place even in the best of fiscal years.

The programs I am thinking of are programs like the international health and education program which talks about world saving while there are millions of needy, illiterate, or starving Americans. I am talking about foreign aid, which pours good money after bad in every corner of the globe. I am talking about military aid to Europe, while Europe thumbs her nose. In line with this concern, I have introduced a resolution to call on the President to begin withdrawing our troops from Europe. We could save enough money that way to skip this telephone tax. Of course there are domestic programs that ought to be slashed—like the poverty program and the infamous "rent supplement." I think we ought to ask ourselves what sort of thing the telephone tax will make room for in the budget. I have no doubt the telephone tax has been paired by backroom planners with some worthless program we would be well advised to defeat even if we had a budget surplus.

The revenues to be voted here today are not aimed only at subsidizing waste abroad—this budget contains enough waste on the home front as well. I understand that the President is tightening his own belt by reactivating the Presidential yacht. I am sure that the American public will be overwhelmed by this sacrifice. Last year, the President tried to pass a tax on bread. Perhaps this year there will be wedding cakes in the White House budget. Either we are

fighting a war or we are not. It is time to stop playing "let's pretend."

I believe that we ought to hold taxes down and cut back on wasteful domestic and overseas programs. If we must have the wasteful programs, then let us pay for them without revenue devices like the excise tax on telephones. There are, after all, alternative revenue sources.

The chairman of this distinguished committee says that there is no painless tax. I do not agree with him. There is a painless tax and voluntary to boot.

I believe that a national lottery would easily surpass the telephone tax in the revenues it would bring in. I think that quite a bit of money could be raised by a lottery operating to support the U.S. war effort. In World War II, we had "Victory Bonds"—why not a "Victory Lottery" in this conflict? It would be less painful and more profitable than the telephone tax.

Let me say again that I oppose this tax package. It is more a deception than a revenue device. The President has strained every muscle to camouflage fiscal reality. He has milked every possible source of jumped-up revenues to cram as much revenue as possible into the coming fiscal year. He has made a great effort to disguise our real need to dispense with wasteful domestic and overseas spending programs. I wish a similar effort had been made to tell the American people what is going on, at home and abroad.

I urge the Members of this House to show courage and vote down this tax bill.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Committee's indulgence at this point to make an overall observation about this program.

First, I am sympathetic. I feel very strongly that the first part of this tax package needs to be accomplished with respect to withholding. While I am not willing to rely on these new proposals as a means of raising the necessary revenue for the war emergency, I am willing to accept them as a step in the right direction.

I believe what we ought to realize here is that we are dealing with reform that would need to be done whether or not we were in an emergency. We should not rely on this suggested reform as a means of raising the additional revenues required for the emergency in which we find ourselves.

Nevertheless, despite my misgivings, I would be willing to support it if it were not coupled with the other provision to restore or defer the excise tax reduction on telephones and automobiles.

I believe, however, in trying to find the means of additional revenue that we should not seek the easy—I will use that term instead of the more harsh term, expedient—way of raising the revenue.

We should not impose the burden for this additional money on any particular segment. While it is true that the great majority of our citizens do now subscribe to telephone service and will be participating and that a great majority of our citizens do now purchase automobiles and will be participating, it is nevertheless wrong in my judgment to seek to have these two categories of people alone bear the burden of this extra cost.

It is my thinking that the final judgment will be that this tax proposal will not be a shining example of the many illustrious efforts of this committee and the administration heretofore to face up to our responsibility.

I wish I could support this because I do want to be a part of accepting the responsibility to raise the revenue necessary to take us through this emergency.

I think we are not doing that with the first part. We are just merely reforming where we need reform and the revenues are not going to be sufficient. It is purely a one-shot proposition.

In the second place, I think we are being unfair in deferring the reduction of these excises. I believe that we should resist the desire to be expeditious in this thing and face up to the responsibility of levying whatever tax is necessary to take us through the emergency and provide, in doing so, that when the emergency is over, the tax levied for that purpose automatically expires.

Last year the telephone subscribers were told that 7 percent of the 10-percent excise tax on telephones would come off in January 1966 and that the remaining 3 percent would come off by January 1, 1969. The automobile dealers and purchasers of automobiles were told that the excise tax on automobiles would be reduced to 1 percent by January 1969.

To place a moratorium on the reduction of these excises on absolute necessities without restoring the excises on certain luxuries which were removed entirely, effective at the end of last year, is wrong. It just is not equitable.

I fully understand and appreciate the fact that the Treasury's original proposal has been modified and that the action advocated here is to impose a moratorium with the expectation that the ultimate reduction will occur as originally scheduled. Moreover, I fully understand that it is easier to adopt this moratorium since the two excises in question do remain in our statutes; and while this modification of the original proposal does make the plan more palatable, it nevertheless is still distasteful in that it does not remove the inequity of collecting an excise on necessities while luxury items go free.

The observation has been made that this action is more desirable than the imposition of a general tax increase because a general increase should be deferred until the Congress can reduce expenditures for programs not related to our efforts in Vietnam.

I believe that we can reduce expenditures in certain nonemergency fields in sufficient amount to meet accelerated costs of the war in Vietnam; and while I do not want to see many of the measures the first session of this Congress enacted reduced to a state of impotence, I do believe that the prudent action to take at this time is to reduce to a minimum certain of these expenditures rather than to reimpose the excise tax on household necessities such as telephones and automobiles.

I wish I could support the program. Under the conditions that it is presented and in the belief that we are doing a most unfair thing to a large segment of our citizens with perhaps no consideration for other things, I cannot.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I guess the first rule of political expediency that any of us hears in beginning our political education would be that it is expedient to vote for all spending programs and it is expedient to vote against all tax increases.

We have nad a real temptation in the 89th Congress to vote for spending programs. There have been many and they have been massive, offering something for everybody. I have been tempted, like everybody else, but I felt that responsibility called for me to vote against these spending programs, and I have voted consistently against them with the exception of the expenditures for defense, and justifiable pay raises for people in Government service, which I wholeheartly support.

Much more tempting, however, is the temptation today to vote against this tax increase. It is always popular to vote against a tax increase, and I guess it always will be. It would be particularly popular to vote against this one, because it is so discriminatory against certain essential businesses, telephones and automobiles.

Of course, there is the added temptation that by voting against this increase we would somehow convince this administration at least to cut down on unnecessary spending.

I feel, however, that we probably should resist this temptation, though reluctantly, because I do not think there is one Member of the House who feels that if we fail to pass this tax increase the administration will really stop spending in the areas where it should have stopped spending already. I think all agree, whether we pass this bill or not, this administration is going to spend money, and spend it fast, for its many unprecedented social programs.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have massive spending. We are going to have a massive budget, and we are going to have a deficit so much higher than the well publicized $1.8 billion, that those who have talked of this figure have only smiled when they told us about it. It will be massive.

I think, therefore, that the overriding issue is one of fiscal responsibility. We have a choice. We are going to have a massive deficit this year. Do we pass it on to future generations to be paid for by inflation, or do we take our medicine and pass a tax increase now? This, very simply, is our choice.

As much as I oppose in this bill, as much as I oppose the spending spree that made it necessary, I will reluctantly vote for it and say that it is the better part of a bad situation to vote for the tax increase now, and at least have the courage to pay for a little bit of our sins while we are still here.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

If I remember correctly, when the tax reduction bill was passed last year, the chairman of the committee indicated that it was necessary, in part, to promote employment in this country.

Now, if I understand it correctly, we have unemployment of 4 percent or less. My question to someone on the committee is, What effect will today's proposed increases have on employment? We have been told previously that tax reduction would be an aid to employment, in other words would decrease unemployment. Are we now going to travel in the opposite direction with respect to employment in the passage of this bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I see the gentleman from Missouri is on his feet, and I assume he is prepared to give his usual thoughtful answer.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York, but I would point out that the point is well taken, of course, to this degree. However, we have increased the employment of young men by about 200,000 in recent months, and it will increase further, also, in the defense industries. First, of course, we have had increases of the men in uniform. In the defense industries there has been an increase of around 200,000 to 300,000. So I suppose this would all be a part of it. The point that I would like to make—and I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to make it—is this: This administration is still talking in terms of this being the longest peacetime upturn in our history. This ceased to be true about June 1965. We have been in a war economy and are in one now. The peacetime theories do not prevail. I think the same point would be made in respect to employment. You cannot consider employment or other economic factors in a wartime period in the same way that you can in peacetime.

Mr. GROSS. Speaking of alleged prosperity and since the gentleman from Missouri is on his feet, I wonder if he would agree with me that the almost $89 billion increase in the public and private debt in 1965 made a very substantial contribution to the alleged prosperity of this country.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and some of that debt is worrying a lot of people because of its quality. Yes. This is a factor which above all I would hope the administration spokesmen would consider. And, also, I hope the administration will stop talking about how well off this country is when they know that we have boys in Vietnam dying. This is no time to be talking about prosperity, and I am fed up with their boasting about it.

Mr. GROSS. Especially when the public and private debt increases by $88 to $89 billion.

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

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield a minute and a half additional to the gentleman from Iowa, if he wants it, if he will yield to me.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Being by nature somewhat bold, I would assume to interject myself in a discussion between the gentleman from Iowa and his colleague from Missouri. I would, however, be compelled to point this out.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to deal with this on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. KEOGH. That is another reason why I would make so bold as to be on my feet. I would remind the gentleman that the tax reduction effected by the act of 1964 amounted to $11.5 billion. The pending bill delays the effective reduction of the scheduled reductions in the excises on automobiles and telephones to the extent of $1.2 billion. I think it cannot be gainsaid by anyone but that the Tax Reduction Act of 1964 was a great contributing factor to the state of the economy generally today.

Mr. GROSS. How about 1965?

Mr. KEOGH. And I think that for years, for years, it has been conceded when unemployment in this country gets down to, or near, or below 4 percent that you are virtually at full employment. My point simply is that it seems to me a delay for 2 years in the reduction of these excises, in my amateur opinion, would have absolutely no effect upon the employment rate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, no one realizes more than I do that what I am about to say will be an exercise in futility, especially in addressing some 20 or 25 Members who are on the floor. I think I understand what the final result will be. I do not intend to make any point of order that a quorum is not present, because I think minds are pretty well made up.

Mr. Chairman, I am in a different position than most of those who have already, or will speak on this bill, inasmuch as I was one of those six who voted against the tax reduction bill last June. At that time I explained that it was not because I was opposed to the reduction and elimination of wartime excise taxes, which should have been removed many years ago, but rather I was opposed to reducing our revenue at a time when we were preparing to authorize an increase in the debt limit. I thought at the time that both actions would have an inflationary effect, and I believe my fears in this respect have been confirmed.

Now, if I voted against the repeal and reduction of taxes last June, some may get the idea that I would be in the most favorable position to vote for this bill today. I will take the few minutes that have been granted to me, to explain why I believe this House will be acting in a most inconsistent and irresponsible manner by adopting the bill now before us.

First, I would remind my friends who are inclined to vote for this bill, that last June we eliminated the excise taxes on many luxury and nonessential commodities and services, and while the bill we are voting on today proposes to restore the cuts which were made on such essential items as automobiles and telephone services, we are doing nothing to reinstate the taxes on jewelry, furs, luggage, purses, handbags, toilet articles, electric, gas and oil appliances, many of which fall into the luxury class, enjoyed by the more affluent segment of our society. When we speak of other items which were included in the removal of excise taxes last June, we are talking about the expensive hi-fi sets, color television, all types of sporting goods, the more sophisticated types of photographic equipment and projectors, used by those who have the means to pay for their indulgence in these types of hobbies. Last June we also removed the excise taxes from cabarets and night clubs, dues for exclusive social clubs, safe deposit boxes, bowling alleys, and billiard parlors, as well as the excise taxes on telegraphic services. The people who use these facilities and services have been relieved of the nuisance and excise taxes, and there is nothing in this bill today to restore those cuts. However, this bill does propose to reinstate the reductions which were made on automobiles and telephones, certainly as essential as any commodity I know.

Tell me, Mr. Chairman, how we are going to justify the discrimination which will be made by the adoption of this bill?

Now let us get down to another consideration which apparently has been overlooked by most people, especially those who are content to let someone else do their thinking for them. I know the President, in his state of the Union message, made some 12 days after some of these reductions had taken effect, recommended the reinstatement of the tax levies on automobiles and telephone service, but I ask you in all sincerity, do you think this recommendation was made as the result of a study by the President. Certainly not, and while I know he accepts the full responsibility of any recommendation he makes, I think all of you know that the same advisers who made the recommendation for the cut last June, made the recommendation for the increase at this time. They were wrong last June and I say they are just as wrong this time. All they are doing now is compounding the mistakes of the past.

Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Chairman, that it was a great surprise to anyone who pretends to know what is going on in the world, to learn that the cost of the war in Vietnam was to continue to rise, and that those who made those recommendations last June did not know that when Congress came back into session this January that there would be the necessity of providing additional revenue? If they did not know that they have no business being in the position of being the advisers to the President.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but I am telling you that, while we are attempting to go through a lot of bookkeeping maneuvers to collect taxes in advance, and we are going to recoup a small portion of the excise taxes we removed last June, we are still going to fall short of raising the money which will be needed

to carry on the operations upon which we have embarked throughout the world, including the war in Vietnam. I am not an economist, I am not even an accountant or bookkeeper, and I do not have a crystal ball. I do believe that I am a man of average intelligence, who has tried to benefit from the experience I have gained throughout the years, and I try to use those faculties with which I am endowed, and on that basis, I am making the prediction here and now that either one of two things will happen before this session of Congress adjourns. Either the President will be coming to this Congress asking for additional revenue, in the form of new or increased taxes, or the fiscal year 1967 will end with a deficit far larger than has been estimated by the President's best advisers. Of course, the Ways and Means Committee which brings us this bill today, under a closed rule, which I voted against, will be back before us with another bill, under a closed rule, asking for an increase in the debt ceiling. I continue to have hope, and I hope that this time they will bring us a bill authorizing a permanent debt ceiling, instead of trying to kid the public with a so-called temporary debt ceiling, maintaining the old nonrealistic permanent debt ceiling of $285 billion.

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked today to approve this bill, consisting of some 50 pages of very technical language, which I doubt if as many as six Members of this House can explain in detail, but which will unquestionably be adopted, to be added to other volumes of the United States Code, and to be translated into regulations of the Internal Revenue Service, which will add to the headaches of the taxpayers and the occupants who make up their returns.

How much more simple it would be, Mr. Chairman, if we would send this bill back to the Ways and Means Committee, with a simple request, worded something like this: "Permanently remove the excise taxes which we reduced or eliminated last June, and then add a surtax to the present income tax of whatever amount is needed to produce the revenue which this administration estimates is necessary to carry on the activity in Vietnam, said additional tax to be automatically repealed, at the end of the fiscal year following the cessation of hostilities and the removal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam." Thus we would be honest in saying to the public that this is a war tax, levied for a specified purpose, and is to be removed when that purpose has been fulfilled.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, as many speakers have said before, I do not like to vote for a tax increase but I do believe in paying our bills. If we are going to spend the money and if we are going to incur the expenses carrying on a war in Vietnam, I think we should pay for it and when we have paid for those expenses, then take the taxes off.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I, as a member of this committee, voted to reimpose these taxes that were taken off. I had to do it after considering the alternatives. I think this is quite important. Here we are trying to do something to raise some necessary additional revenue. If we do not do this, the alternative is a further increase in the income taxes, as the gentleman from Missouri stated, and whether he thinks so or not, in my judgment, that would meet with far less pleasurable reaction on the part of the people than this particular method of doing it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. HERLONG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you think it would be a more responsible action? I am not talking about the political angles, I am talking about being responsible and acting responsibly.

Mr. HERLONG. In my judgment, this is the most responsible way that we can provide the necessary money at this particular time, after having gone carefully into all of these alternatives in the committee. I would say to the gentleman, the other basic alternative is a larger deficit. I am just as happy as I can be that somebody in the Treasury and in the administration now recognizes the dangers of big deficits and wants to do something to prevent it as we go along.

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

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe that these are the alternatives—a deficit or higher taxes. I think there is one other alternative and that is to cut down on the unnecessary spending.

Mr. HERLONG. I would agree with the gentleman completely. But does the gentleman seriously believe that there is any possibility of doing that in this Congress?

Mr. GROSS. Not as long as there is a rose garden at the White House and the ability to twist arms—no.

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

Mr. HERLONG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Even if the Congress does reduce the 1967 budget, I do not see anything wrong in fiscal year 1967 in actually having a little bit of a surplus.

Mr. HERLONG. I would be delighted to see that come about.

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

Mr. HERLONG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. The answer to that is—we could if Congress would pass recision bills affecting fiscal year 1966—that is what I would like to see.

Mr. HERLONG. There are a lot of things a lot of us would like to see done here. But we are faced with a condition and not a theory. The condition with which we are faced at this time certainly impels us to vote for this legislation.

I would remind the gentleman that of all the taxes that were taken off the last time—these are the only two which were not completely taken off. These were reduced or were in the process of being phased out. The gentleman mentioned a number of items which should or could be taken care of by putting the tax back on these items before we did something in this field.

Let me remind the gentleman that what we are seeking in this bill is money, and with respect to the items that the gentleman mentioned, while the taxes have already been taken off, I would remind you that the machinery for collecting these taxes is still in existence and it will not be nearly as difficult to put these back on as it would be to reimpose taxes where the machinery has already gone out of existence for their collection.

The items that the gentleman mentioned as something that should be put back before we went into this earlier, for example the cabaret tax that he is talking about—maybe it should be put back—but you only get $47 million in a full calendar year out of that. From the tax on furs and so on you only get $30 million for the whole year. On air conditioners, $34 million. On phonographs, television sets, and records, you get a total of $225 million on all of these items.

This, to me, is not what we are after. We have to get larger sums of money. This is the most painless—and responsible—way that I see in which we can get the money at this time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do you think there are some principles involved also?

Mr. HERLONG. Of course there are principles involved. The principle I am thinking of most is coming nearest to balancing our budget. This is the way I believe we should act if we are to act responsibly. I therefore urge the membership to support this bill and vote against any motion to recommit.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. The fact that I oppose this legislation does not mean that I am against responsible financing of Government obligations. On the contrary, my vote will instead be a vote against what I consider to be the fiscal irresponsibility which brings this bill before us at this time.

We are told that this tax adjustment bill is necessary to aid in financing the increased costs of Government associated with the war in Vietnam and, in so doing, to avoid the creation of serious inflationary pressures. Certainly I agree that our support for our boys and our ob-

jectives in Vietnam should receive first priority. I also feel that we should support the war effort by providing for effective safeguards against inflation at home. But it seems to me that what we are doing in this bill is asking the taxpayer to tighten his belt while allowing the Federal Government to let its belt out. In other words, it appears that the real purpose of this legislation is to seek Congressional approval for the administration's proposals for new and expanded domestic and welfare programs while at the same time waging a costly war of indefinite duration abroad. When increased Government spending for these expensive programs at home, together with the necessary costs of Vietnam, are imposed on an already vigorous economy, the result can only be inflation.

It seems to me that we, as Members of Congress, have both a moral and fiscal responsibility to those we represent to approach today's revenue problem in a realistic and forthright manner. As I see it, the current difficulty does not spring so much from a lack of revenue as from a lack of control over Government spending. In this bill, however, we have an opportunity to serve notice that any request for higher taxes must be matched by a corresponding demonstration by the administration that unessential, nondefense spending will be substantially reduced or postponed until this threat of inflation is past and the situation in Vietnam is resolved. This is a time for both the Congress and the administration to establish meaningful priorities. Unless this is done, we will soon have before us other bills calling not only for new tax increases but more economic controls as well.

Although I have no objection to the several adjustments in tax collection procedures set out in H.R. 12752, I do seriously question the wisdom of singling out telephone service and automobiles as the two items on which to raise this additional revenue. In this day and age, telephones and automobiles are more often necessities than luxuries.

I respectfully submit, therefore, that before we in the Congress embark on piecemeal tax increases, we first insist upon a hard reappraisal of current and future nondefense Government spending so that we can properly determine what, if any, tax legislation is really essential.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] such time as he may require.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I can quite understand and sympathize with the financial predicament in which the administration now finds itself. None of us would welcome the prospect of owing more than we are able to pay. None of us would welcome the dilemma of trying to make a dollar out of 98 cents, if I may paraphrase an old saying.

Indeed, how often have breadwinners in every walk of life emerged from the holiday season in a virtual panic over how they would pay for the indulgences and largess to which they have yielded in the spirit of the season?

I am sure we can all sympathize with the administration's predicament over how to find the money to pay for all the promises and commitments that have been made for the next fiscal year.

I share that sympathy. I readily appreciate the gravity of the situation.

However, I cannot sympathize with the proposed means by which the administration would solve its problem.

I cannot sympathize with the legislation now before this body which, no matter what else it may be called, is an outright slap in the face for the American taxpayer. It is an insult to the intelligence of every last citizen of this land. It is as pure an example of two-faced political skulduggery as we have ever seen. I admit that I was convinced last June, along with 400 of my distinguished colleagues in this body, in believing the President's glowing promise and infectious optimism when he forecast vast economic benefits to be gained through a cut in Federal excise taxes.

I believed him when he told us that his proposed program of excise tax revisions would "spur growth and move us closer to full employment by removing an unnecessary drag on consumer and business purchasing power."

I went along with the President when he forecast that a cut in excise taxes would "lower prices to consumers; lessen the burden of regressive taxes on low-income families; raise business profits by expanding sales and cutting costs of tax compliance; cut the Government's costs of tax collection and enforcement; end an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation; and free consumers from the distorting effects of these taxes on their market choices."

I believed the President when he told us on May 17 last year:

> In proposing these reductions, I am fully aware of our present and prospective commitments for the defense of the free world. It is impossible to predict precisely what expenditures these may involve in the future. There is, however, no present indication that expenditures will increase to an extent that would make these excise tax reductions inadvisable.

Thus, less than a year ago, the President indicated he was fully aware of our present and prospective commitments, and that there was no indication that expenditures would increase so far to require that we keep these excise taxes. Although he did not mention Vietnam by name, I have assumed all along that he meant to include our involvement in Vietnam as part of his analysis of the situation.

The President also told us:

> Our international responsibilities require that we redouble our efforts to assure the continued healthy growth of our economy. Barring some sudden change in the present world situation, I am sure that these excise tax reductions will be a sound and profitable investment in that growth.

Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1965, this Nation was deeply and irrevocably committed to the Vietnam war. We were in it up to our necks and any knowledgeable, thinking person knew that we were destined to be in it for quite some time to come. We were, in fact, farther away from a peaceful settlement of that war in May of 1965 than we are at this very moment.

I submit that in the months since last May, there has been no sudden change in the world situation, nor has there been any surprising change in the extent of our commitment on behalf of the defense of the free world.

We in the Congress at that time, just as we are now, were effectively kept in the dark about the truth in Vietnam. Few of us had more to go on than the day-to-day newspaper accounts of jungle ambushes, attacks on air bases, dynamiting of GI barracks, and air raids on Communist strong points. If the President told us that he was fully aware of our present and prospective commitments, we had no choice but to believe him. If he told us it was in the best interest of our domestic economy and of our international responsibilities to cut excise taxes, we had no choice but to believe him.

And I, along with the 400 other Members of this body, did believe him. We voted 401 to 6 in favor of the reduction in excise taxes on June 2, 1965.

Any man who assumes the tremendous burdens of the Presidency must, by nature and pressure, be a prudent man. Thus, I reasoned, the President's appeal for reduction of excise taxes was couched in prudence and economic wisdom; that it was sound and feasible; and I voted in favor of the plan.

The President was applauded by the business community. He was applauded by labor. He was cheered by the Nation's consumers. By proposing to eliminate a multibillion-dollar tax burden from around the necks of America's merchants and consumers, he won a legion of supporters.

Prior to the President's message calling for repeal of excises, I had introduced a bill on my own in the Congress to repeal just the 10-percent Federal tax on telephone calls. Through a little elementary arithmetic, I was able to tell the taxpayers in my congressional district that they would share an annual saving of close to $2 million with repeal of the telephone tax. In 1964, some 129,618 users in my district had paid out $1.9 million in telephone excise taxes.

Even before the President told me so, I was able to figure out for myself that a cut in these taxes would prove a shot in the arm for the economy. The 1964 cut in corporate and individual income taxes had produced an obvious upsurge, so a further cut in the tax imposed on an essential communications service could only accelerate the upsurge.

The accuracy of all our predictions is still open to speculation. The reduction went into effect only some 12 days before the President demanded that it be reinstated. And even now, it has been off the books only some 54 days. If this bill is allowed to pass the Congress, we will have associated ourselves with the shortest tax cut in history.

If this obvious case of political duplicity was not bad enough, the President compounds the insult by insisting on a domestic program that flirts dangerously with inflation, that endeavors to expand

programs of dubious value, and that amounts to a direct contradiction of the attitude he is asking us to assume in approving the postponement of excise tax cuts.

There is no quarrel with the fact that in order to spend all the money the President wants to spend in fiscal 1967, we are going to have to dig up new sources of revenue. We either accept that or we face a monstrous deficit which is certain to trigger a disastrous period of uncontrolled inflation.

There is, of course, a third alternative and I call upon the Members of this body and of the other side to join me in an appeal to the President to take a pair of Texas-sized pruning shears to the budget of fiscal 1967.

I call upon the President to reevaluate his domestic spending program for the next fiscal year and suggest that postponement or reduction in many of the Great Society's domestic programs and I leave this to the discretion of the President where to use the blue pencil. I call upon the administration to weigh a possible postponement of some of these Great Society programs against the economic impact certain to result from a postponement of an excise tax cut.

I call upon the Members of Congress to reject this excise cut postponement provision and to insist on a reevaluation of the budget and a reappraisal of the priorities on Federal spending.

The reinstatement of Federal excise taxes is not the answer to the fiscal problems now facing this country. To accept such a notion is to court fiscal disaster.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I rise in support of this bill. I shall oppose the motion to recommit. I take that position without any enthusiasm, as I am sure no Member of this Congress ever is enthusiastic about increasing the taxes on our people. In fact, I do so with some reluctance. On the other hand, it seems to me that under present circumstances responsibility requires support of this additional revenue bill. I support it reluctantly because I think that last year by prudent action the administration and the Congress could have avoided the fiscal situation that makes this bill necessary.

In the face of a growing war in Vietnam, the administration proposed, and this Congress enacted during the last session, the largest program of domestic spending in our history. As a result of last year's action, the deficit for this fiscal year 1966 that we are now in is projected at over $7 billion. In fact, if we used accurate bookkeeping, we could say that if we look at the actual spending as compared with our traditional sources of revenue, the resulting deficit would be close to $12 or $13 billion. For bookkeeping purposes that deficit has been reduced by an almost $1 billion windfall from seigniorage, which, added to the $3.3 billion from the sale of assets which, also through a bookkeeping process, shows up as a reduction of expenditures, and then this bill itself, reduces the deficit by another $1.15 billion. With all of this, we end up with what appears on the record to be a $6.4 billion deficit—and that in a year of relatively high prosperity.

I would point out that last January the administration estimated expenditures for this fiscal year 1966 would be $7 billion less than current estimates. In other words, when the administration came to Congress a year ago this time and projected the fiscal program for this country for the year 1966, which we are now in, the administration underestimated expenditures by $7 billion. This bill is part of the penalty that we must pay for that profligacy.

Admittedly, almost $5 billion of the increase is attributable to the cost of the war. But I suggest that the administration knew those costs would be in excess of the January estimates when they made those estimates and sent that projection up to the Congress a year ago. I suggest that the true costs for 1966 were camouflaged in order to get the Congress to enact the increased domestic programs, many of questionable urgency in view of the war.

It seems to me that we have got to make up our minds about a few things. There certainly should be no question in anyone's mind but that we are engaged in a war, a war in Vietnam.

There is a question, I think, sometimes as to whether we are willing to fight a war to end the aggression and terrorism in that area.

Look at the budget just presented to us for the coming year—fiscal 1967. How can we as a people, how can our fighting men, and how can Hanoi or Peiping be convinced that the administration is really determined to fight this war, when they see some of the things going on here at home?

Take the financial plan of this Nation which has been presented to us by the President. In a time of war, when the economy is booming, when shortages are appearing, when the demand for manpower is intensifying, a nation needs to adopt a policy of restraint. It needs to adopt a budget which says, "Let us proceed with caution. There is possible trouble ahead." It should shun like the plague an expansionary budget in an already greatly expanded economy, lest it supply those last few breaths of air which cause the balloon finally to burst. Then we will have inflation upon us, with all its evils and hardships and suffering.

Yet, how should we characterize a budget which not only proposes that this Nation undertake all its normal expenditures while paying the heavy costs of the war, but also proposes to increase domestic spending for new programs just enacted, and then, on top of everything else, proposes for immediate enactment by the Congress new programs which will cost still more money?

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a war budget before us. It is the kind of budget that one would propose if one wanted to stimulate a depressed economy in peacetime. It is potentially a very dangerous budget. It can bring on economic dislocations, not only miserable in themselves, but exceedingly harmful to the war effort.

This is a budget which proposes to spend in 1 year the fantastic sum of $112.8 billion more than this Nation has ever spent in any other year, including the World War II years. And too, as we find in various places in the budget, that amount understates the actual spending by $6 billion from the sales of assets has been used to produce at least a bookkeeping reduction in spending estimates. Actual expenditures in the President's budget will be almost $119 billion. Expenditures will be kept there—at $119 billion—only if—and this is a real big "if"—Congress is willing to go along with some of the reductions and questionable cuts proposed by the President in the same budget. Since 1961 there has been a $37 billion increase in the annual level of spending—and do not think that this is all because of the war. Only a third of that increase can be attributed to Vietnam.

While the administration was trying last year to convince Hanoi of our seriousness in Vietnam, the adminstration was prodding this Congress to turn out the largest program of domestic spending this Nation has ever seen. It is difficult to blame anyone for thinking that this Nation was more concerned with its domestic affairs than it was with fighting a serious war.

As a result of that program enacted last year, as a result of continuing large-scale appropriations for new programs, look at what our people and our fighting men and our enemy can read in the newspapers today. Here are just three of many items appearing in the last couple of days. Remember, we are supposed to be at war, and in a costly war.

Item No. 1 is from the Washington Evening Star:

> Washington is receiving a Federal beautification grant of $483,000 for landscaping around buildings. Other cities who are receiving grants are Pittsburgh, which will get about $465,000 and New Haven, about $325,000.

Item No. 2 is from a very recent newsletter of the National Education Association:

> The U.S. Office of Education is concerned lest some of the nearly $1 billion Congress made available under title I of the Education Act go down the drain because local school districts haven't yet figured out how to use it properly.

Item No. 3 is from the Washington Daily News:

> The Baltimore Health Department requested a Federal grant of $300,000 to conduct an antismoking campaign in the fifth grade in the city's public schools.

Does this sound like an administration which has decided to make the hard decisions required by the kind of war in which this Nation is engaged? I suggest to you that we did not act like a nation at war in 1964, nor in 1965, nor are we doing so today. As a consequence, that war drags on. We apparently will not act like a nation seriously at war even during fiscal 1967 if we are to enjoy all of the luxuries which we will lavish on ourselves under the President's budget. And what about the period beyond that—beyond fiscal 1967?

We are told that we will be heavily engaged for a long time in Vietnam. But Hanoi and Peiping, if they look at the budget closely, will conclude that we must be planning to get out soon, because with the heavy costs of the proposed domestic spending programs, we will be in a frightful fiscal situation if the equally heavy costs of the Vietnam war continue beyond fiscal 1967. Why? Because this budget is being financed—and even this bill finances it to a degree—from future revenues. We are selling assets and taking advantage of windfalls and speeding up tax collections to reduce the deficit for fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967. There will come a time, Mr. Chairman, and it will come soon, when those wells will run dry. Then we will have either a colossal deficit or colossal tax increases or both plus Federal controls of wages, prices, and rent controls if the war continues.

It seems to me that a nation which has made a decision to fight a bitter war to a successful conclusion would not dare to take such a grave risk.

Mr. Chairman, yes; I support this bill, this additional revenue that will be provided. I oppose the motion to recommit. I believe it is the only reasonable thing to do under the circumstances. However, I would caution that this is only part of what the present circumstances require. There are those in this debate who have suggested alternatives. They say that we have the alternative of higher taxes or reduced expenditures. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, we do not enjoy the luxury of alternatives. We have to do both. It is because we have to do both on this occasion that I am going to support this tax bill. This will not be enough. We also have to do the other things, namely, to cut back and use restraint in the area of our expenditures. There must be a real change in the thinking of the Administration and the majority in this Congress.

If we are to support our men in Vietnam, if we are to end the present crisis of credibility that disturbs our people today, and if we are to convince our people and Hanoi of our seriousness in resisting aggression and terrorism, if we are to avoid inflation, a bust, we must not only enact this tax, but we must also reef in our spending sails. We must get out of a dream world and come down to reality.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, the Revenue Act of 1964 provided the American taxpayer a substantial tax cut. This tax cut was predicated on a fiscally responsible budget which was designed to be in balance and actually would provide for a major reduction in our national debt this year. Our sober responsibilities throughout the world and particularly in Vietnam have now changed that situation. Fiscal responsibility requires that some adjustments in our current tax rate be made to meet our responsibilities in leading the free world.

The present bill makes several adjustments in tax collection procedures that will speed up income tax payments by individuals and in particular by corporations. These provisions do not add additional tax burdens. Indeed, this section of the bill represents a marked improvement.

Another section of the bill, however, delays the schedule of reductions in taxes on automobiles and telephones. Particularly with respect to telephones, it is impossible for us in 1966 to call the use of telephones a luxury. The telephone and automobile are essential to people in all walks of life. Our hard-working industrial and agricultural producers find these items essential to their well-being.

Because we need additional revenue, given the current world situation, it is, of course, necessary that a tax adjustment be supported. I intend to support this present legislation on final passage but will take the opportunity to support a properly designed motion to recommit to take out that section which, in my estimation, unfairly reimposes taxation on automobiles and telephones without restoring the excise taxes on a wide variety of luxury items and without restoring excise taxes on cabarets and nightclubs. I opposed a closed rule on this bill because I feel it is in order for us to consider other areas of tax reforms that would meet our Nation's needs and yet, at the same time, refrain from putting too heavy a burden upon our working people.

One such recommendation that has long been overdue is the need to reduce the present oil depletion allowance which currently gives an unwarranted tax advantage to an advantageously situated small segment of our population. It is unfortunate that a progressive reduction in the oil depletion allowance has not been incorporated in the present bill. To meet that need, I have introduced legislation in the House which will reduce the oil depletion allowance from its present rate of 27½ to 20 percent in progressive steps over a 3-year period.

I respectfully call to the attention of the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee the fact that a sensible reduction in the oil depletion allowance will bring to the Nation substantial revenue without reimposing upon our working people in our factories and on our farms a heavier share of the tax load.

Finally, I believe it is time we redistributed that load by eliminating the special tax privileges that currently exist. The place to start is the reduction of the oil depletion allowance. The time to start is now.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, so long as U.S. fighting men are in Vietnam, we have a solemn obligation to support them. The fulfillment of that obligation necessarily involves a higher level of taxation.

During the last session, when the administration proposed a reduction in the automobile excise tax I heartily applauded the idea of eliminating this burdensome and discriminatory tax which has been aimed at the industry of my State. However, because of our commitments in Vietnam, I made it clear then that any excise tax reduction should be accompanied by a corresponding increase in the level of nondiscriminatory general taxation.

Today, we are confronted with the need to raise more revenue, and we have a choice to make. We are in a position to reimpose a discriminatory automobile excise tax or we could choose another course. We could, and we should, pass legislation increasing general taxes that would be fairly applied and equally directed to all parts of our country.

As a Representative of the State of Michigan, I feel that I must vote against final passage of the discriminatory bill before us. However, I want to make it clear that if this bill does not pass, I stand ready to support a request by the President for an increase in nondiscriminatory general taxes.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, this bill has my deep concern—particularly the temporary restoration of excise taxes on telephones and automobiles. During the first session of the Congress, I supported the legislation to rid the country of these inequitable taxes.

However, the emergency created by the war in Vietnam is such that I cannot possibly avoid the consequences of not providing the additional income necessary to cover the tremendous expenses incurred by the war and our domestic policy.

While balancing my strong feelings against excise taxes on the one hand and the demands of our country on the other the latter must prevail. Until a peaceful settlement is reached in southeast Asia we, as Americans, must all be willing to sacrifice in some way to support our fighting men in the armed services. Our heritage dictates the course we must follow.

It is my sincere hope that the responsible committee of the Congress—in this instance the Ways and Means Committee—will begin working on a substitute tax program, so that excise taxes on telephones and automobiles can eventually be eliminated as Congress intended in accordance with the legislation passed during the first session.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to provide revenues to aid in financing the increased costs of Government associated with operations in Vietnam. I am in full accord with this purpose. But I must object to the means by which these revenues are to be collected.

Mr. Chairman, in the last session of this Congress, the American citizen was assured by this body that he was to be afforded cuts in excise tax rates on automobiles and telephone service. No doubt many Americans based their own budgets on this reliance. Are we now, less than a year later, to rescind this assurance, and risk dangerous inflationary pressures?

Mr. Chairman, I have long been an opponent of those fiscal policies that neglect the presence of an ever-increasing national debt. I believe that the present bill's existence was made necessary only

because of excessive spending in the past, and is an example of how unwarranted spending directly affects the American citizens.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, no one believes any more strongly than I in trying to have a balanced budget, but I do not believe that this bill is the way to accomplish that desired objective. If the administration and this Congress really want to balance the budget, this can be easily accomplished through reduction in domestic spending which will in no manner impair necessary progress in this country.

For the administration to suggest that this tax increase is needed to help finance the war in Vietnam tortures all reason. There might have been some validity in this argument if the President had called for a reduction or even a continuation of the present level of domestic expenditures this year. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the additional cost for prosecuting the war in Vietnam, we found the President appealing for additional increases in his Great Society programs—even to extending them to the peoples of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayer should not be the scapegoat for our failure to practice fiscal responsibility. He should not be required to shoulder the added tax burden simply because of the administration's desire to launch new social legislation for the benefit of the world.

As long as this Congress accedes to every request of the President we shall never see a reduction in unnecessary domestic expenditures.

Accordingly, there is no justification for the increase in excise taxes on telephone service and automobiles, both of which are essential to every American family no matter what its lot or station in life may be. It is about time we considered the interests of the overburdened taxpayer instead of the overzealous tax spender.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise today in support of this bill.

I am aware of the mounting cost of the Vietnamese conflict and the strain it has placed upon the Federal budget. As a responsible Member of the Congress, I cannot vote for expenditures and, on the other hand, vote against the taxes to pay for these expenditures. At a time when American lives are being lost in defense of freedom, Americans will not refuse to pay increased taxes to support their fighting sons. It is not the imposition of taxes that I oppose, it is the method employed in this bill that I am against.

Mr. Chairman, I was a vigorous supporter of the legislation which was signed into law last year which would cut and, in many cases, eliminate the so-called nuisance excise taxes. I think that the concept embodied in this legislation was sound and my views on this matter are unchanged.

I feel that there is much that is good in this bill. The adjustments in tax collecting procedures is, I think, meritorious. I am, however, unalterably opposed to the restoration of excise taxes on automobiles and on telephone services. I am, as I said on the House floor last year, opposed to most of these excise taxes as a matter of principle but I am particularly opposed to levying excise taxes on necessities of life, and make no mistake about it, the telephone and the automobile are no longer luxuries to most Americans.

Why, Mr. Chairman, does the Committee on Ways and Means advocate restoring these tax cuts and yet refuse to support a restoration of the excise taxes on items which are luxuries, such as furs, toilet articles, and jewelry.

This is not in its entirety a good bill, Mr. Chairman, and in common with many Members of this House, I would like to vote for much of it and oppose the rest, but, unfortunately, the system does not work that way and when the yeas and nays are called, I cannot say 60 percent yea and 40 percent nay.

As much as I wish this were the case, it is not and it is with great reluctance that I cast a favorable vote today. But I know that it is my duty to support fully our military effort in southeast Asia. So long as we are committed to this action, the Congress owes a duty to our men in uniform to provide them with full support. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, and only for this reason, I shall vote to support H.R. 12752.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration today proposes to raise more money from individuals and industry alike by revoking the recent excise tax cuts and speeding up the take in personal withholding and corporate income tax payments.

Many a U.S. taxpayer, already burdened by the new social security levy that began January 1, will find his paycheck reduced by adoption of this legislation. Yet, the administration is not willing to do its share by cutting back nonessential expenditures and deferring initiation of new programs which cannot be justified in view of our current budgetary situation.

The administration has requested approximately $3.25 billion more in fiscal 1967 for programs in health, education, welfare, housing, poverty, and manpower training. From the beginning, it has shown a determination that the war in Vietnam will not interfere with its beloved Great Society programs. Programs of dubious value continue to be expanded. There has been no restraint exercised in nondefense spending so far as I can see, with the exception of needed and proven programs such as the school milk fund.

It should be obvious to us all—the administration included—that greatly increased expenditures for social programs have brought us face to face with the problem of inflation. In calling for help to the poor, the administration should realize that it is the poor who suffer most from inflation. Even a small rise in the cost of living works a hardship on the poor and the millions of pensioners and others who must live on fixed incomes.

In its efforts to conceal the degree to which this Government is operating at a deficit the administration has proved most ingenious in finding new sources of revenue. Unfortunately, however, the administration is relying to a great extent upon nonrecurring revenues amounting to more than $12 billion. This is just a temporary expedient, and we will have to face the music sooner or later.

I am unalterably opposed to the provisions of this bill which would restore the excise tax on automobiles and telephones to the levels of January 1, 1966, and delay the further cuts which we voted last year. Why should automobile buyers and telephone users be singled out to bear the burden of raising revenue? I find it impossible to support this principle and will therefore vote in favor of recommitting this bill with instructions to delete the provisions relating to excise tax restoration.

Furthermore, I object to the manner in which these proposed revisions have been presented to the taxpaying public. The public has been led to believe that these tax adjustments are a painless means of enabling the administration to meet its obligations. However, not only do the revisions mean that less money for consumption will be available on a nationwide basis, but the result is that the administration is borrowing on the future.

Confronted with the prospects of continued deficits and an ever-rising national debt, it becomes imperative that we exert a much more stringent discipline over the nature and volume of Federal spending. We should not spend first and then worry about where the money is going to come from. That is what the administration has been doing. If it had exhibited a little fiscal commonsense, there would be no need for the legislation before us today.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any man that has made a better impression upon me since I have been a Member of Congress than the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. In fact, I do not think there has ever been a more able Representative in the Congress than the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. I always make a desperate effort to follow his good, sound judgment and vote for all the bills that he reports from his committee.

I certainly want to vote for any and all the necessary legislation to finance the unfortunate Vietnam war.

I was a Member of Congress when the excise taxes were placed on automobiles, travel tickets, telephones, and numerous other items and every other Member of Congress at that time who made a speech on this subject stated that the excise taxes would be removed soon after World War II. This is truly a nuisance tax and I voted on several occasions during the past 10 years to remove taxes from plane and railroad tickets, also telephone service; however, we were not successful in having these taxes removed until last year.

Now, that it has only been in effect for approximately 1 month, we are here again trying to place this excise tax on the same items. I could easily vote for

this bill increasing taxes if the section pertaining to excise taxes were deleted. I certainly am of the opinion that these excise taxes are more of a nuisance to the public than they are of financial benefit to the Treasury and I will be compelled to vote against this bill in its present form.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in disagreement with the proposal to increase the excise taxes which the Congress so recently voted to reduce. One of the principal reasons given is that the war in Vietnam will require additional funds, and undoubtedly this is a compelling reason. It is equally important to try to keep the budget in balance, and there is strong justification in the requirement to hold back the forces of inflation. It is awkward, of course, to vote against a measure designed to achieve either of these purposes. Nevertheless, I believe a request for additional taxes should not have been forthcoming until a determined effort had been made to curb nonessential expenditures on the homefront.

Military expenditures other than for the Vietnamese war have been trimmed $1.6 billion below last year's level. These reductions are largely in the area of troop housing and similar areas where a need for improvements has long existed. Also, there have been decreases in impacted-area school funds, in school lunchroom programs, and in agricultural programs of long standing. But it is disappointing to note that, on the contrary, increases of $3.2 billion have been proposed in the programs of the Great Society. Surely these are not more important than the programs previously referred to. There also is an increase in the funds requested for foreign aid. The extreme reluctance of most of the nations of the world to help in the struggle against the spread of communism in southeast Asia does little to encourage bigger programs in foreign aid.

It just does not appear to me that things are in balance. I believe that a protest vote is justifiable. I would hope that there will be a readjustment in proposed spending to provide a better balance between the things that are really needed and the things that can be postponed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that the Ways and Means Committee has proposed a method, in the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, to provide funds for the support of our Vietnam operations which does not result in a general tax increase nor affect tax liabilities. I am also pleased to see, and I must commend the committee, that the bill will provide the needed funds without generating serious inflationary pressures in the domestic economy. It may, in fact, from my reading of the bill, have the more desired effect of having a moderating influence on the expenditures of individuals and business firms.

The major function of the bill will be to improve the procedures for collecting taxes, without affecting tax liabilities. I think that the proposed changes in the graduated withholding of Federal income tax from wages and salaries will result in a more satisfactory condition for the individual taxpayer at tax filing time. The effect of the proposed change, as explained in the committee report, will be to bring the amount of tax withheld during the year more in line with the total amount of tax due. The new withholding rates should benefit both those groups who find that sufficient tax has not been withheld, so that they have had to make a large payment when filing their tax return, and that group which finds, after preparing their tax return, that too much has been withheld and they are entitled to a refund.

According to the committee report, the largest single source of additional revenue is attributable to advancing the payment dates for corporate tax, so that the current payments basis for corporations with tax liabilities in excess of $100,000 will be reached in 1967 instead of 1970 as scheduled under present law.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 12752, the tax adjustment bill of 1966, because I believe it is designed to provide revenues necessary to finance the increased costs of government associated with military operations in Vietnam.

I support it because I believe that the language of the bill is designed to finance these costs in a manner which will avoid the serious inflationary escalation which would undoubtedly take place if this bill should fail to pass.

I recognize that inflation may probably come even if the bill does pass, but I believe that there will be less dangerous inflation if this bill becomes law.

Mr. Chairman, it is always unpopular to vote to levy taxes or to increase existing taxes, and it is especially unpopular to restore a tax or taxes which were removed less than a year ago. I view this legislation as a choice between casting a popular vote—as a vote against taxes always is—or a vote to face up to the responsibility of levying increased taxes for increased costs of government occasioned by a major military operation. When faced with the choice between doing that which is popular at the time, or that which I believe to be an act of responsibility, then I must forgo temporary popularity and strive to be responsible when it comes to legislation.

With all my heart, I hope that we will soon be able to accomplish an honorable and successful termination of our military operations in southeast Asia. When that day comes, I shall introduce and support the necessary legislation to repeal everything that we shall enact today. I view this bill today as a measure necessary to the successful prosecution of our military efforts in Vietnam, and I believe that the people of the district which I have the honor to represent are willing to support this position.

Many of my dear friends have written me urging me to, in effect, support the motion to recommit, and some of them have said that if the motion to recommit does not pass, that it may cost them an average of $9 per year. To those dear friends, I affectionately and respectfully reply that $9 a year is a small price to pay for our freedom and the freedom of our children.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can soon repeal the taxes which we shall enact today, but under present conditions which exist in Vietnam, I must respectfully vote against the motion to recommit and vote for H.R. 12752.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, after much reflection on the need for the additional revenues provided for in the tax adjustment bill before us and on the specific means the legislation would utilize, I shall vote in favor of the motion to recommit.

I recognize that increased tax revenues may be required to support our military efforts in Vietnam, and, whatever our individual views may be about the wisdom of the policies being pursued there by the present administration, there is an unquestionable obligation to provide the resources American troops require.

On the other hand, it is clear from today's debate that the proposed tax adjustments would produce considerably more in revenues than are required for the purposes of the Vietnam war. In effect, therefore, we are being asked to increase taxes, including certain excise taxes which this very Congress reduced or repealed just last year, on what amounts to an emergency basis even though a substantial portion of those taxes would not be applied to the prosecution of the war.

I see no justification, Mr. Chairman, for reneging on our promise of last year for less compelling reasons than the national security. If the administration is concerned about the threat of inflation—as, indeed, they should be—there are more effective ways of dealing with it than by reimposing excises on telephone service and automobiles. If the administration simply wants to reduce a prospective budget deficit, then the more appropriate action would be a reduction in proposed spending.

The passage by Congress and the approval by the President of last year's excise tax reduction bill was based on sound economic and social grounds. I do not believe the situation has changed sufficiently to warrant the abrupt about-face which this bill would entail.

The recommittal motion, Mr. Chairman, will remove from the bill only the provisions restoring telephone and auto excise taxes. At the same time, it will leave in the bill enough additional revenues to meet the President's request for the extra funds for the Vietnam war. Anything more than that should be considered on its own merits—not under the cover of war—and should be approved, if at all, only after the administration has removed nonessential spending from its appropriations requests.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I will vote today not to reimpose the excise taxes on automobiles and phone calls for the same reason I supported President Johnson's request last year to repeal those taxes—because repeal would "advance the cause of fairness and balance in our tax system."

I agreed with President Johnson's argument last year—and I have not changed my mind—that repealing the excise taxes would "spur growth and move us closer to full employment," and "lower prices to consumers." Most importantly, I strongly agreed that repealing the excises would "lessen the burden of regressive taxes on low-income families" and "end an unfair burden on the

many businesses and workers"—in this case auto and phone company workers—"who produce the commodities which are singled out for excise taxation."

If there is need for increased taxes, we should use those forms of taxation which are related to the ability to pay. We should not reimpose arbitrary taxes which fall most heavily on working people. Taxes which were unfair and discriminatory last year would be just as unfair and discriminatory this year.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, having voted for the motion to recommit, which was unsuccessful, I vote "no" on final passage.

I do not believe that the debate has produced any justification for this tax increase.

Despite the cost of the war in Vietnam, it is obvious that an honest attempt to control nonmilitary Federal expenditures would make this tax increase unnecessary.

For political reasons, it is perfectly obvious that President Johnson will continue to pursue his "guns and butter" policies. If the House had shown legitimate legislative independence and rejected this tax increase, proper economies in nondefense agencies and departments could have been realized.

This tax increase is, in effect, a blank check for further runaway Federal spending at the expense of the taxpayer.

I have not been a critic of the President's policy in Vietnam. He certainly has enough critics among the radical left of his own party. It is obvious, however, that he is attempting to appease the dangerous radical left of the country by continuing the wild-eyed politically motivated spending schemes of the so-called Great Society. This is the reason for this tax bill, and I reiterate that therefore I cannot support it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I fully recognize the need for additional revenue to meet the increasing costs of our commitment in Vietnam and to continue necessary domestic programs. And I am willing to support measures to raise the needed revenue, so long as we adhere to the sound taxation principle of ability to pay in raising the revenue.

I have always opposed excise or sales taxes—Federal or State—because they are regressive and often strike hardest at those who can least afford them. If the excises are imposed on items which are clearly luxuries, my objections are not as strong because low-income families are not usually the purchasers of luxuries.

I was very pleased last year—as I know many others in this body were—when we finally took action to do away with many of the Federal excise, or "nuisance" taxes on a rather wide range of items—from handbags to theater admissions. And I was particularly pleased about the action with respect to the excises imposed upon two necessities of modern life, automobiles, and telephone service.

In this day and age, ownership of an automobile—even a new auto on occasion—should not be considered a luxury. Certainly telephone service—local or long distance—is not a luxury.

To raise or postpone lowering the cost of using either, I believe is wrong. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the proposed Tax Adjustment Act of 1966.

As I said a few moments ago, I am prepared to vote for measures to raise the money we need to carry out our operations in Vietnam. But I am not in favor of reimposing or continuing a regressive tax which ignores the ability to pay in its application.

Mr. Chairman, I agree in substance with the views of our distinguished and very able colleague from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], a member of the Ways and Means Committee. His views are outlined on pages 49 and 50 of the committee's report.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] in his usual fashion has explained fully and comprehensively the provisions of the bill before the committee. I shall not undertake to repeat any detailed explanation. I have requested time to make very briefly one or two observations which I think are pertinent.

First, Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, because we need the revenue to keep our Government fiscally sound.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I must observe that in connection with the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, I cautioned that the administration and the Congress should not proceed too far and too fast with the complete repeal or too drastic reduction of some of the excise taxes—the auto and telephone tax—then being considered. I pointed out that a too drastic or abrupt reduction in the automobile and telephone taxes would result in an abrupt loss of considerable revenue which the forthcoming budgets might not be in a position to absorb.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the months which have ensued since that action have borne out my prediction. We are now in a necessary posture of restoring some of the cuts which were made somewhat too abruptly in these taxes in the last session. I recognize that the action then was taken in complete good faith, and of necessity Members of Congress relied on the information which we had before us. It was simply a matter of judgment which I at the time thought should be exercised along the paths of greater restraint.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me summarize very briefly the reasons why I support the bill before us and why this action is necessary now to maintain a fiscally responsible course for the Government.

The bill is designed to help finance the additional expenditures required by the Vietnam conflict without generating serious inflationary pressures in the domestic economy. The modifications in collection procedures provided in the bill will have a significant effect on revenues in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 even though they will not increase tax liabilities. The improved collection techniques will also mean important benefits to the vast majority of taxpayers, in that amounts withheld will more nearly approximate final liabilities.

We are advised that the increased tax collections resulting from this bill will have a moderating influence on the expenditures of individuals and business firms, an influence that will tend to offset the inflationary effects of increased defense expenditures. Such a policy is appropriate in view of the near capacity levels of output and employment at which the economy is now operating, and may well promote better balance between the rate of growth of output and investment in expanded capacity. It will also support our effort to reduce the deficit in our balance of payments, in contributing to the comparative stability in the prices of U.S. goods as compared to rising prices of the goods of other nations.

It should also be pointed out that by selecting the excise taxes on telephone service and passenger automobiles for restoration, administration, and collection of the taxes will be much simpler both for business and the Government than would be the reinstitution of taxes previously repealed—such as the tax on cosmetics or jewelry—since these taxes on automobiles and telephones had only been reduced and the machinery for collection and payment is still in effect.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against this excise tax bill for these reasons. The Johnson-Humphrey administration asked Congress to repeal excise taxes last year, to take effect January 1, 1966. We repealed. I voted for this repeal.

This excise tax cut had been in effect 12 days when the President came before us and asked us to put the tax back on. The reason given—the cost of the war in Vietnam. The Johnson-Humphrey administration knew full well when the taxes were repealed that the war was going to require great increases in expenditures.

The administration knew full well last year, when it was plastering all manner of costly Great Society welfare legislation on the books that many new billions of dollars would have to be snatched from the taxpayers to pay the tab.

It is irresponsible management of our Nation's fiscal affairs to cut taxes, knowing that spending policies would require their almost immediate reenactment. I cannot and will not support such careless tax and spending policies.

Further, it is not necessary to reimpose these excise taxes if the administration will live within its means.

All it has to do is stop piling new spending for new programs and it will be possible to finance the usual, needed domestic programs as well as the Vietnam war.

Lastly, this bill proposes to reimpose excise taxes on autos and phone bills only. It does not include many luxury items such as mink coats and jewelry. Autos and phones are necessities today, not luxuries, and this bill hits everyone, particularly many who can afford it least.

We are today witnessing the oldest trick in the political book. It goes something like this: First, make a big noise about reducing or repealing an unpopular tax. Be the hero of the day. Then, when the reduction has been in effect for such a short time that it is hardly noticeable, cry loudly about pressing national emergencies and reinstate the tax with obvious reluctance. The theory is a simple one. You do not lose any significant revenue, everybody loves you for

repealing the tax, and nobody really blames you for being forced to reimpose it to save the country from some peril.

But, Mr. Chairman, today this theory will not work. The American people are too tired of being tricked, and they will not believe in the tricksters.

Less than a year ago, in action long overdue, the Congress repealed excise taxes which were supposed to have been a temporary expedient to finance the Korean war. We did this at the request of the administration, accompanied by great fanfare from White House press sources.

Now, the President knew at the time that he could not continue to increase spending and at the same time lose all this tax revenue—$1.7 billion of it. Nor did he have any intention of cutting down on the expensive programs of the Great Society or practicing any real austerity in spending.

The result of all this is clearly before us in this bill we consider today. The taxes will be reimposed, and before we have even had a chance to notice that they were gone.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues and I warned last year that this tax cut would have to be accompanied by a little belt tightening in the administration. But the belt has been loosened instead, and now it is the consumer who must tighten his belt. The same consumer, I might add, who has been tightening his belt for some time now due to the increase in prices caused by the administration's reckless and inflationary fiscal policies.

The problem that the administration faces today is not caused by lack of revenue. It is caused by a lack of control over Government spending and a refusal to meet the responsibility of balancing a budget.

Tax revenues have already increased by $28 billion in the past 5 years. But spending has far exceeded that figure, and we have seen Government expenditures rise by $37 billion in the same 5 years.

And, contrary to administration propaganda, less than a third of that increase is due to the war in Vietnam. The rest is due to gross irresponsibility with the taxpayer's dollars.

Mr. Chairman, it is far beyond time for us to put a stop to this never-ending and dangerous game in which the taxpayer must always be the loser. It is high time for us to demand what we should have insisted upon long before this—a balanced budget, where the administration behaves like all of us must, and lives within its means.

The American taxpayer is not an endless source of money. He is already being hit squarely in the pocketbook by inflation, and now the administration is asking him to cough up more money to help pay for more inflation.

I urge the Members of this House to defeat the proposal before us today to reinstate the excise taxes, and stop this reckless policy which can only lead to the ruin of our economy.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, we have to face the fact that we cannot meet our obligations in Vietnam and make the threat of inflation disappear with mirrors. We need sound, long-range fiscal planning and a thorough-going review and overhaul of Federal programs and spending.

This is why I am voting against the administration's Tax Adjustment Act, H.R. 12752, today and why I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Before we move forward on any tax increase, there should be a general belt-tightening within the Federal Establishment. I feel sure that substantial funds can and should be obtained by exercising greater economy in Federal spending and by cutting the "fiscal fat" out of unnecessary and wasteful Federal programs. I know that this can be done without damage to the administration's overall program.

For example, modifications of the farm program and the Public Works and Economic Development Act, both of which I voted against, could pare nearly $6 billion from the Federal budget over the next 5 years.

This Tax Adjustment Act we are considering here today is not a sound, long-range measure. Many of the contributions that the administration claims it will make to the Treasury are illusory. In fact, $4.7 billion of the $6 billion total that the administration claims the measure will bring in is not a revenue increase at all. This $4.7 billion is just a temporary gain resulting from a speed-up in collections of corporate and individual taxes that would have been collected anyway. Over the long haul, this will not add one single, solitary nickel to the Treasury and when the short-term windfall is spent to meet today's deficit, where will the administration turn for money to continue existing programs?

The moratorium that the administration proposes for excise tax reductions on automobiles and telephone service is arbitrary and discriminatory. Why were automobiles and telephone service singled out? The administration tells us that the companies involved do not object. Why should they? In this day and age, cars and telephones are necessities. The costs will be borne, not by the companies, but by the average consumer.

Mr. Chairman, before the administration comes to Congress to ask for new taxes, it should undertake an immediate review of Federal spending and cut away the fat. We might also consider a tax on war profits. Then, if additional funds are needed the administration should come forward with responsible long-range proposals that do more than merely defer the day of reckoning.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, because I recognize fully the necessity for increasing the Government's revenues at this critical time, I shall vote for H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. My support, however, is extremely reluctant.

The administration argues that this measure is needed in order to finance the war in Vietnam. I disagree. The war could be financed out of current revenues if the administration would only cut down on its unprecedented high level of spending for domestic programs, as I have long urged. It has refused to do so. It is this refusal that leads me to conclude that this administration has neither the wit not the will to take this necessary course and so I am constrained to vote for this tax increase.

Without the added revenues provided by this measure, we would court a disastrous inflation, increased deficits in our international balance of payments, and more rapid draining of our dwindling gold supply.

Inflation presents one of the major domestic dangers to our economy today. All steps, such as this bill, that will help to dampen the flames of inflation, deserve support.

The bill is poor in several respects. It restores excise tax cuts on cars and telephone rates, which the Congress voted to lower just last year. Cars and telephones are necessities for most people and it does not seem right to restore a tax on those items while leaving untouched the luxury items—jewels, furs, luggage, cosmetics, and the like—on which we also removed taxes last year.

We are told that the automobile and telephone companies, which are enjoying record prosperity, do not object to this tax restoration. To me, this is a meaningless argument. It is not the companies that will pay this tax; it is the consumers.

NO SPENDING BRAKES

It is deeply disturbing that the Administration shows no sign of applying the brakes significantly to its deficit spending on the domestic front. Instead, it tries to tell us that everything would be wonderful and that the budget would be heading toward an early surplus if it were not for the extraordinary costs of the war in Vietnam.

This argument is punctured completely by the excellent statement of six minority members of the Ways and Means Committee whose supplemental views accompany the report on H.R. 12752. They point out that Federal spending has increased rapidly until, in our next fiscal year, it will be $37 billion higher than it was in 1961, but that less than one-third of this spending increase can be attributed to the costs of the war in Vietnam.

During this same period, our revenues have climbed as well. Our income will be higher by $28 billion in fiscal 1967 than it was in 1961. Thus, it is readily apparent that our deficit condition was not caused by lack of revenues but by lack of restraint and intelligent selectivity in Government spending. These figures support my claim that the war in Vietnam could be financed by prudence on the domestic front.

BAD PLANNING OR DECEIT?

Another disturbing aspect to this legislation is that it shows either that the administration has not been forthright in telling the American people what the war in Vietnam is going to cost or that its planning is very bad.

Last year, when the administration asked for these tax reductions it said we could afford the loss of revenues involved. Now, just a few months later, the administration comes back-pedalling to Congress. Are we to believe that our military and diplomatic aims are so little

understood by those responsible for planning them? Or are we to conclude that this is merely a method for easing the country slowly into the facts of our situation? Either way, it is very troubling. One does not wish to think that the Government does not know what it is doing. Nor does one wish to think it is concealing its intentions from the public. But it is hard to avoid reaching one conclusion or the other.

TAX REFORMS NEEDED

Tax reform is sorely needed, particularly tax reduction. But this cannot come until the way is prepared through sound and responsible spending policies. That is why I have voted to eliminate the enormous Federal subsidies to big farms and plantations, to reduce foreign aid, against the Appalachian redevelopment program, the antipoverty bill, and other deferrable or unnecessary programs.

I have long urged that we raise individual tax exemptions from $600 to $900 a year, a reform that would ease the burden on the hard-pressed head of household at a time of rapidly rising costs of living. But this would cost the Government some $8 billion a year in lost revenues. As long as the Government continues to spend upwards of $500 million a month beyond its income, such a proposal has no chance of acceptance.

I oppose the deficit-spending policies which make this bill necessary. It is those that are to blame and not just the war in Vietnam. I shall vote for it with the warning that if this Congress and this administration do not quickly establish strict priorities, we will face calls for more taxes and very likely for Government controls over the economy to check the mounting flames of inflation that are searing the public, in particular the poor, and which will soon become so painful that even this administration will have to react.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, on January 13 of this year, I rose to speak against the reimposition of the "luxury taxes" on automobiles and telephone service that had been suggested by the President the evening before in his state of the Union message. I maintained then, and I continue to believe today, that automobiles and telephone service are necessities to most Americans and should not be taxed as luxuries. For this reason, I will vote to recommit the bill before us, with instructions to strike the provision delaying the excise tax reductions on autos and telephone service.

If the bill is not returned to committee, I will be compelled to vote for final passage for a very important reason: additional revenues are required to offset the rising costs of the war in Vietnam, or serious inflation will be stimulated.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their own remarks on the bill before the Committee of the Whole at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself just 1 minute.

I want to take this occasion to congratulate my very distinguished friend from Wisconsin for his statement in support of the bill and in opposition to the motion to recommit. My friend is always very logical. I wanted the House to know that he has thoroughly convinced me that we ought to be against the motion to recommit, and I hope other Members on this side will feel as I do about it and join me in opposition to the motion to recommit and in support of the bill on final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments that are offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill follows:

H.R. 12752

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. Short Title, etc.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Tax Adjustment Act of 1966".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

TITLE I—ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Section 101. Income Tax Collected at Source.

(a) PERCENTAGE METHOD OF WITHHOLDING.—Subsection (a) of section 3402 (relating to requirement of withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) REQUIREMENT OF WITHHOLDING.—Every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages (except as otherwise provided in this section) a tax determined in accordance with the following tables. For purposes of applying such tables, the term 'the amount of wages' means the amount by which the wages exceed the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b)(1):

"TABLE 1.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $4	0.
Over $4 but not over $13.	14% of excess over $4.
Over $13 but not over $23.	$1.26 plus 15% of excess of $13.
Over $23 but not over $85.	$2.76 plus 17% of excess of $23.
Over $85 but not over $169.	$13.30 plus 20% of excess over $85.
Over $169 but not over $212.	$30.10 plus 25% of excess over $169.
Over $212	$40.85 plus 30% of excess over $212.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $4	0.
Over $4 but not over $23.	14% of excess over $4.
Over $23 but not over $85.	$2.66 plus 15% of excess over $23.
Over $85 but not over $169.	$11.96 plus 17% of excess over $85.
Over $169 but not over $340.	$26.24 plus 20% of excess over $169.
Over $340 but not over $423.	$60.44 plus 25% of excess over $340.
Over $423	$81.19 plus 30% of excess over $423.

"TABLE 2.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
$8 but not over $27	14% of excess over $8.
Over $27 but not over $46.	$2.66 plus 15% of excess over $27.
Over $46 but not over $169.	$5.51 plus 17% of excess over $46.
Over $169 but not over $338.	$26.42 plus 20% of excess over $169.
Over $338 but not over $423.	$60.22 plus 25% of excess over $338.
Over $423	$81.47 plus 30% of excess over $423.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
Over $8 but not over $46.	14% of excess over $8.
Over $46 but not over $169.	$5.32 plus 15% of excess over $46.
Over $169 but not over $338.	$23.77 plus 17% of excess over $169.
Over $338 but not over $681.	$52.50 plus 20% of excess over $338.
Over $681 but not over $846.	$121.10 plus 25% of excess over $681.
Over $846	$162.35 plus 30% of excess over $846.

"TABLE 3.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
Over $8 but not over $29.	14% of excess over $8.
Over $29 but not over $50.	$2.94 plus 15% of excess over $29.
Over $50 but not over $183.	$6.09 plus 17% of excess over $50.
Over $183 but not over $367.	$28.70 plus 20% of excess over $183.
Over $367 but not over $458.	$65.50 plus 25% of excess over $367.
Over $458	$88.25 plus 30% of excess over $458.

"(b) Married person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $8	0.
Over $8 but not over $50.	14% of excess over $8.
Over $50 but not over $183.	$5.88 plus 15% of excess over $50.
Over $183 but not over $367.	$25.83 plus 17% of excess over $183.
Over $367 but not over $738.	$57.11 plus 20% of excess over $367.
Over $738 but not over $917.	$131.31 plus 25% of excess over $738.
Over $917	$176.06 plus 30% of excess over $917.

"TABLE 4.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $17	0.
Over $17 but not over $58.	14 percent of excess over $17.
Over $58 but not over $100.	$5.74 plus 15 percent of excess over $58.
Over $100 but not over $367.	$12.04 plus 17 percent of excess over $100.
Over $367 but not over $733.	$57.43 plus 20 percent of excess over $367.
Over $733 but not over $917.	$130.63 plus 25 percent of excess over $733.
Over $917	$176.63 plus 30 percent of excess over $917.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $17	0.
Over $17 but not over $100.	14 percent of excess over $17.
Over $100 but not over $367.	$11.62 plus 15 percent of excess over $100.
Over $367 but not over $733.	$51.67 plus 17 percent of excess over $367.
Over $733 but not over $1,475.	$113.89 plus 20 percent of excess over $733.
Over $1,475 but not over $1,833.	$262.29 plus 25 percent of excess over $1,475.
Over $1,833	$351.79 plus 30 percent of excess over $1,833.

"TABLE 5.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is quarterly*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $50	0.
Over $50 but not over $175.	14 percent of excess over $50.
Over $175 but not over $300.	$17.50 plus 15 percent of excess over $175.
Over $300 but not over $1,100.	$36.25 plus 17 percent of excess over $300.
Over $1,100 but not over $2,200.	$172.25 plus 20 percent of excess over $1,110.
Over $2,200 but not over $2,750.	$392.25 plus 25 percent of excess over $2,200.
Over $2,750	$529.75 plus 30 percent of excess over $2,750.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $50	0.
Over $50 but not over $300.	14 percent of excess over $50.
Over $300 but not over $1,100.	$35.00 plus 15 percent of excess over $300.
Over $1,100 but not over $2,200.	$155 plus 17 percent of excess over $1,100.
Over $2,200 but not over $4,425.	$342 plus 20 percent of excess over $2,200.

"TABLE 5.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is quarterly*—Continued

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Over $4,425 but not over $5,500.	$787 plus 25 percent of excess over $4,425.
Over $5,500	$1,055.75 plus 30 percent of excess over $5,500.

"TABLE 6.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semiannual*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $100	0.
Over $100 but not over $350.	14 percent of excess over $100.
Over $350 but not over $600.	$35.00 plus 15 percent of excess over $350.
Over $600 but not over $2,200.	$72.50 plus 17 percent of excess over $600.
Over $2,200 but not over $4,400.	$344.50 plus 20 percent of excess over $2,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $5,5000.	$784.50 plus 25 percent of excess over $4,400.
Over $5,500	$1,059.50 plus 30 percent of excess over $5,500.

"(b) Married person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $100	0.
Over $100 but not over $600.	14 percent of excess over $100.
Over $600 but not over $2,200.	$70 plus 15 percent of excess over $600.
Over $2,200 but not over $4,400.	$310 plus 17 percent of excess over $2,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $8,850.	$684 plus 20 percent of excess over $4,400.
Over $8,850 but not over $11,000.	$1,574 plus 25 percent of excess over $8,850.
Over $11,000	$2,111.50 plus 30 percent of excess over $11,000.

"TABLE 7.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is annual*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $200	0.
Over $200 but not over $700.	14% of excess over $200.
Over $700 but not over $1,200.	$70 plus 15% of excess over $700.
Over $1,200 but not over $4,400.	$145 plus 17% of excess over $1,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $8,800.	$689 plus 20% of excess over $4,400.
Over $8,800 but not over $11,000.	$1,569 plus 25% of excess over $8,800.
Over $11,000	$2,119 plus 30% of excess over $11,000.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $200	0.
Over $200 but not over $1,200.	14% of excess over $200.

"TABLE 7.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is annual*—Continued

"If the amount of wages is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Over $1,200 but not over $4,400.	$140 plus 15% of excess over $1,200.
Over $4,400 but not over $8,800.	$620 plus 17% of excess over $4,400.
Over $8,800 but not over $17,700.	$1,368 plus 20% of excess over $8,800.
Over $17,700 but not over $22,000.	$3,148 plus 25% of excess over $17,700.
Over $22,000	$4,223 plus 30% of excess over $22,000.

"TABLE 8.—*If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period*

"(a) Single Person—Including Head of Household:

"If the amount of wages divided by the number of days in the payroll period is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $0.50	0.
Over $0.50 but not over $1.90.	14% of excess over $0.50.
Over $1.90 but not over $3.30.	$0.20 plus 15% of excess over $1.90.
Over $3.30 but not over $12.10.	$0.41 plus 17% of excess over $3.30.
Over $12.10 but not over $24.10.	$1.91 plus 20% of excess over $12.10.
Over $24.10 but not over $30.10.	$4.31 plus 25% of excess over $24.10.
Over $30.10	$5.81 plus 30% of excess over $30.10.

"(b) Married Person:

"If the amount of wages divided by the number of days in the payroll period is:	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be:
Not over $0.50	0.
Over $0.50 but not over $3.30.	14% of excess over $0.50.
Over $3.30 but not over $12.10.	$0.39 plus 15% of excess over $3.30.
Over $12.10 but not over $24.10.	$1.71 plus 17% of excess over $12.10.
Over $24.10 but not over $48.50.	$3.75 plus 20% of excess over $24.10.
Over $48.50 but not over $60.30.	$8.63 plus 25% of excess over $48.50.
Over 60.30	$11.58 plus 30% of excess over $60.30."

(b) AMOUNT OF WITHHOLDING EXEMPTION.—Paragraph (1) of section 3402(b) (relating to percentage method withholding table) is amended by striking out the table set forth therein and inserting the following table in lieu thereof:

"Percentage Method Withholding Table

"Payroll period:	Amount of one withholding exemption
Weekly	$13.50.
Biweekly	26.90.
Semimonthly	29.20.
Monthly	58.30.
Quarterly	175.00.
Semiannual	350.00.
Annual	700.00.
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period).	1.90."

(c) WAGE BRACKET WITHHOLDING.—Paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) (relating to wage bracket withholding) is amended by striking out the tables set forth therein and inserting the folowing tables in lieu thereof:

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$4	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$4	$5	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5	$6	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6	$7	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7	$8	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8	$9	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9	$10	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$11	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$11	$12	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$13	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$13	$14	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$15	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$15	$16	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$17	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$17	$18	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$19	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$19	$20	2.30	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$21	2.40	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$21	$22	2.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$23	2.70	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$23	$24	2.90	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$25	3.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$25	$26	3.20	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$27	3.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$27	$28	3.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$29	3.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$29	$30	3.90	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$31	4.10	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$31	$32	4.20	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$33	4.40	2.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$33	$34	4.60	2.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$35	4.70	2.50	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$35	$36	4.90	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$37	5.10	2.80	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$37	$38	5.20	3.00	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$39	5.40	3.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$39	$40	5.60	3.30	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$41	5.80	3.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$41	$42	5.90	3.60	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$43	6.10	3.80	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$43	$44	6.30	4.00	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$45	6.40	4.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$45	$46	6.60	4.30	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$47	6.80	4.50	2.30	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$47	$48	6.90	4.70	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$49	7.10	4.80	2.60	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$49	$50	7.30	5.00	2.70	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$51	7.50	5.20	2.90	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$51	$52	7.60	5.30	3.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$53	7.80	5.50	3.20	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$53	$54	8.00	5.70	3.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$55	8.10	5.80	3.60	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$55	$56	8.30	6.00	3.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$57	8.50	6.20	3.90	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$57	$58	8.60	6.40	4.10	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$59	8.80	6.50	4.20	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$59	$60	9.00	6.70	4.40	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	9.20	6.90	4.70	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	9.60	7.30	5.00	2.70	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	9.90	7.60	5.30	3.10	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	10.30	8.00	5.70	3.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	10.60	8.30	6.00	3.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	10.90	8.60	6.40	4.10	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	11.30	9.00	6.70	4.40	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	11.60	9.30	7.00	4.80	2.50	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	12.00	9.70	7.40	5.10	2.80	.80	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	12.30	10.00	7.70	5.40	3.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	12.60	10.30	8.10	5.80	3.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	13.00	10.70	8.40	6.10	3.80	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	13.30	11.00	8.70	6.50	4.20	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	13.70	11.40	9.10	6.80	4.50	2.30	.30	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	14.10	11.70	9.40	7.10	4.80	2.60	.60	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	14.50	12.00	9.80	7.50	5.20	2.90	.90	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	14.90	12.40	10.10	7.80	5.50	3.20	1.20	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	15.30	12.70	10.40	8.20	5.90	3.60	1.50	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	15.70	13.10	10.80	8.50	6.20	3.90	1.80	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	16.10	13.40	11.10	8.80	6.50	4.30	2.10	.10	0	0	0
$100	$105	16.80	14.10	11.70	9.40	7.10	4.80	2.60	.60	0	0	0
$105	$110	17.80	15.10	12.60	10.30	8.00	5.70	3.40	1.30	0	0	0
$110	$115	18.80	16.10	13.40	11.10	8.80	6.50	4.30	2.10	.10	0	0
$115	$120	19.80	17.10	14.40	12.00	9.70	7.40	5.10	2.80	.80	0	0
$120	$125	20.80	18.10	15.40	12.80	10.50	8.20	6.00	3.70	1.50	0	0
$125	$130	21.80	19.10	16.40	13.80	11.40	9.10	6.80	4.50	2.30	.40	0
$130	$135	22.80	20.10	17.40	14.80	12.20	9.90	7.70	5.40	3.10	1.10	0
$135	$140	23.80	21.10	18.40	15.80	13.10	10.80	8.50	6.20	3.90	1.80	0
$140	$145	24.80	22.10	19.40	16.80	14.10	11.60	9.40	7.10	4.80	2.50	.60
$145	$150	25.80	23.10	20.40	17.80	15.10	12.50	10.20	7.90	5.60	3.30	1.30
$150	$160	27.30	24.60	21.90	19.30	16.60	13.90	11.50	9.20	6.90	4.60	2.40
$160	$170	29.30	26.60	23.90	21.30	18.60	15.90	13.20	10.90	8.60	6.30	4.00
$170	$180	31.06	28.60	25.90	23.30	20.60	17.90	15.20	12.60	10.30	8.00	5.70
$180	$190	34.10	30.80	27.90	25.30	22.60	19.90	17.20	14.50	12.00	9.70	7.40
$190	$200	36.60	33.30	29.90	27.30	24.60	21.90	19.20	16.50	13.80	11.40	9.10
$200	$210	39.10	35.80	32.40	29.30	26.60	23.90	21.20	18.50	15.80	13.10	10.80
$210	$220	41.80	38.30	34.90	31.50	28.60	25.90	23.20	20.50	17.80	15.10	12.50
$220	$230	44.80	40.80	37.40	34.00	30.70	27.90	25.20	22.50	19.80	17.10	14.40
$230	$240	47.80	43.80	39.90	36.50	33.20	29.90	27.20	24.50	21.80	19.10	16.40
$240	$250	50.80	46.80	42.70	39.00	35.70	32.30	29.20	26.50	23.80	21.10	18.40
$250	$260	53.80	49.80	45.70	41.70	38.20	34.80	31.40	28.50	25.80	23.10	20.40
$260	$270	56.80	52.80	48.70	44.70	40.70	37.30	33.90	30.60	27.80	25.10	22.40
$270	$280	59.80	55.80	51.70	47.70	43.60	39.80	36.40	33.10	29.80	27.10	24.40
$280	$290	62.80	58.80	54.70	50.70	46.60	42.60	38.90	35.60	32.20	29.10	26.40
$290	$300	65.80	61.80	57.70	53.70	49.60	45.60	41.60	38.10	34.70	31.30	28.40

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$300	$310	$68.80	$64.80	$60.70	$56.70	$52.60	$48.60	$44.60	$40.60	$37.20	$33.80	$30.50
$310	$320	71.80	67.80	63.70	59.70	55.60	51.60	47.60	43.50	39.70	36.30	33.00
$320	$330	74.80	70.80	66.70	62.70	58.60	54.60	50.60	46.50	42.50	38.80	35.50
$330	$340	77.80	73.80	69.70	65.70	61.60	57.60	53.60	49.50	45.50	41.40	38.00
$340	$350	80.80	76.80	72.70	68.70	64.60	60.60	56.60	52.50	48.50	44.40	40.50
$350	$360	83.80	79.80	75.70	71.70	67.60	63.60	59.60	55.50	51.50	47.40	43.40
		30 percent of the excess over $360 plus—										
$360 and over		85.30	81.30	77.20	73.20	69.10	65.10	61.10	57.00	53.00	48.90	44.90

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$4	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$4	$5	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5	$6	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6	$7	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7	$8	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8	$9	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9	$10	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$11	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$11	$12	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$13	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$13	$14	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$15	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$15	$16	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$17	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$17	$18	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$19	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$19	$20	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$21	2.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$21	$22	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$23	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$23	$24	2.80	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$25	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$25	$26	3.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$27	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$27	$28	3.40	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$29	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$29	$30	3.70	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$31	3.80	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$31	$32	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$33	4.10	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$33	$34	4.30	2.30	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$35	4.40	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$35	$36	4.60	2.50	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$37	4.70	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$37	$38	4.90	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$39	5.00	3.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$39	$40	5.20	3.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$41	5.30	3.30	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$41	$42	5.50	3.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$43	5.60	3.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$43	$44	5.80	3.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$45	5.90	3.90	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$45	$46	6.10	4.00	2.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$47	6.20	4.20	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$47	$48	6.40	4.30	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$49	6.50	4.50	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$49	$50	6.70	4.60	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$51	6.80	4.80	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$51	$52	7.00	4.90	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$53	7.10	5.10	3.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$53	$54	7.30	5.20	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$55	7.40	5.40	3.40	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$55	$56	7.60	5.50	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$57	7.70	5.70	3.70	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$57	$58	7.90	5.80	3.80	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$59	8.00	6.00	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$59	$60	8.20	6.10	4.10	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	8.40	6.40	4.30	2.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	8.70	6.70	4.60	2.60	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	9.00	7.00	4.90	2.90	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	9.30	7.30	5.20	3.20	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	9.60	7.60	5.50	3.50	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.90	7.90	5.80	3.80	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	10.20	8.20	6.10	4.10	2.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	10.50	8.50	6.40	4.40	2.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.80	8.80	6.70	4.70	2.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	11.10	9.10	7.00	5.00	3.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	11.40	9.40	7.30	5.30	3.30	1.40	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	11.70	9.70	7.60	5.60	3.60	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	12.00	10.00	7.90	5.90	3.90	1.90	.10	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	12.30	10.30	8.20	6.20	4.20	2.20	.30	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	12.70	10.60	8.50	6.50	4.50	2.50	.60	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	13.00	10.90	8.80	6.80	4.80	2.80	.90	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	13.30	11.20	9.10	7.10	5.10	3.10	1.20	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$94	$96	$13.70	$11.50	$9.40	$7.40	$5.40	$3.40	$1.50	$0	$0	$0	$0
$96	$98	14.00	11.80	9.70	7.70	5.70	3.70	1.70	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	14.40	12.10	10.00	8.00	6.00	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0	0
$100	$105	15.00	12.70	10.60	8.50	6.50	4.50	2.50	.60	0	0	0
$105	$110	15.80	13.50	11.30	9.30	7.30	5.30	3.20	1.30	0	0	0
$110	$115	16.70	14.40	12.10	10.00	8.00	6.00	4.00	2.00	.10	0	0
$115	$120	17.50	15.20	12.90	10.80	8.80	6.80	4.70	2.70	.80	0	0
$120	$125	18.40	16.10	13.80	11.50	9.50	7.50	5.50	3.50	1.50	0	0
$125	$130	19.20	16.90	14.60	12.30	10.30	8.30	6.20	4.20	2.20	.40	0
$130	$135	20.10	17.80	15.50	13.20	11.00	9.00	7.00	5.00	3.00	1.10	0
$135	$140	20.90	18.60	16.30	14.00	11.80	9.80	7.70	5.70	3.70	1.80	0
$140	$145	21.80	19.50	17.20	14.90	12.60	10.50	8.50	6.50	4.50	2.50	.60
$145	$150	22.60	20.30	18.00	15.70	13.50	11.30	9.20	7.20	5.20	3.20	1.30
$150	$160	23.90	21.60	19.30	17.00	14.70	12.40	10.40	8.30	6.30	4.30	2.30
$160	$170	25.60	23.30	21.00	18.70	16.40	14.10	11.90	9.80	7.80	5.80	3.80
$170	$180	27.50	25.00	22.70	20.40	18.10	15.80	13.60	11.30	9.30	7.30	5.30
$180	$190	29.50	26.80	24.40	22.10	19.80	17.50	15.30	13.00	10.80	8.80	6.80
$190	$200	31.50	28.80	26.10	23.80	21.50	19.20	17.00	14.70	12.40	10.30	8.30
$200	$210	33.50	30.80	28.10	25.50	23.20	20.90	18.70	16.40	14.10	11.80	9.80
$210	$220	35.50	32.80	30.10	27.40	24.90	22.60	20.40	18.10	15.80	13.50	11.30
$220	$230	37.50	34.80	32.10	29.40	26.70	24.30	22.10	19.80	17.50	15.20	12.90
$230	$240	39.50	36.80	34.10	31.40	28.70	26.00	23.80	21.50	19.20	16.90	14.60
$240	$250	41.50	38.80	36.10	33.40	30.70	28.00	25.50	23.20	20.90	18.60	16.30
$250	$260	43.50	40.80	38.10	35.40	32.70	30.00	27.30	24.90	22.60	20.30	18.00
$260	$270	45.50	42.80	40.10	37.40	34.70	32.00	29.30	26.60	24.30	22.00	19.70
$270	$280	47.50	44.80	42.10	39.40	36.70	34.00	31.30	28.60	26.00	23.70	21.40
$280	$290	49.50	46.80	44.10	41.40	38.70	36.00	33.30	30.60	27.90	25.40	23.10
$290	$300	51.50	48.80	46.10	43.40	40.70	38.00	35.30	32.60	29.90	27.20	24.80
$300	$310	53.50	50.80	48.10	45.40	42.70	40.00	37.30	34.60	31.90	29.20	26.50
$310	$320	55.50	52.80	50.10	47.40	44.70	42.00	39.30	36.60	33.90	31.20	28.50
$320	$330	57.50	54.80	52.10	49.40	46.70	44.00	41.30	38.60	35.90	33.20	30.50
$330	$340	59.50	56.80	54.10	51.40	48.70	46.00	43.30	40.60	37.90	35.20	32.50
$340	$350	61.70	58.80	56.10	53.40	50.70	48.00	45.30	42.60	39.90	37.20	34.50
$350	$360	64.20	60.80	58.10	55.40	52.70	50.00	47.30	44.60	41.90	39.20	36.50
$360	$370	66.70	63.30	60.10	57.40	54.70	52.00	49.30	46.60	43.90	41.20	38.50
$370	$380	69.20	65.80	62.50	59.40	56.70	54.00	51.30	48.60	45.90	43.20	40.50
$380	$390	71.70	68.30	65.00	61.60	58.70	56.00	53.30	50.60	47.90	45.20	42.50
$390	$400	74.20	70.80	67.50	64.10	60.70	58.00	55.30	52.60	49.90	47.20	44.50
$400	$410	76.70	73.30	70.00	66.60	63.20	60.00	57.30	54.60	51.90	49.20	46.50
$410	$420	79.20	75.80	72.50	69.10	65.70	62.40	59.30	56.60	53.90	51.20	48.50
$420	$430	81.80	78.30	75.00	71.60	68.20	64.90	61.50	58.60	55.90	53.20	50.50
$430	$440	84.80	80.80	77.50	74.10	70.70	67.40	64.00	60.60	57.90	55.20	52.50
$440	$450	87.80	83.80	80.00	76.60	73.20	69.90	66.50	63.10	59.90	57.20	54.50
$450	$460	90.80	86.80	82.70	79.10	75.70	72.40	69.00	65.60	62.30	59.20	56.50
$460	$470	93.80	89.80	85.70	81.70	78.20	74.90	71.50	68.10	64.80	61.40	58.50
$470	$480	96.80	92.80	88.70	84.70	80.70	77.40	74.00	70.60	67.30	63.90	60.50
$480	$490	99.80	95.80	91.70	87.70	83.60	79.90	76.50	73.10	69.80	66.40	63.00
$490	$500	102.80	98.80	94.70	90.70	86.60	82.60	79.00	75.60	72.30	68.90	65.50
$500	$510	105.80	101.80	97.70	93.70	89.60	85.60	81.60	78.10	74.80	71.40	68.00
$510	$520	108.80	104.80	100.70	96.70	92.60	88.60	84.60	80.60	77.30	73.90	70.50
$520	$530	111.80	107.80	103.70	99.70	95.60	91.60	87.60	83.50	79.80	76.40	73.00
$530	$540	114.80	110.80	106.70	102.70	98.60	94.60	90.60	86.50	82.50	78.90	75.50
$540	$550	117.80	113.80	109.70	105.70	101.60	97.60	93.60	89.50	85.50	81.40	78.00
$550	$560	120.80	116.80	112.70	108.70	104.60	100.60	96.60	92.50	88.50	84.40	80.50
$560	$570	123.80	119.80	115.70	111.70	107.60	103.60	99.60	95.50	91.50	87.40	83.40
		30 percent of the excess over $570 plus—										
$570 and over		125.30	121.30	117.20	113.20	109.10	105.10	101.10	97.00	93.00	88.90	84.90

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.90	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.20	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	5.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$46	$48	$5.70	$1.70	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$48	$50	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	6.40	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	6.70	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	7.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.80	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	8.10	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	8.40	4.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.80	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	9.10	4.70	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	9.50	5.00	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.80	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	10.10	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	10.50	5.90	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.80	6.20	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	11.20	6.60	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	11.50	6.90	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	11.80	7.30	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	12.20	7.60	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	12.50	7.90	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	12.90	8.30	3.90	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	13.20	8.60	4.20	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	13.50	9.00	4.50	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	13.90	9.30	4.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	14.20	9.60	5.10	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	14.60	10.00	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	14.90	10.30	5.70	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	15.20	10.70	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	15.60	11.00	6.40	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	15.90	11.30	6.80	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	16.30	11.70	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	16.60	12.00	7.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	16.90	12.40	7.80	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	17.30	12.70	8.10	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	17.60	13.00	8.50	4.10	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	18.00	13.40	8.80	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	18.50	13.90	9.30	4.80	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	19.20	14.60	10.00	5.40	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	19.80	15.30	10.70	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	20.50	15.90	11.40	6.80	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	21.20	16.60	12.00	7.50	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	21.90	17.30	12.70	8.10	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	22.60	18.00	13.40	8.80	4.40	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	23.20	18.70	14.10	9.50	5.00	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	23.90	19.30	14.80	10.20	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	24.60	20.00	15.40	10.90	6.30	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	25.30	20.70	16.10	11.50	7.00	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	26.00	21.40	16.80	12.20	7.60	3.40	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	26.70	22.10	17.50	12.90	8.30	4.00	.10	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	27.50	22.70	18.20	13.60	9.00	4.60	.70	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	28.30	23.40	18.80	14.30	9.70	5.20	1.20	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	29.10	24.10	19.50	14.90	10.40	5.80	1.80	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	29.90	24.80	20.20	15.60	11.00	6.50	2.30	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	30.70	25.50	20.90	16.30	11.70	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	31.50	26.10	21.60	17.00	12.40	7.80	3.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	32.30	26.90	22.20	17.70	13.10	8.50	4.10	.30	0	0	0
$200	$210	33.70	28.30	23.40	18.90	14.30	9.70	52.0	1.20	0	0	0
$210	$220	35.70	30.30	25.10	20.60	16.00	11.40	6.80	2.60	0	0	0
$220	$230	37.70	32.30	26.90	22.30	17.70	13.10	8.50	4.10	.30	0	0
$230	$240	39.70	34.30	28.90	24.00	19.40	14.80	10.20	5.60	1.70	0	0
$240	$250	41.70	36.30	30.90	25.70	21.10	16.50	11.90	7.30	3.10	0	0
$250	$260	43.70	38.30	32.90	27.50	22.80	18.20	13.60	9.00	4.60	.70	0
$260	$270	45.70	40.30	34.90	29.50	24.50	19.90	15.30	10.70	6.20	2.10	0
$270	$280	47.70	42.30	36.90	31.50	26.20	21.60	17.00	12.40	7.90	3.60	0
$280	$290	49.70	44.30	38.90	33.50	28.10	23.30	18.70	14.10	9.60	5.10	1.10
$290	$300	51.70	46.30	40.90	35.50	30.10	25.00	20.40	15.80	11.30	6.70	2.50
$300	$320	54.70	49.30	43.90	38.50	33.10	27.70	23.00	18.40	13.80	9.20	4.80
$320	$340	58.70	53.30	47.90	42.50	37.10	31.70	26.40	21.80	17.20	12.60	8.10
$340	$360	63.20	57.30	51.90	46.50	41.10	35.70	30.30	25.20	20.60	16.00	11.50
$360	$380	68.20	61.50	55.90	50.50	45.10	39.70	34.30	29.00	24.00	19.40	14.90
$380	$400	73.20	66.50	59.90	54.50	49.10	43.70	38.30	33.00	27.60	22.80	18.30
$400	$420	78.20	71.50	64.80	58.50	53.10	47.70	42.30	37.00	31.60	26.20	21.70
$420	$440	83.60	76.50	69.80	63.00	57.10	51.70	46.30	41.00	35.60	30.20	25.10
$440	$460	89.60	81.50	74.80	68.00	61.30	55.70	50.30	45.00	39.60	34.20	28.80
$460	$480	95.60	87.50	79.80	73.00	66.30	59.70	54.30	49.00	43.60	38.20	32.80
$480	$500	101.60	93.50	85.40	78.00	71.30	64.60	58.30	53.00	47.60	42.20	36.80
$500	$520	107.60	99.50	91.40	83.30	76.30	69.60	62.80	57.00	51.60	46.20	40.80
$520	$540	113.60	105.50	97.40	89.30	81.30	74.60	67.80	61.10	55.60	50.20	44.80
$540	$560	119.60	111.50	103.40	95.30	87.30	79.60	72.80	66.10	59.60	54.20	48.80
$560	$580	125.60	117.50	109.40	101.30	93.30	85.20	77.80	71.10	64.40	58.20	52.80
$580	$600	131.60	123.50	115.40	107.30	99.30	91.20	83.10	76.10	69.40	62.70	56.80
$600	$620	137.60	129.50	121.40	113.30	105.30	97.20	89.10	81.10	74.40	67.70	60.90
$620	$640	143.60	135.50	127.40	119.30	111.30	103.20	95.10	87.00	79.40	72.70	65.90
$640	$660	149.60	141.50	133.40	125.30	117.30	109.20	101.10	93.00	85.00	77.70	70.90
$660	$680	155.60	147.50	139.40	131.30	123.30	115.20	107.10	99.00	91.00	82.90	75.90
$680	$700	161.60	153.50	145.40	137.30	129.30	121.20	113.10	105.00	97.00	88.90	80.90
$700	$720	167.60	159.50	151.40	143.30	135.30	127.20	119.10	111.00	103.00	94.90	86.80
		30 percent of the excess over $720 plus—										
$720 and over		170.60	162.50	154.40	146.30	138.30	130.20	122.10	114.00	106.00	97.90	89.80

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0
$32	$34	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.80	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.10	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.40	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	4.90	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	5.50	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	5.80	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	6.10	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	6.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	6.70	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	7.00	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.30	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	7.90	4.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.20	4.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	8.50	4.50	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	8.80	4.80	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.10	5.10	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	9.40	5.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	9.70	5.70	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.00	6.00	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	10.30	6.30	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	10.60	6.60	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	10.90	6.90	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	11.20	7.20	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	11.50	7.50	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	11.80	7.80	3.80	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	12.10	8.10	4.10	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	12.40	8.40	4.40	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	12.70	8.70	4.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	13.00	9.00	5.00	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	13.30	9.30	5.20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	13.60	9.60	5.50	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	13.90	9.90	5.80	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	14.20	10.20	6.10	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	14.50	10.50	6.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	14.80	10.80	6.70	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	15.10	11.10	7.00	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	15.40	11.40	7.30	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	15.70	11.70	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	16.00	12.00	7.90	4.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	16.30	12.30	8.20	4.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	16.80	12.70	8.70	4.70	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	17.40	13.30	9.30	5.30	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	18.00	13.90	9.90	5.80	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	18.60	14.50	10.50	6.40	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	19.20	15.10	11.10	7.00	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	19.80	15.70	11.70	7.60	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	20.40	16.30	12.30	8.20	4.30	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	21.00	16.90	12.90	8.80	4.80	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	21.60	17.50	13.50	9.40	5.40	1.60	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	22.20	18.10	14.10	10.00	6.00	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	22.80	18.70	14.70	10.60	6.60	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	23.40	19.30	15.30	11.20	7.20	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	24.00	19.90	15.90	11.80	7.80	3.90	.10	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	24.70	20.50	16.50	12.40	8.40	4.40	.70	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	25.30	21.10	17.10	13.00	9.00	5.00	1.20	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	26.00	21.70	17.70	13.60	9.60	5.60	1.80	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	26.70	22.30	18.30	14.20	10.20	6.20	2.30	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	27.40	22.90	18.90	14.80	10.80	6.80	2.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	28.10	23.50	19.50	15.40	11.40	7.40	3.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	28.70	24.20	20.10	16.00	12.00	8.00	4.00	.30	0	0	0
$200	$210	29.90	25.40	21.10	17.10	13.10	9.00	5.00	1.20	0	0	0
$210	$220	31.60	27.10	22.60	18.60	14.60	10.50	6.50	2.60	0	0	0
$220	$230	33.30	28.80	24.20	20.10	16.10	12.00	8.00	4.00	.30	0	0
$230	$240	35.00	30.50	25.90	21.60	17.60	13.50	9.50	5.40	1.70	0	0
$240	$250	36.70	32.20	27.60	23.10	19.10	15.00	11.00	6.90	3.10	0	0
$250	$260	38.40	33.90	29.30	24.70	20.60	16.50	12.50	8.40	4.50	.70	0
$260	$270	40.10	35.60	31.00	26.40	22.10	18.00	14.00	9.90	5.90	2.10	0
$270	$280	41.80	37.30	32.70	28.10	23.60	19.50	15.50	11.40	7.40	3.50	0
$280	$290	43.50	39.00	34.40	29.80	25.20	21.00	17.00	12.90	8.90	4.90	1.10
$290	$300	45.20	40.70	36.10	31.50	26.90	22.50	18.50	14.40	10.40	6.40	2.50
$300	$320	47.80	43.20	38.60	34.00	29.50	24.90	20.70	16.70	12.70	8.60	4.60
$320	$340	51.20	46.60	42.00	37.40	32.90	28.30	23.70	19.70	15.70	11.60	7.60
$340	$360	54.90	50.00	45.40	40.80	36.30	31.70	27.10	22.70	18.70	14.60	10.60
$360	$380	58.90	53.50	48.80	44.20	39.70	35.10	30.50	25.90	21.70	17.60	13.60
$380	$400	62.90	57.50	52.20	47.60	43.10	38.50	33.90	29.30	24.80	20.60	16.60
$400	$420	66.90	61.50	56.20	51.00	46.50	41.90	37.30	32.70	28.20	23.60	19.60
$420	$440	70.90	65.50	60.20	54.80	49.90	45.30	40.70	36.10	31.60	27.00	22.60
$440	$460	74.90	69.50	64.20	58.80	53.40	48.70	44.10	39.50	35.00	30.40	25.80
$460	$480	78.90	73.50	68.20	62.80	57.40	52.10	47.50	42.90	38.40	33.80	29.20
$480	$500	82.90	77.50	72.20	66.80	61.40	56.00	50.90	46.30	41.80	37.20	32.60
$500	$520	86.90	81.50	76.20	70.80	65.40	60.00	54.60	49.70	45.20	40.60	36.00
$520	$540	90.90	85.50	80.20	74.80	69.40	64.00	58.60	53.20	48.60	44.00	39.40
$540	$560	94.90	89.50	84.20	78.80	73.40	68.00	62.60	57.20	52.00	47.40	42.80
$560	$580	98.90	93.50	88.20	82.80	77.40	72.00	66.60	61.20	55.80	50.80	46.20

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$580	$600	$102.90	$97.50	$92.20	$86.80	$81.40	$76.00	$70.60	$65.20	$59.80	$54.50	$49.60
$600	$620	106.90	101.50	96.20	90.80	85.40	80.00	74.60	69.29	63.80	58.50	53.10
$620	$640	110.90	105.50	100.20	94.80	89.40	84.00	78.60	73.20	67.80	62.50	57.10
$640	$660	114.90	109.50	104.20	98.80	93.40	88.00	82.60	77.20	71.80	66.50	61.10
$660	$680	118.90	113.50	108.20	102.80	97.40	92.00	86.60	81.20	75.80	70.50	65.10
$680	$700	123.40	117.50	112.20	106.80	101.40	96.00	90.60	85.20	79.80	74.50	69.10
$700	$720	128.40	121.70	116.20	110.80	105.40	100.00	94.60	89.20	83.80	78.50	73.10
$720	$740	133.40	126.70	120.20	114.80	109.40	104.00	98.60	93.20	87.80	82.50	77.10
$740	$760	138.40	131.70	124.90	118.80	113.40	108.00	102.60	97.20	91.80	86.50	81.10
$760	$780	143.40	136.70	129.90	123.20	117.40	112.00	106.60	101.20	95.80	90.50	85.10
$780	$800	148.40	141.70	134.90	128.20	121.50	116.00	110.60	105.20	99.80	94.50	89.10
$800	$820	153.40	146.70	139.90	133.20	126.50	120.00	114.60	109.20	103.80	98.50	93.10
$820	$840	158.40	151.70	144.90	138.20	131.50	124.70	118.60	113.20	107.80	102.50	97.10
$840	$860	163.60	156.70	149.90	143.20	136.50	129.70	123.00	117.20	111.80	106.50	101.10
$860	$880	169.60	161.70	154.90	148.20	141.50	134.70	128.00	121.30	115.80	110.50	105.10
$880	$900	175.60	167.50	159.90	153.20	146.50	139.70	133.00	126.30	119.80	114.50	109.10
$900	$920	181.60	173.50	165.40	158.20	151.50	144.70	138.00	131.30	124.50	118.50	113.10
$920	$940	187.60	179.50	171.40	163.30	156.50	149.70	143.00	136.30	129.50	122.80	117.10
$940	$960	193.60	185.50	177.40	169.30	161.50	154.70	148.00	141.30	134.50	127.80	121.10
$960	$980	199.60	191.50	183.40	175.30	167.30	159.70	153.00	146.30	139.50	132.80	126.10
$980	$1,000	205.60	197.50	189.40	181.30	173.30	165.20	158.00	151.30	144.50	137.80	131.10
$1,000	$1,020	211.60	203.50	195.40	187.30	179.30	171.20	163.10	156.30	149.50	142.80	136.10
$1,020	$1,040	217.60	209.50	201.40	193.30	185.30	177.20	169.10	161.30	154.50	147.80	141.10
$1,040	$1,060	223.60	215.50	207.40	199.30	191.30	183.20	175.10	167.00	159.50	152.80	146.10
$1,060	$1,080	229.60	221.50	213.40	205.30	197.30	189.20	181.10	173.00	165.00	157.80	151.10
$1,080	$1,100	235.60	227.50	219.40	211.30	203.30	195.20	187.10	179.00	171.00	162.90	156.10
$1,100	$1,120	241.60	233.50	225.40	217.30	209.30	201.20	193.10	185.00	177.00	168.90	161.10
$1,120	$1,140	247.60	239.50	231.40	223.30	215.30	207.20	199.10	191.00	183.00	174.90	166.80
		30 percent of the excess over $1,140 plus—										
$1,140 and over		250.60	242.50	234.40	226.30	218.30	210.20	202.10	194.00	186.00	177.90	169.80

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.40	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.70	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	5.00	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.30	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	5.60	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	5.90	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$50	$52	6.20	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$54	6.60	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	6.90	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	7.20	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.60	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	7.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	8.30	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.60	3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	8.90	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	9.30	4.50	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.60	4.80	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	10.00	5.01	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	10.30	5.40	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	10.60	5.70	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	11.00	6.00	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	11.30	6.40	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	11.70	6.70	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	12.00	7.00	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	12.30	7.40	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	12.70	7.70	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	13.00	8.10	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	13.40	8.40	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	13.70	8.70	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	14.00	9.10	4.30	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	14.40	9.40	4.60	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	14.70	9.80	4.90	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	15.10	10.10	5.20	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	15.40	10.40	5.50	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	15.70	10.80	5.80	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	16.10	11.10	6.20	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$110	$112	$16.40	$11.50	$6.50	$2.10	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$112	$114	16.80	11.80	6.80	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	17.10	12.10	7.20	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	17.40	12.50	7.50	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	17.80	12.80	7.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	18.30	13.30	8.40	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	19.00	14.00	9.00	4.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	19.60	14.70	9.70	4.90	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	20.30	15.40	10.40	5.50	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	21.00	16.00	11.10	6.10	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	21.70	16.70	11.80	6.80	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	22.40	17.40	12.40	7.50	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	23.00	18.10	13.10	8.20	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	23.70	18.80	13.80	8.80	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	24.40	19.40	14.50	9.50	4.70	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	25.10	20.10	15.20	10.20	5.30	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	25.80	20.80	15.80	10.90	5.90	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	26.40	21.50	16.50	11.60	6.60	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	27.10	22.20	17.20	12.20	7.30	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	27.80	22.80	17.90	12.90	8.00	3.40	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	28.50	23.50	18.60	13.60	8.60	4.00	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	29.20	24.20	19.20	14.30	9.30	4.60	.40	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	30.00	24.90	19.90	15.00	10.00	5.20	.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	30.80	25.60	20.60	15.60	10.70	5.80	1.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	31.60	26.20	21.30	16.30	11.40	6.40	2.10	0	0	0	0
$200	$210	33.00	27.40	22.50	17.50	12.60	7.60	3.00	0	0	0	0
$210	$220	35.00	29.20	24.20	19.20	14.30	9.30	4.50	.40	0	0	0
$220	$230	37.00	31.20	25.90	20.90	16.00	11.00	6.00	1.80	0	0	0
$230	$240	39.00	33.20	27.60	22.60	17.70	12.70	7.70	3.20	0	0	0
$240	$250	41.00	35.20	29.40	24.30	19.40	14.40	9.40	4.70	.50	0	0
$250	$260	43.00	37.20	31.40	26.00	21.10	16.10	11.10	6.20	1.90	0	0
$260	$270	45.00	39.20	33.40	27.70	22.80	17.80	12.80	7.90	3.30	0	0
$270	$280	47.00	41.20	35.40	29.50	24.50	19.50	14.50	9.60	4.80	.60	0
$280	$290	49.00	43.20	37.40	31.50	26.20	21.20	16.20	11.30	6.30	2.00	0
$290	$300	51.00	45.20	39.40	33.50	27.90	22.90	17.90	13.00	8.00	3.40	0
$300	$320	54.00	48.20	42.40	36.50	30.70	25.50	20.50	15.50	10.60	5.70	1.40
$320	$340	58.00	52.20	46.40	40.50	34.70	28.90	23.90	18.90	14.00	9.00	4.30
$340	$360	62.00	56.20	50.40	44.50	38.70	32.90	27.30	22.30	17.40	12.40	7.50
$360	$380	66.20	60.20	54.40	48.50	42.70	36.90	31.00	25.70	20.80	15.80	10.90
$380	$400	71.20	64.20	58.40	52.50	46.70	40.90	35.00	29.20	24.20	19.20	14.30
$400	$420	76.20	68.90	62.40	56.50	50.70	44.90	39.00	33.20	27.60	22.60	17.70
$420	$440	81.20	73.90	66.60	60.50	54.70	48.90	43.00	37.20	31.40	26.00	21.10
$440	$460	86.20	78.90	71.60	64.50	58.70	52.90	47.00	41.20	35.40	29.50	24.50
$460	$480	91.80	83.90	76.60	69.30	62.70	56.90	51.00	45.20	39.40	33.50	27.90
$480	$500	97.80	89.00	81.60	74.30	67.00	60.90	55.00	49.20	43.40	37.50	31.70
$500	$520	103.80	95.00	86.60	79.30	72.00	64.90	59.00	53.20	47.40	41.50	35.70
$520	$540	109.80	101.00	92.30	84.30	77.00	69.80	63.00	57.20	51.40	45.50	39.70
$540	$560	115.80	107.00	98.30	89.50	82.00	74.80	67.50	61.20	55.40	49.50	43.70
$560	$580	121.80	113.00	104.30	95.50	87.00	79.80	72.50	65.20	59.40	53.50	47.70
$580	$600	127.80	119.00	110.30	101.50	92.80	84.80	77.50	70.20	63.40	57.50	51.70
$600	$620	133.80	125.00	116.30	107.50	98.80	90.00	82.50	75.20	67.90	61.50	55.70
$620	$640	139.80	131.00	122.30	113.50	104.80	96.00	87.50	80.20	72.90	65.60	59.70
$640	$660	145.80	137.00	128.30	119.50	110.80	102.00	93.30	85.20	77.90	70.60	63.70
$660	$680	151.80	143.00	134.30	125.50	116.80	108.00	99.30	90.50	82.90	75.60	68.30
$680	$700	157.80	149.00	140.30	131.50	122.80	114.00	105.30	96.50	87.90	80.60	73.30
$700	$720	163.80	155.00	146.30	137.50	128.80	120.00	111.30	102.50	93.80	85.60	78.30
$720	$740	169.80	161.00	152.30	143.50	134.80	126.00	117.30	108.50	99.80	91.00	83.30
$740	$760	175.80	167.00	158.30	149.50	140.80	132.00	123.30	114.50	105.80	97.00	88.30
		30 percent of the excess over $760 plus—										
$760 and over		178.80	170.00	161.30	152.50	143.80	135.00	126.30	117.50	108.80	100.00	91.30

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$8	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$8	$10	$0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10	$12	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$12	$14	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$14	$16	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$16	$18	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$18	$20	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$22	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$22	$24	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$26	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$26	$28	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$30	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$30	$32	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$34	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$34	$36	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$38	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$38	$40	4.30	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$42	4.60	.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$42	$44	4.90	.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$46	5.10	1.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$46	$48	5.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$50	5.70	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$50	$52	$6.00	$1.90	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$52	$54	6.30	2.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$54	$56	6.60	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$58	6.90	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$58	$60	7.20	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$62	7.50	3.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$62	$64	7.80	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$66	8.10	3.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$66	$68	8.40	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$70	8.70	4.40	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$70	$72	9.00	4.70	.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$74	9.30	5.00	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$74	$76	9.60	5.30	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$78	9.90	5.50	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$78	$80	10.20	5.80	1.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$82	10.50	6.10	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$82	$84	10.80	6.40	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$86	11.10	6.70	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$86	$88	11.40	7.00	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$90	11.70	7.30	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$90	$92	12.00	7.60	3.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$94	12.30	7.90	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$94	$96	12.60	8.20	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$98	12.90	8.50	4.20	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$98	$100	13.20	8.80	4.50	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$102	13.50	9.10	4.80	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$102	$104	13.80	9.40	5.10	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$106	14.10	9.70	5.40	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$106	$108	14.40	10.00	5.60	1.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$110	14.70	10.30	5.90	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$110	$112	15.00	10.60	6.20	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$114	15.30	10.90	6.50	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$114	$116	15.60	11.20	6.80	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$118	15.90	11.50	7.10	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$118	$120	16.20	11.80	7.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	16.60	12.30	7.90	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	17.20	12.90	8.50	4.20	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	17.80	13.50	9.10	4.80	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	18.40	14.10	9.70	5.30	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	19.00	14.70	10.30	5.90	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	19.60	15.30	10.90	6.50	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	20.20	15.90	11.50	7.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	20.80	16.50	12.10	7.70	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	21.40	17.10	12.70	8.30	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	22.00	17.70	13.30	8.90	4.60	.50	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	22.60	18.30	13.90	9.50	5.20	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	23.20	18.90	14.50	10.10	5.70	1.70	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	23.80	19.50	15.10	10.70	6.30	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	24.40	20.10	15.70	11.30	6.90	2.80	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	25.00	20.70	16.30	11.90	7.50	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	25.60	21.30	16.90	12.50	8.10	3.90	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	26.30	21.90	17.50	13.10	8.70	4.50	.40	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	27.00	22.50	18.10	13.70	9.30	5.00	.90	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	27.60	23.10	18.70	14.30	9.90	5.60	1.50	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	28.30	23.70	19.30	14.90	10.50	6.20	2.10	0	0	0	0
$200	$210	29.50	24.70	20.30	16.00	11.60	7.20	3.00	0	0	0	0
$210	$220	31.20	26.30	21.80	17.50	13.10	8.70	4.40	.40	0	0	0
$220	$230	32.90	28.00	23.30	19.00	14.60	10.20	5.80	1.80	0	0	0
$230	$240	34.60	29.70	24.80	20.50	16.10	11.70	7.30	3.20	0	0	0
$240	$250	36.30	31.40	26.40	22.00	17.60	13.20	8.80	4.60	.50	0	0
$250	$260	38.00	33.10	28.10	23.50	19.10	14.70	10.30	6.00	1.90	0	0
$260	$270	39.70	34.80	29.80	25.00	20.60	16.20	11.80	7.50	3.30	0	0
$270	$280	41.40	36.50	31.50	26.50	22.10	17.70	13.30	9.00	4.70	0.60	0
$280	$290	43.10	38.20	33.20	28.20	23.60	19.20	14.80	10.50	6.10	2.00	0
$290	$300	44.80	39.90	34.90	29.90	25.10	20.70	16.30	12.00	7.60	3.40	0
$300	$320	47.40	42.40	37.50	32.50	27.50	23.00	18.60	14.20	9.80	5.50	1.40
$320	$340	50.80	45.80	40.90	35.90	30.90	26.00	21.60	17.20	12.80	8.50	4.20
$340	$360	54.20	49.20	44.30	39.30	34.30	29.40	24.60	20.20	15.80	11.50	7.10
$360	$380	57.70	52.60	47.70	42.70	37.70	32.80	27.80	23.20	18.80	14.50	10.10
$380	$400	61.70	56.00	51.10	46.10	41.10	36.20	31.20	26.30	21.80	17.50	13.10
$400	$420	65.70	59.80	54.50	49.50	44.50	39.60	34.60	29.70	24.80	20.50	16.10
$420	$440	69.70	63.80	58.00	52.90	47.90	43.00	38.00	33.10	28.10	23.50	19.10
$440	$460	73.70	67.80	62.00	56.30	51.30	46.40	41.40	36.50	31.50	26.50	22.10
$460	$480	77.70	71.80	66.00	60.20	54.70	49.80	44.80	39.90	34.90	29.90	25.10
$480	$500	81.70	75.80	70.00	64.20	58.30	53.20	48.20	43.30	38.30	33.30	28.40
$500	$520	85.70	79.80	74.00	68.20	62.30	56.60	51.60	46.70	41.70	36.70	31.80
$520	$540	89.70	83.80	78.00	72.20	66.30	60.50	55.00	50.10	45.10	40.10	35.20
$540	$560	93.70	87.80	82.00	76.20	70.30	64.50	58.70	53.50	48.50	43.50	38.60
$560	$580	97.70	91.80	86.00	80.20	74.30	68.50	62.70	56.90	51.90	46.90	42.00
$580	$600	101.70	95.80	90.00	84.20	78.30	72.50	66.70	60.80	55.30	50.30	45.40
$600	$620	105.70	99.80	94.00	88.20	82.30	76.50	70.70	64.80	59.00	53.70	48.80
$620	$640	109.70	103.80	98.00	92.20	86.30	80.50	74.70	68.80	63.00	57.20	52.20
$640	$660	113.70	107.80	102.00	96.20	90.30	84.50	78.70	72.80	67.00	61.20	55.60
$660	$680	117.70	111.80	106.00	100.20	94.30	88.50	82.70	76.80	71.00	65.20	59.30
$680	$700	121.70	115.80	110.00	104.20	98.30	92.50	86.70	80.80	75.00	69.20	63.30
$700	$720	125.70	119.80	114.00	108.20	102.30	96.50	90.70	84.80	79.00	73.20	67.30
$720	$740	129.70	123.80	118.00	112.20	106.30	100.50	94.70	88.80	83.00	77.20	71.30
$740	$760	134.30	127.80	122.00	116.20	110.30	104.50	98.70	92.80	87.00	81.20	75.30
$760	$780	139.30	132.00	126.00	120.20	114.30	108.50	102.70	96.80	91.00	85.20	79.30
$780	$800	144.30	137.00	130.00	124.20	118.30	112.50	106.70	100.80	95.00	89.20	83.30
$800	$820	149.30	142.00	134.70	128.20	122.30	116.50	110.70	104.80	99.00	93.20	87.30
$820	$840	154.30	147.00	139.70	132.40	126.30	120.50	114.70	108.80	103.00	97.20	91.30
$840	$860	159.30	152.00	144.70	137.42	130.30	124.50	118.70	112.80	107.00	101.20	95.30
$860	$880	164.30	157.00	149.70	142.40	135.10	128.50	122.70	116.80	111.00	105.20	99.30
$880	$900	169.30	162.00	154.70	147.40	140.10	132.80	126.70	120.80	115.00	109.20	103.30
$900	$920	174.30	167.00	159.70	152.40	145.10	137.80	130.70	124.80	119.00	113.20	107.30
$920	$940	180.00	172.00	164.70	157.40	150.10	142.80	135.50	128.80	123.00	117.20	111.30
$940	$960	186.00	177.20	169.70	162.40	155.10	147.80	140.50	133.30	127.00	121.20	115.30
$960	$980	192.00	183.20	174.70	167.40	160.10	152.80	145.50	138.30	131.00	125.20	119.30
$980	$1,000	198.00	189.20	180.50	172.40	165.10	157.80	150.50	143.30	136.00	129.20	123.30
$1,000	$1,020	204.00	195.20	186.50	177.70	170.10	162.80	155.50	148.30	141.00	133.70	127.30
$1,020	$1,040	210.00	201.20	192.50	183.70	175.10	167.80	160.50	153.30	146.00	138.70	131.40

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$1,040	$1,060	$216.00	$207.20	$198.50	$189.70	$181.00	$172.80	$165.50	$158.30	$151.00	$143.70	$136.40
$1,060	$1,080	222.00	213.20	204.50	195.70	187.00	178.20	170.50	163.30	156.00	148.70	141.40
$1,080	$1,100	228.00	219.20	210.50	201.70	193.00	184.20	175.50	168.30	161.00	153.70	146.40
$1,100	$1,120	234.00	225.20	216.50	207.70	199.00	190.20	181.50	173.30	166.00	158.70	151.40
$1,120	$1,140	240.00	231.20	222.50	213.70	205.00	196.20	187.50	178.70	171.00	163.70	156.40
$1,140	$1,160	246.00	237.20	228.50	219.70	211.00	202.20	193.50	184.70	176.00	168.70	161.40
$1,160	$1,180	252.00	243.20	234.50	225.70	217.00	208.20	199.50	190.70	182.00	173.70	166.40
$1,180	$1,200	258.00	249.20	240.50	231.70	223.00	214.20	205.50	196.70	188.00	179.20	171.40
$1,200	$1,220	264.00	255.20	246.50	237.70	229.00	220.20	211.50	202.70	194.00	185.20	176.50
		30 percent of the excess over $1,220 plus—										
$1,220 and over		267.00	258.20	249.50	240.70	232.00	223.20	214.50	205.70	197.00	188.20	179.50

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$16	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$16	$20	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$24	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$28	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$32	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$36	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$40	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$44	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$48	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$52	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$56	5.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$60	5.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$64	6.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$68	7.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$72	7.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$76	8.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$80	8.80	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$84	9.40	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$88	10.00	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$92	10.60	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$96	11.20	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$100	11.80	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$104	12.40	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$108	13.10	4.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$112	13.80	4.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$116	14.50	5.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$120	15.10	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	15.80	6.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	16.50	7.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	17.20	7.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	17.90	8.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	18.50	9.00	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	19.20	9.60	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	19.90	10.20	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	20.60	10.80	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	21.30	11.40	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	21.90	12.00	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	22.60	12.70	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	23.30	13.40	4.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	24.00	14.10	5.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$172	$176	24.70	14.70	5.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$176	$180	25.30	15.40	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	26.00	16.10	6.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	26.70	16.80	7.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	27.40	17.50	8.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	28.10	18.10	8.70	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	28.70	18.80	9.30	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	$204	29.40	19.50	9.90	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$204	$208	30.10	20.20	10.50	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$208	$212	30.80	20.90	11.10	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$212	$216	31.50	21.50	11.70	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$216	$220	32.10	22.20	12.30	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$220	$224	32.80	22.90	13.00	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$224	$228	33.50	23.60	13.70	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$228	$232	34.20	24.30	14.40	5.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$232	$236	34.90	24.90	15.00	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$236	$240	35.50	25.60	15.70	6.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$240	$248	36.60	26.60	16.70	7.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$248	$256	37.90	28.00	18.10	8.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$256	$264	39.30	29.40	19.50	9.80	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$264	$272	40.60	30.70	20.80	11.00	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$272	$280	42.00	32.10	22.20	12.30	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$280	$288	43.40	33.40	23.50	13.60	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$288	$296	44.70	34.80	24.90	15.00	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$296	$304	46.10	36.20	26.30	16.30	7.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$304	$312	47.40	37.50	27.60	17.70	8.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$312	$320	48.80	38.90	29.00	19.10	9.50	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$320	$328	50.20	40.20	30.30	20.40	10.70	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$328	$336	51.50	41.60	31.70	21.80	11.90	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$336	$344	52.90	43.00	33.10	23.10	13.20	4.40	0	0	0	0	0
$344	$352	54.20	44.30	34.40	24.50	14.60	5.60	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is not married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$352	$360	$55.60	$45.70	$35.80	$25.90	$15.90	$6.70	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$360	$368	57.00	47.00	37.10	27.20	17.30	7.90	0	0	0	0	0
$368	$376	58.50	48.40	38.50	28.60	18.70	9.10	.70	0	0	0	0
$376	$384	60.10	49.80	39.90	29.90	20.00	10.30	1.90	0	0	0	0
$384	$392	61.70	51.10	41.20	31.30	21.40	11.50	3.00	0	0	0	0
$392	$400	63.30	52.50	42.60	32.70	22.70	12.80	4.10	0	0	0	0
$400	$420	66.10	54.90	45.00	35.00	25.10	15.20	6.10	0	0	0	0
$420	$440	70.10	58.40	48.40	38.40	28.50	18.60	9.10	.70	0	0	0
$440	$460	74.10	62.40	51.80	41.80	31.90	22.00	12.10	3.50	0	0	0
$460	$480	78.10	66.40	55.20	45.20	35.30	25.40	15.50	6.30	0	0	0
$480	$500	82.10	70.40	58.80	48.60	38.70	28.80	18.90	9.30	.90	0	0
$500	$520	86.10	74.40	62.80	52.00	42.10	32.20	22.30	12.40	3.70	0	0
$520	$540	90.10	78.40	66.80	55.40	45.50	35.60	25.70	15.80	6.60	0	0
$540	$560	94.10	82.40	70.80	59.10	48.90	39.00	29.10	19.20	9.60	1.20	0
$560	$580	98.10	86.40	74.80	63.10	52.30	42.40	32.50	22.60	12.70	4.00	0
$580	$600	102.10	90.40	78.80	67.10	55.70	45.80	35.90	26.00	16.10	6.80	0
$600	$640	108.10	96.40	84.80	73.10	61.40	50.90	41.00	31.10	21.20	11.30	2.80
$640	$680	116.10	104.40	92.80	81.10	69.40	57.80	47.80	37.90	28.00	18.00	8.60
$680	$720	124.10	112.40	100.80	89.10	77.40	65.80	54.60	44.70	34.80	24.80	14.90
$720	$760	132.40	120.40	108.80	97.10	85.40	73.80	62.10	51.50	41.60	31.60	21.70
$760	$800	142.40	128.40	116.80	105.10	93.40	81.80	70.10	58.40	48.40	38.40	28.50
$800	$840	152.40	137.80	124.80	113.10	101.40	89.80	78.10	66.40	55.20	45.20	35.30
$840	$880	162.40	147.80	133.30	121.10	109.40	97.80	86.10	74.40	62.80	52.00	42.10
$880	$920	172.40	157.80	143.30	129.10	117.40	105.80	94.10	82.40	70.80	59.10	48.90
$920	$960	183.60	167.80	153.30	138.70	125.40	113.80	102.10	90.40	78.80	67.10	55.70
$960	$1,000	195.60	178.10	163.30	148.70	134.10	121.80	110.10	98.40	86.80	75.10	63.40
$1,000	$1,040	207.60	190.10	173.30	158.70	144.10	129.80	118.10	106.40	94.80	83.10	71.40
$1,040	$1,080	219.60	202.10	184.60	168.70	154.10	139.50	126.10	114.40	102.80	91.10	79.40
$1,080	$1,120	231.60	214.10	196.60	179.10	164.10	149.50	134.90	122.40	110.80	99.10	87.40
$1,120	$1,160	243.60	226.10	208.60	191.10	174.10	159.50	144.90	130.40	118.80	107.10	95.40
$1,160	$1,200	255.60	238.10	220.60	203.10	185.60	169.50	154.90	140.30	126.80	115.10	103.40
$1,200	$1,240	267.60	250.10	232.60	215.10	197.60	180.10	164.90	150.30	135.80	123.10	111.40
$1,240	$1,280	279.60	262.10	244.60	277.10	209.60	192.10	174.90	160.30	145.80	131.20	119.40
$1,280	$1,320	291.60	274.10	256.60	239.10	221.60	204.10	186.60	170.30	155.80	141.20	127.40
$1,320	$1,360	303.60	286.10	268.60	251.10	233.60	216.10	198.60	181.10	165.80	151.20	136.60
$1,360	$1,400	315.60	298.10	280.60	263.10	245.60	228.10	210.60	193.10	175.80	161.20	146.60
$1,400	$1,440	327.60	310.10	292.60	275.10	257.60	240.10	222.60	205.10	187.60	171.20	156.60
$1,440	$1,480	339.60	322.10	304.60	287.10	269.60	252.10	234.60	217.10	199.60	182.10	166.60
$1,480	$1,520	351.60	334.10	316.60	299.10	281.60	264.10	246.60	229.10	211.60	194.10	176.60
		30 percent of the excess over $1,520 plus—										
$1,520 and over		357.60	340.10	322.60	305.10	287.60	270.10	252.60	235.10	217.60	200.10	182.60

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$0	$16	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$16	$20	$0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$20	$24	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$24	$28	1.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$28	$32	1.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$32	$36	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$36	$40	3.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$40	$44	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$44	$48	4.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$48	$52	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$52	$56	5.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$56	$60	5.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$60	$64	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$64	$68	6.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$68	$72	7.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$72	$76	8.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$76	$80	8.60	.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$80	$84	9.10	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$84	$88	9.70	1.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$88	$92	10.30	2.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$92	$96	10.80	2.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$96	$100	11.40	3.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$100	$104	12.00	3.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$104	$108	12.60	4.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$108	$112	13.20	4.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$112	$116	13.80	5.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$116	$120	14.40	6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$120	$124	15.00	6.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$124	$128	15.60	7.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$128	$132	16.20	7.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$132	$136	16.80	8.30	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$136	$140	17.40	8.80	.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$140	$144	18.00	9.40	1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$144	$148	18.60	9.90	1.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$148	$152	19.20	10.50	2.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$152	$156	19.80	11.10	2.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$156	$160	20.40	11.60	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$160	$164	21.00	12.20	4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$164	$168	21.60	12.80	4.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$168	$172	22.20	13.40	5.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly and he is married—

"And the wages are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
At least—	But less than—	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
		The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be—										
$172	$176	$22.80	$14.00	$5.70	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$176	$180	23.40	14.60	6.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$180	$184	24.00	15.20	6.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$184	$188	24.60	15.80	7.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$188	$192	25.20	16.40	7.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$192	$196	25.80	17.00	8.50	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$196	$200	26.40	17.60	9.10	.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$200	$204	27.00	18.20	9.60	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$204	$208	27.60	18.80	10.20	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$208	$212	28.20	19.40	10.70	2.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$212	$216	28.80	20.00	11.30	3.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$216	$220	29.40	20.60	11.90	3.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$220	$224	30.00	21.20	12.50	4.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$224	$228	30.60	21.80	13.10	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$228	$232	31.20	22.40	13.70	5.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$232	$236	31.80	23.00	14.30	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$236	$240	32.40	23.60	14.90	6.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$240	$248	33.30	24.50	15.80	7.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$248	$256	34.50	25.70	17.00	8.40	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$256	$264	35.70	26.90	18.20	9.60	1.40	0	0	0	0	0	0
$264	$272	36.90	28.10	19.40	10.70	2.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
$272	$280	38.10	29.30	20.60	11.80	3.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
$280	$288	39.30	30.50	21.80	13.00	4.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
$288	$296	40.50	31.70	23.00	14.20	5.90	0	0	0	0	0	0
$296	$304	41.70	32.90	24.20	15.40	7.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
$304	$312	42.90	34.10	25.40	16.60	8.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$312	$320	44.10	35.30	26.60	17.80	9.20	1.10	0	0	0	0	0
$320	$328	45.30	36.50	27.80	19.00	10.40	2.20	0	0	0	0	0
$328	$336	46.50	37.70	29.00	20.20	11.50	3.30	0	0	0	0	0
$336	$344	47.70	38.90	30.20	21.40	12.70	4.40	0	0	0	0	0
$344	$352	48.90	40.10	31.40	22.60	13.90	5.60	0	0	0	0	0
$352	$360	50.10	41.30	32.60	23.80	15.10	6.70	0	0	0	0	0
$360	$368	51.30	42.50	33.80	25.00	16.30	7.80	0	0	0	0	0
$368	$376	52.60	43.70	35.00	26.20	17.50	8.90	.70	0	0	0	0
$376	$384	53.90	44.90	36.20	27.40	18.70	10.00	1.90	0	0	0	0
$384	$392	55.30	46.10	37.40	28.60	19.90	11.20	3.00	0	0	0	0
$392	$400	56.70	47.30	38.60	29.80	21.10	12.30	4.10	0	0	0	0
$400	$420	59.00	49.40	40.70	31.90	23.20	14.40	6.10	0	0	0	0
$420	$440	62.40	52.50	43.70	34.90	26.20	17.40	8.90	.70	0	0	0
$440	$460	65.80	55.90	46.70	37.90	29.20	20.40	11.70	3.50	0	0	0
$460	$480	69.20	59.30	49.70	40.90	32.20	23.40	14.70	6.30	0	0	0
$480	$500	72.60	62.70	52.80	43.90	35.20	26.40	17.70	9.10	.90	0	0
$500	$520	76.00	66.10	56.20	46.90	38.20	29.40	20.70	11.90	3.70	0	0
$520	$540	79.40	69.50	59.60	49.90	41.20	32.40	23.70	14.90	6.50	0	0
$540	$560	82.80	72.90	63.00	53.10	44.20	35.40	26.70	17.90	9.30	1.20	0
$560	$580	86.20	76.30	66.40	56.50	47.20	38.40	29.70	20.90	12.20	4.00	0
$580	$600	89.60	79.70	69.80	59.90	50.20	41.40	32.70	23.90	15.20	6.80	0
$600	$640	94.70	84.80	74.90	65.00	55.10	45.90	37.20	28.40	19.70	11.00	2.80
$640	$680	101.50	91.60	81.70	71.80	61.90	52.00	43.20	34.40	25.70	16.90	8.40
$680	$720	108.30	98.40	88.50	78.60	68.70	58.80	49.20	40.40	31.70	22.90	14.20
$720	$760	115.30	105.20	95.30	85.40	75.50	65.60	55.60	46.40	37.70	28.90	20.20
$760	$800	123.30	112.00	102.10	92.20	82.30	72.40	62.40	52.50	43.70	34.90	26.20
$800	$840	131.30	119.70	108.90	99.00	89.10	79.20	69.20	59.30	49.70	40.90	32.20
$840	$880	139.30	127.70	116.00	105.80	95.90	86.00	76.00	66.10	56.20	46.90	38.20
$880	$920	147.30	135.70	124.00	112.60	102.70	92.80	82.80	72.90	63.00	53.10	44.20
$920	$960	155.30	143.70	132.00	120.30	109.50	99.60	89.60	79.70	69.80	59.90	50.20
$960	$1,000	163.30	151.70	140.00	128.30	116.70	106.40	96.40	86.50	76.60	66.70	56.80
$1,000	$1,040	171.30	159.70	148.00	136.30	124.70	113.20	103.20	93.30	83.40	73.50	63.60
$1,040	$1,080	179.30	167.70	156.00	144.30	132.70	121.00	110.00	100.10	90.20	80.30	70.40
$1,080	$1,120	187.30	175.70	164.00	152.30	140.70	129.00	117.30	106.90	97.00	87.10	77.20
$1,120	$1,160	195.30	183.70	172.00	160.30	148.70	137.00	125.30	113.70	103.80	93.90	84.00
$1,160	$1,200	203.30	191.70	180.00	168.30	156.70	145.00	133.30	121.70	110.60	100.70	90.80
$1,200	$1,240	211.30	199.70	188.00	176.30	164.70	153.00	141.30	129.70	118.00	107.50	97.60
$1,240	$1,280	219.30	207.70	196.00	184.30	172.70	161.00	149.30	137.70	126.00	114.30	104.40
$1,280	$1,320	227.30	215.70	204.00	192.30	180.70	169.00	157.30	145.70	134.00	122.30	111.20
$1,320	$1,360	235.30	223.70	212.00	200.30	188.70	177.00	165.30	153.70	142.00	130.30	118.70
$1,360	$1,400	243.30	231.70	220.00	208.30	196.70	185.00	173.30	161.70	150.00	138.30	126.70
$1,400	$1,440	251.30	239.70	228.00	216.30	204.70	193.00	181.30	169.70	158.00	146.30	134.70
$1,440	$1,480	259.30	247.70	236.00	224.30	212.70	201.00	189.30	177.70	166.00	154.30	142.70
$1,480	$1,520	268.60	255.70	244.00	232.30	220.70	209.00	197.30	185.70	174.00	162.30	150.70
$1,520	$1,560	278.60	264.00	252.00	240.30	228.70	217.00	205.30	193.70	182.00	170.30	158.70
$1,560	$1,600	288.60	274.00	260.00	248.30	236.70	225.00	213.30	201.70	190.00	178.30	166.70
$1,600	$1,640	298.60	284.00	269.40	256.30	244.70	233.00	221.30	209.70	198.00	186.30	174.70
$1,640	$1,680	308.60	294.00	279.40	264.80	252.70	241.00	229.30	217.70	206.00	194.30	182.70
$1,680	$1,720	318.60	304.00	289.40	274.80	260.70	249.00	237.30	225.70	214.00	202.30	190.70
$1,720	$1,760	328.60	314.00	299.40	284.80	270.30	257.00	245.30	233.70	222.00	210.30	198.70
$1,760	$1,800	338.60	324.00	309.40	294.80	280.30	5.70	253.30	241.70	230.00	218.30	206.70
$1,800	$1,840	348.60	334.00	319.40	304.80	290.30	275.70	261.30	249.70	238.00	226.30	214.70
$1,840	$1,880	359.90	344.00	329.40	314.80	300.30	285.70	271.10	257.70	246.00	234.30	222.70
$1,880	$1,920	371.90	354.40	339.40	324.80	310.30	295.70	281.10	266.50	254.00	242.30	230.70
$1,920	$1,960	383.90	366.40	349.40	334.80	320.30	305.70	291.10	276.50	262.00	250.30	238.70
$1,960	$2,000	395.90	378.40	360.90	344.80	330.30	315.70	301.10	286.50	271.90	258.30	246.70
$2,000	$2,040	407.90	390.40	372.90	355.40	340.30	325.70	311.10	296.50	281.90	267.30	254.70
$2,040	$2,080	419.90	402.40	384.90	367.40	350.30	335.70	321.10	306.50	291.90	277.30	262.80
$2,080	$2,120	431.90	414.40	396.90	379.40	361.90	345.70	331.10	316.50	301.90	287.30	272.80
$2,120	$2,160	443.90	426.40	408.90	391.40	373.90	356.40	341.10	326.50	311.90	297.30	282.80
$2,160	$2,200	455.90	438.40	420.90	403.40	385.90	368.40	351.10	336.50	321.90	307.30	292.80
$2,200	$2,240	467.90	450.50	432.90	415.40	397.90	380.40	362.90	346.50	331.90	317.30	302.80
$2,240	$2,280	479.90	462.40	444.90	427.40	409.90	392.40	374.90	357.40	341.90	327.30	312.80
$2,280	$2,320	491.90	474.40	456.90	439.40	421.90	404.40	386.90	369.40	351.90	337.30	322.80
$2,320	$2,360	503.90	486.40	468.90	451.40	433.90	416.40	398.90	381.40	363.90	347.30	332.80
$2,360	$2,400	515.90	498.40	480.90	463.40	445.90	428.40	410.90	393.40	375.90	358.40	342.80
$2,400	$2,440	527.90	510.40	492.90	475.40	457.90	440.40	422.90	405.40	387.90	370.40	352.80
		30 percent of the excess over $2,440 plus—										
$2,440 and over		533.90	516.40	498.90	481.40	463.90	446.40	428.90	411.40	393.90	376.40	358.90

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period and he is not married—

"And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such periods—										
$0	$0.75	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$.75	$1.00	$0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.00	$1.25	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.25	$1.50	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.50	$1.75	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.75	$2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.00	$2.25	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.25	$2.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.50	$2.75	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.75	$3.00	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.00	$3.25	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.25	$3.50	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.50	$3.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.75	$4.00	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.00	$4.25	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.25	$4.50	.60	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.50	$4.75	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.75	$5.00	.65	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.00	$5.25	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.25	$5.50	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.50	$5.75	.80	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.75	$6.00	.85	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.00	$6.25	.90	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.25	$6.50	.90	.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.50	$6.75	.95	.65	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.75	$7.00	1.00	.70	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.00	$7.25	1.05	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.25	$7.50	1.10	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.50	$7.75	1.15	.80	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.75	$8.00	1.20	.85	.55	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.00	$8.25	1.20	.90	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.25	$8.50	1.25	.95	.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.50	$8.75	1.30	1.00	.65	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.75	$9.00	1.35	1.00	.70	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.00	$9.25	1.40	1.05	.75	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.25	$9.50	1.45	1.10	.80	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.50	$9.75	1.45	1.15	.80	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.75	$10.00	1.50	1.20	.85	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.00	$10.50	1.60	1.25	.95	.60	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.50	$11.00	1.65	1.35	1.00	.70	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0
$11.00	$11.50	1.75	1.40	1.10	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$11.50	$12.00	1.85	1.50	1.20	.85	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0
$12.00	$12.50	1.95	1.60	1.25	.95	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0
$12.50	$13.00	2.05	1.70	1.35	1.05	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0	0
$13.00	$13.50	2.15	1.75	1.45	1.10	.80	.45	.15	0	0	0	0
$13.50	$14.00	2.25	1.85	1.50	1.20	.85	.55	.25	0	0	0	0
$14.00	$14.50	2.35	1.95	1.60	1.30	.95	.65	.30	.05	0	0	0
$14.50	$15.00	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.35	1.05	.70	.40	.10	0	0	0
$15.00	$15.50	2.55	2.15	1.80	1.45	1.15	.80	.45	.20	0	0	0
$15.50	$16.00	2.65	2.25	1.85	1.55	1.20	.90	.55	.25	0	0	0
$16.00	$16.50	2.75	2.35	1.95	1.60	1.30	.95	.65	.35	.05	0	0
$16.50	$17.00	2.85	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75	.40	.10	0	0
$17.00	$17.50	2.95	2.55	2.15	1.80	1.45	1.15	.80	.50	.20	0	0
$17.50	$18.00	3.05	2.65	2.25	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90	.55	.25	0	0
$18.00	$18.50	3.15	2.75	2.35	2.00	1.65	1.30	1.00	.65	.35	.05	0
$18.50	$19.00	3.25	2.85	2.45	2.10	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75	.40	.15	0
$19.00	$19.50	3.35	2.95	2.55	2.20	1.80	1.50	1.15	.85	.50	.20	0
$19.50	$20.00	3.45	3.05	2.65	2.30	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90	.60	.30	0
$20.00	$21.00	3.60	3.20	2.80	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.35	1.05	.70	.40	.10
$21.00	$22.00	3.80	3.40	3.00	2.65	2.25	1.85	1.55	1.20	.90	.55	.25
$22.00	$23.00	4.00	3.60	3.20	2.85	2.45	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75	.40
$23.00	$24.00	4.20	3.80	3.40	3.05	2.65	2.25	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90	.55
$24.00	$25.00	4.40	4.00	3.60	3.25	2.85	2.45	2.10	1.70	1.40	1.05	.75
$25.00	$26.00	4.65	4.20	3.80	3.45	3.05	2.65	2.30	1.90	1.55	1.25	.90
$26.00	$27.00	4.90	4.40	4.00	3.65	3.25	2.85	2.50	2.10	1.75	1.40	1.10
$27.00	$28.00	5.15	4.65	4.20	3.85	3.45	3.05	2.70	2.30	1.90	1.60	1.25
$28.00	$29.00	5.40	4.90	4.45	4.05	3.65	3.25	2.90	2.50	2.10	1.75	1.40
$29.00	$30.00	5.65	5.15	4.70	4.25	3.85	3.45	3.10	2.70	2.30	1.90	1.60
$30.00	$31.00	5.90	5.40	4.95	4.45	4.05	3.65	3.30	2.90	2.50	2.10	1.75
$31.00	$32.00	6.20	5.65	5.20	4.70	4.25	3.85	3.50	3.10	2.70	2.30	1.95
$32.00	$33.00	6.50	5.95	5.45	4.95	4.50	4.05	3.70	3.30	2.90	2.50	2.15
$33.00	$34.00	6.80	6.25	5.70	5.20	4.75	4.25	3.90	3.50	3.10	2.70	2.35
$34.00	$35.00	7.10	6.55	5.95	5.45	5.00	4.50	4.10	3.70	3.30	2.90	2.55
$35.00	$36.00	7.40	6.85	6.25	5.70	5.25	4.75	4.30	3.90	3.50	3.10	2.75
$36.00	$37.00	7.70	7.15	6.55	6.00	5.50	5.00	4.50	4.10	3.70	3.30	2.95
$37.00	$38.00	8.00	7.45	6.85	6.30	5.75	5.25	4.75	4.30	3.90	3.50	3.15
$38.00	$39.00	8.30	7.75	7.15	6.60	6.00	5.50	5.00	4.55	4.10	3.70	3.35
$39.00	$40.00	8.60	8.05	7.45	6.90	6.30	5.75	5.25	4.80	4.30	3.90	3.55
$40.00	$41.00	8.90	8.35	7.75	7.20	6.60	6.05	5.50	5.05	4.55	4.10	3.75
$41.00	$42.00	9.20	8.65	8.05	7.50	6.90	6.35	5.75	5.30	4.80	4.35	3.95
$42.00	$43.00	9.50	8.95	8.35	7.80	7.20	6.65	6.05	5.55	5.05	4.60	4.15
$43.00	$44.00	9.80	9.25	8.65	8.10	7.50	6.95	6.35	5.80	5.30	4.85	4.35
$44.00	$45.00	10.10	9.55	8.95	8.40	7.80	7.25	6.65	6.10	5.55	5.10	4.60
$45.00	$46.00	10.40	9.85	9.25	8.70	8.10	7.55	6.95	6.40	5.80	5.35	4.85
$46.00	$47.00	10.70	10.15	9.55	9.00	8.40	7.85	7.25	6.70	6.10	5.60	5.10
$47.00	$48.00	11.00	10.45	9.85	9.30	8.70	8.15	7.55	7.00	6.40	5.85	5.35
$48.00	$49.00	11.30	10.75	10.15	9.60	9.00	8.45	7.85	7.30	6.70	6.15	5.60
$49.00	$50.00	11.60	11.05	10.45	9.90	9.30	8.75	8.15	7.60	7.00	6.45	5.85
		30 percent of the excess over $50 plus—										
$50 and over		11.75	11.20	10.60	10.05	9.45	8.90	8.30	7.75	7.15	6.60	6.00

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period and he is married—

"And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such periods—										
$0	$0.75	14% of wages	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
$.75	$1.00	$0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.00	$1.25	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.25	$1.50	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.50	$1.75	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$1.75	$2.00	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.00	$2.25	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.25	$2.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.50	$2.75	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$2.75	$3.00	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.00	$3.25	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.25	$3.50	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.50	$3.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$3.75	$4.00	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.00	$4.25	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.25	$4.50	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.50	$4.75	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$4.75	$5.00	.60	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.00	$5.25	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.25	$5.50	.70	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.50	$5.75	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$5.75	$6.00	.75	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.00	$6.25	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.25	$6.50	.85	.55	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.50	$6.75	.90	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$6.75	$7.00	.90	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.00	$7.25	.95	.65	.40	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.25	$7.50	1.00	.70	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.50	$7.75	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$7.75	$8.00	1.05	.80	.50	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.00	$8.25	1.10	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.25	$8.50	1.15	.85	.55	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.50	$8.75	1.20	.90	.60	.35	.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
$8.75	$9.00	1.20	.95	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.00	$9.25	1.25	.95	.70	.40	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.25	$9.50	1.30	1.00	.70	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.50	$9.75	1.35	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
$9.75	$10.00	1.35	1.10	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.00	$10.50	1.45	1.15	.85	.55	.30	0	0	0	0	0	0
$10.50	$11.00	1.50	1.20	.95	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0	0
$11.00	$11.50	1.60	1.30	1.00	.70	.45	.15	0	0	0	0	0
$11.50	$12.00	1.65	1.35	1.10	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0	0
$12.00	$12.50	1.75	1.45	1.15	.85	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0	0
$12.50	$13.00	1.80	1.50	1.25	.95	.65	.35	.10	0	0	0	0
$13.00	$13.50	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.00	.75	.45	.15	0	0	0	0
$13.50	$14.00	2.00	1.65	1.40	1.10	.80	.50	.25	0	0	0	0
$14.00	$14.50	2.05	1.75	1.45	1.15	.90	.60	.30	.05	0	0	0
$14.50	$15.00	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.65	.40	.10	0	0	0
$15.00	$15.50	2.25	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0	0
$15.50	$16.00	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.80	.55	.25	0	0	0
$16.00	$16.50	2.40	2.10	1.75	1.45	1.20	.90	.60	.30	.05	0	0
$16.50	$17.00	2.50	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.40	.10	0	0
$17.00	$17.50	2.60	2.25	1.95	1.60	1.35	1.05	.75	.45	.20	0	0
$17.50	$18.00	2.65	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.85	.55	.25	0	0
$18.00	$18.50	2.75	2.45	2.10	1.75	1.50	1.20	.90	.60	.35	.05	0
$18.50	$19.00	2.85	2.50	2.20	1.85	1.55	1.25	1.00	.70	.40	.15	0
$19.00	$19.50	2.90	2.60	2.25	1.95	1.65	1.35	1.05	.75	.50	.20	0
$19.50	$20.00	3.00	2.70	2.35	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.55	.25	0
$20.00	$21.00	3.15	2.80	2.50	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.65	.40	.10
$21.00	$22.00	3.30	3.00	2.65	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.80	.55	.25
$22.00	$23.00	3.45	3.15	2.80	2.50	2.15	1.85	1.55	1.25	.95	.70	.40
$23.00	$24.00	3.65	3.30	3.00	2.65	2.35	2.00	1.70	1.40	1.10	.85	.55
$24.00	$25.00	3.85	3.50	3.15	2.85	2.50	2.20	1.85	1.55	1.25	1.00	.70
$25.00	$26.00	4.05	3.65	3.35	3.00	2.70	2.35	2.05	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85
$26.00	$27.00	4.25	3.85	3.50	3.20	2.85	2.50	2.20	1.85	1.55	1.30	1.00
$27.00	$28.00	4.45	4.05	3.65	3.35	3.00	2.70	2.35	2.05	1.70	1.45	1.15
$28.00	$29.00	4.65	4.25	3.85	3.50	3.20	2.85	2.55	2.20	1.90	1.60	1.30
$29.00	$30.00	4.85	4.45	4.05	3.70	3.35	3.05	2.70	2.40	2.05	1.75	1.45
$30.00	$31.00	5.05	4.65	4.25	3.90	3.55	3.20	2.90	2.55	2.25	1.90	1.60
$31.00	$32.00	5.25	4.85	4.45	4.10	3.70	3.35	3.05	2.70	2.40	2.05	1.75
$32.00	$33.00	5.45	5.05	4.65	4.30	3.90	3.55	3.20	2.90	2.55	2.25	1.90
$33.00	$34.00	5.65	5.25	4.85	4.50	4.10	3.70	3.40	3.05	2.75	2.40	2.10
$34.00	$35.00	5.85	5.45	5.05	4.70	4.30	3.90	3.55	3.25	2.90	2.60	2.25
$35.00	$36.00	6.05	5.65	5.25	4.90	4.50	4.10	3.75	3.40	3.10	2.75	2.40
$36.00	$37.00	6.25	5.85	5.45	5.10	4.70	4.30	3.90	3.55	3.25	2.90	2.60
$37.00	$38.00	6.45	6.05	5.65	5.30	4.90	4.50	4.10	3.75	3.40	3.10	2.75
$38.00	$39.00	6.65	6.25	5.85	5.50	5.10	4.70	4.30	3.95	3.60	3.25	2.95
$39.00	$40.00	6.85	6.45	6.05	5.70	5.30	4.90	4.50	4.15	3.75	3.45	3.10
$40.00	$41.00	7.05	6.65	6.25	5.90	5.50	5.10	4.70	4.35	3.95	3.60	3.25
$41.00	$42.00	7.25	6.85	6.45	6.10	5.70	5.30	4.90	4.55	4.15	3.75	3.45
$42.00	$43.00	7.45	7.05	6.65	6.30	5.90	5.50	5.10	4.75	4.35	3.95	3.60
$43.00	$44.00	7.65	7.25	6.85	6.50	6.10	5.70	5.30	4.95	4.55	4.15	3.80
$44.00	$45.00	7.85	7.45	7.05	6.70	6.30	5.90	5.50	5.15	4.75	4.35	4.00
$45.00	$46.00	8.05	7.65	7.25	6.90	6.50	6.10	5.70	5.35	4.95	4.55	4.20
$46.00	$47.00	8.25	7.85	7.45	7.10	6.70	6.30	5.90	5.55	5.15	4.75	4.40
$47.00	$48.00	8.45	8.05	7.65	7.30	6.90	6.50	6.10	5.75	5.35	4.95	4.60
$48.00	$49.00	8.65	8.25	7.85	7.50	7.10	6.70	6.30	5.95	5.55	5.15	4.80
$49.00	$50.00	8.90	8.45	8.05	7.70	7.30	6.90	6.50	6.15	5.75	5.35	5.00
$50.00	$51.00	9.15	8.65	8.25	7.90	7.50	7.10	6.70	6.35	5.95	5.55	5.20
$51.00	$52.00	9.40	8.90	8.45	8.10	7.70	7.30	6.90	6.55	6.15	5.75	5.40
$52.00	$53.00	9.65	9.15	8.65	8.30	7.90	7.50	7.10	6.75	6.35	5.95	5.60
$53.00	$54.00	9.90	9.40	8.90	8.50	8.10	7.70	7.30	6.95	6.55	6.15	5.80
$54.00	$55.00	10.15	9.65	9.15	8.70	8.30	7.90	7.50	7.15	6.75	6.35	6.00
$55.00	$56.00	10.40	9.90	9.40	8.95	8.50	8.10	7.70	7.35	6.95	6.55	6.20
$56.00	$57.00	10.65	10.15	9.65	9.20	8.70	8.30	7.90	7.55	7.15	6.75	6.40
$57.00	$58.00	10.90	10.40	9.90	9.45	8.95	8.50	8.10	7.75	7.35	6.95	6.60
$58.00	$59.00	11.15	10.65	10.15	9.70	9.20	8.75	8.30	7.95	7.55	7.15	6.80
$59.00	$60.00	11.40	10.90	10.40	9.95	9.45	9.00	8.50	8.15	7.75	7.35	7.00
$60.00	$61.00	11.65	11.15	10.65	10.20	9.70	9.25	8.75	8.35	7.95	7.55	7.20

"If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period and he is married—

"And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—										
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
At least—	But less than—	The amount of income tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such periods—										
$61.00	$62.00	$11.95	$11.40	$10.90	$10.45	$9.95	$9.50	$9.00	$8.55	$8.15	$7.75	$7.40
$62.00	$63.00	12.25	11.65	11.15	10.70	10.20	9.75	9.25	8.75	8.35	7.95	7.60
$63.00	$64.00	12.55	11.95	11.40	10.95	10.45	10.00	9.50	9.00	8.55	8.15	7.80
$64.00	$65.00	12.85	12.25	11.70	11.20	10.70	10.25	9.75	9.25	8.80	8.35	8.00
$65.00	$66.00	13.15	12.55	12.00	11.45	10.95	10.50	10.00	9.50	9.05	8.55	8.20
$66.00	$67.00	13.45	12.85	12.30	11.70	11.20	10.75	10.25	9.75	9.30	8.80	8.40
$67.00	$68.00	13.75	13.15	12.60	12.00	11.45	11.00	10.50	10.00	9.55	9.05	8.60
$68.00	$69.00	14.05	13.45	12.90	12.30	11.75	11.25	10.75	10.25	9.80	9.30	8.85
$69.00	$70.00	14.35	13.75	13.20	12.60	12.05	11.50	11.00	10.50	10.05	9.55	9.10
$70.00	$71.00	14.65	14.05	13.50	12.90	12.35	11.75	11.25	10.75	10.30	9.80	9.35
$71.00	$72.00	14.95	14.35	13.80	13.20	12.65	12.05	11.50	11.00	10.55	10.05	9.60
$72.00	$73.00	15.25	14.65	14.10	13.50	12.95	12.35	11.80	11.25	10.80	10.30	9.85
$73.00	$74.00	15.55	14.95	14.40	13.80	13.25	12.65	12.10	11.50	11.05	10.55	10.10
$74.00	$75.00	15.85	15.25	14.70	14.10	13.55	12.95	12.40	11.80	11.30	10.80	10.35
$75.00	$76.00	16.15	15.55	15.00	14.40	13.85	13.25	12.70	12.10	11.55	11.05	10.60
$76.00	$77.00	16.45	15.85	15.30	14.70	14.15	13.55	13.00	12.40	11.85	11.30	10.85
$77.00	$78.00	16.75	16.15	15.60	15.00	14.45	13.85	13.30	12.70	12.15	11.55	11.10
$78.00	$79.00	17.05	16.45	15.90	15.30	14.75	14.15	13.60	13.00	12.45	11.85	11.35
$79.00	$80.00	17.35	16.75	16.20	15.60	15.05	14.45	13.90	13.30	12.75	12.15	11.60
		30 percent of the excess over $80 plus—										
$80 and over		17.50	16.90	16.35	15.75	15.20	14.60	14.05	13.45	12.90	12.30	11.75"

(d) DISCLOSURE OF MARITAL STATUS; DETERMINATION OF MARITAL STATUS; TREATMENT OF SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Section 3402 (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) DETERMINATION AND DISCLOSURE OF MARITAL STATUS.—

"(1) DETERMINATION OF STATUS BY EMPLOYER.—For purposes of applying the tables in subsections (a) and (c) to a payment of wages, the employer shall treat the employee as a single person unless there is in effect with respect to such payment of wages a withholding exemption certificate furnished to the employer by the employee after the date of the enactment of this subsection indicating that the employee is married.

"(2) DISCLOSURE OF STATUS BY EMPLOYEE.—An employee shall be entitled to furnish the employer with a withholding exemption certificate indicating he is married only if, on the day of such furnishing, he is married (determined with the applicaton of the rules in paragraph (3)). An employee whose marital status changes from married to single shall, at such time as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe, furnish the employer with a new withholding exemption certificate.

"(3) DETERMINATION OF MARITAL STATUS.—For purposes of paragraph (2), an employee shall on any day be considered—

"(A) as not married, if (i) he is legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or separate maintenance, or (ii) either he or his spouse is, or on any preceding day within the calendar year was, a nonresident alien; or

"(B) as married, if (i) his spouse (other than a spouse referred to in subparagraph (A)) died within the portion of his taxable year which precedes such day, or (ii) his spouse died during one of the two taxable years immediately preceding the current taxable year and, on the basis of facts existing at the beginning of such day, the employee reasonably expects, at the close of his taxable year, to be a surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(b))."

(e) WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES FOR ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—

(1) ALLOWANCE.—Section 3402(f)(1) (relating to withholding exemptions) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (D),

(B) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) any allowance to which he is entitled under subsection (m), but only if his spouse does not have in effect a withholding exemption certificate claiming such allowance."

(2) WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES BASED ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—Section 3402 (relating to income tax collected at source) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES BASED ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—An employee shall be entitled to withholding allowances under this subsection with respect to a payment of wages in a number equal to the number determined by dividing by $700 the excess of—

"(A) his estimated itemized deductions, over

"(B) an amount equal to the sum of 12 percent of the first $7,500 of his estimated wages and 17 percent of the remainder of his estimated wages.

For purposes of this subsection, fractional numbers shall not be taken into account.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) ESTIMATED ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.—The term 'estimated itemized deductions' means the aggregate amount which he reasonably expects will be allowable as deductions under chapter 1 (other than the deductions referred to in sections 141 and 151 and other than the deductions required to be taken into account in determining adjusted gross income under section 62) for the estimation year. In no case shall such aggregate amount be greater than the amount of such deductions shown on his return of tax under subtitle A for the taxable year preceding the estimation year.

"(B) ESTIMATED WAGES.—The term 'estimated wages' means the aggregate amount which he reasonably expects will constitute wages for the estimation year. In no case shall such aggregate amount be less than the amount of wages shown on his return for the taxable year preceding the estimation year.

"(C) ESTIMATION YEAR.—In the case of an employee who files his return on the basis of a calendar year, the term 'estimation year' means—

"(i) with respect to payments of wages after April 30 and on or before December 31 of any calendar year, such calendar year, and

"(ii) with respect to payments of wages on or after January 1 and before May 1 of any calendar year, the preceding calendar year (or, if the employee has filed a return for the preceding calendar year, and if he has in effect a withholding allowance under this subsection based on using the current calendar year as the estimation year, such current calendar year).

In the case of an employee who files his return on a basis other than the calendar year, his estimation year, and the amounts deducted and withheld to be governed by such estimation year, shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(A) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—The number of withholding allowances to which a husband and wife are entitled under this subsection shall be determined on the basis of their combined wages and deduction. This subparagraph shall not apply to a husband and wife who filed separate returns for the taxable year preceding the estimation year and who reasonably expect to file separate returns for the estimation year.

"(B) ONLY ONE CERTIFICATE TO BE IN EFFECT.—In the case of any employee, withholding allowances under this subsection may not be claimed with more than one employer at any one time.

"(C) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—In the case of an employee who files his return on the basis of a calendar year, that portion of a withholding exemption certificate which relates to allowances under this subsection shall not be effective with respect to payments of wages after the first April 30 following the close of the estimation year on which it is based.

"(D) LIMITATION.—The Secretary or his delegate may by regulations provide that one or more of the withholding allowances to which an employee would, but for this subparagraph, be entitled under this subsection shall be denied because such employee's estimated wages are above the level at which the amounts deducted and withheld under this chapter are generally sufficient to offset the liability for tax under

chapter 1 with respect to the wages from which such amounts are deducted and withheld.

"(E) AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE TABLES.—The Secretary or his delegate may prescribe tables pursuant to which employees shall determine the number of allowances to which they are entitled under this subsection. Such tables may be based on reasonable wage and itemized deduction brackets.

"(F) TREATMENT OF ALLOWANCES.—For purposes of this title, any withholding allowance under this subsection shall be treated as if it were denominated a withholding exemption."

(3) STATUS DETERMINATION DATE.—The last sentence of section 3402(f)(3)(B) is amended to read as follows: "For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'status determination date' means January 1, May 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year."

(4) CIVIL PENALTY.—

(A) Subchapter B of chapter 68 (relating to assessable penalties) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6682. FALSE INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO WITHHOLDING ALLOWANCES BASED ON ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS.

"(a) CIVIL PENALTY.—In addition to any criminal penalty provided by law, if any individual in claiming a withholding allowance under section 3402(f)(1)(F) states (1) that the wages (within the meaning of chapter 24) shown on his return for any taxable year were less than such wages actually shown, or (2) that the itemized deductions referred to in section 3402(m) on the return for any taxable year were greater than such deductions actually shown, he shall pay a penalty of $50 for each such statement, unless (1) such statement did not result in a decrease in the amounts deducted and withheld under chapter 24, or (2) the taxes imposed with respect to the individual under subtitle A for the succeeding taxable year do not exceed the sum of (A) the credits against such taxes allowed by part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1, and (B) the payments of estimated tax which are considered payments on account of such taxes.

"(b) DEFICIENCY PROCEDURES NOT TO APPLY.—Subchapter B of chapter 63 (relating to deficiency procedures for income, estate, and gift taxes), shall not apply in respect of the assessment or collection of any penalty imposed by subsection (a)."

(B) The table of sections of such subchapter B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6682. False information with respect to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions."

(5) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Section 7205 (relating to fraudulent withholding exemption certificate or failure to supply information) is amended—

(A) by striking out "section 3402(f)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3402", and

(B) by striking out "any penalty otherwise provided" and inserting in lieu thereof "any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by section 6682)".

(6) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1966, but only with respect to withholding exemptions based on estimation years beginning after such date.

(f) TRANSITIONAL DETERMINATION STATUS DATE.—Notwithstanding section 3402(f)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, a withholding exemption certificate furnished the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act and before May 1, 1966, shall take effect with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after May 1, 1966, or the 10th day after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, whichever is later, and at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective with respect to any payment of wages made on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section (other than subsection (e)) shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after April 30, 1966.

Sec. 102. Estimated Tax in Case of Individuals.

(a) INCLUSION OF SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAX IN ESTIMATED TAX.—Section 6015(c) (relating to definition of estimated tax in the case of an individual) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) ESTIMATED TAX.—For purposes of this title, in the case of an individual, the term 'estimated tax' means—

"(1) the amount which the individual estimates as the amount of the income tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year, plus

"(2) the amount which the individual estimates as the amount of the self-employment tax imposed by chapter 2 for the taxable year, minus

"(3) the amount which the individual estimates as the sum of any credits against tax provided by part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1."

(b) ADDITION TO TAX FOR UNDERPAYMENT OF ESTIMATED TAX.—

(1) Section 6654(a) (relating to addition to the tax for underpayment of estimated tax by an individual) is amended by inserting after "chapter 1" the following: "and the tax under chapter 2".

(2) Section 6654(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding subsections, the addition to the tax with respect to any underpayment of any installment shall not be imposed if the total amount of all payments of estimated tax made on or before the last date prescribed for the payment of such installment equals or exceeds the amount which would have been required to be paid on or before such date if the estimated tax were whichever of the following is the least—

"(1) The tax shown on the return of the individual for the preceding taxable year, if a return showing a liability for tax was filed by the individual for the preceding taxable year and such preceding year was a taxable year of 12 months.

"(2) An amount equal to 70 percent (66⅔ percent in the case of individuals referred to in section 6073(b), relating to income from farming or fishing) of the tax for the taxable year computed by placing on an annualized basis the taxable income for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid and by taking into account the adjusted self-employment income (if the net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a)) for the taxable year equal or exceed $400). For purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) The taxable income shall be placed on an annualized basis by—

"(i) multiplying by 12 (or, in the case of a taxable year of less than 12 months, the number of months in the taxable year) the taxable income (computed without deduction of personal exemptions) for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid,

"(ii) dividing the resulting amount by the number of months in the taxable year ending before the month in which such installment date falls, and

"(iii) deducting from such amount the deductions for personal exemptions allowable for the taxable year (such personal exemptions being determined as of the last date prescribed for payment of the installment).

"(B) The term 'adjusted self-employment income' means—

"(i) the net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a)) for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid, but not more than

"(ii) the excess of $6,600 over the amount determined by placing the wages (within the meaning of section 1402(b)) for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid on an annualized basis in a manner consistent with clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A).

"(3) An amount equal to 90 percent of the tax computed, at the rates applicable to the taxable year, on the basis of the actual taxable income and the actual self-employment income for the months in the taxable year ending before the month in which the installment is required to be paid as if such months constituted the taxable year.

"(4) An amount equal to the tax computed, at the rates applicable to the taxable year, on the basis of the taxpayer's status with respect to personal exemptions under section 151 for the taxable year, but otherwise on the basis of the facts shown on his return for, and the law applicable to, the preceding taxable year."

(3) Section 6654(f) (relating to definition of tax for purposes of subsections (b) and (d) of section 6654) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) TAX COMPUTED AFTER APPLICATION OF CREDITS AGAINST TAX.—For purposes of subsections (b) and (d), the term 'tax' means—

"(1) the tax imposed by this chapter 1, plus

"(2) the tax imposed by chapter 2, minus

"(3) the credits against tax allowed by part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1, other than the credit against tax provided by section 31 (relating to tax withheld on wages)."

(4) Section 7701(a) (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(34) ESTIMATED INCOME TAX.—The term 'estimated income tax' means—

"(A) in the case of an individual, the estimated tax as defined in section 6015(c), or

"(B) in the case of a corporation, the estimated tax as defined in section 6016(b)."

(5) Section 1403(b) (cross references) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For provisions relating to declarations of estimated tax on self-employment income, see section 6015."

(c) MINISTERS, MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS, AND CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PRACTITIONERS.—Section 1402(e)(3) (relating to effective date of waiver certificates) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) For purposes of sections 6015 and 6654, a waiver certificate described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as taking effect on the first day of the first taxable year beginning after the date on which such certificate is filed."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

Sec. 103. Underpayment of installments of estimated income tax in case of individuals.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6654(b) (relating to amount of underpayment), and section 6654(d) (relating to exception) as amended by section 102(b)(2) of this Act, are amended by striking out "70 percent" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "80 percent".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

Sec. 104. Installment payments of estimated income tax by corporations.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 6154 (relating to installment payments of estimated income tax by corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) AMOUNT AND TIME FOR PAYMENT OF EACH INSTALLMENT.—The amount of estimated tax (as defined in section 6016(b)) with respect to which a declaration is required under section 6016 shall be paid as follows:

"(1) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1966.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965, and before January 1, 1967, such estimated tax shall be paid in installments in accordance with the following table:

"If the declaration is timely filed on or before the 15th day of the—	The following percentages of the estimated tax shall be paid on the 15th day of the—			
	4th month	6th month	9th month	12th month
4th month of the taxable year	12	12	25	25
6th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 4th month)		16	29	29
9th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 6th month)			37	37
12th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 9th month)				74

"(2) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER 1966.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966, such estimated tax shall be paid in installments in accordance with the following table:

"If the declaration is timely filed on or before the 15th day of the—	The following percentages of the estimated tax shall be paid on the 15th day of the—			
	4th month	6th month	9th month	12th month
4th month of the taxable year	25	25	25	25
6th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 4th month)		33⅓	33⅓	33⅓
9th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 6th month)			50	50
12th month of the taxable year (but after the 15th day of the 9th month)				100

"(3) TIMELY FILING.—A declaration is timely filed for the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) if it is not required by section 6074(a) to be filed on a date (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the declaration under section 6081) before the date it is actually filed.

"(4) LATE FILING.—If the declaration is filed after the time prescribed in section 6074(a) (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the declaration under section 6081), there shall be paid at the time of such filing all installments of estimated tax which would have been payable on or before such time if the declaration had been filed within the time prescribed in section 6074(a), and the remaining installments shall be paid at the times at which, and in the amounts in which, they would have been payable if the declaration had been so filed."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

TITLE II—POSTPONEMENT OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAX RATE REDUCTIONS

Sec. 201. Passenger Automobiles.

(a) POSTPONEMENT OF RATE REDUCTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 4061(a)(2) (relating to imposition of tax) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Articles enumerated in subparagraph (B) are taxable at whichever of the following rates is applicable:

"7 percent for the period beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 through March 31, 1968.

"2 percent for the period April 1, 1968, through December 31, 1968.

"1 percent for the period after December 31, 1968."

(b) FLOOR STOCKS TAX.—Section 4226 (relating to floor stocks taxes) is amended—

(1) By adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraph:

"(8) 1966 TAX ON AUTOMOBILES.—On any article subject to tax under section 4061(a)(2) which on the day after the date of the enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 is held by a dealer and has not been used and is intended for sale, there is imposed a floor stocks tax at the rate of 1 percent of the price for which the article was sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the tax imposed under this paragraph shall be paid by such dealer and shall be collected from him by the manufacturer, producer, or importer."

(2) By amending subsection (d)—

(A) by striking out "and except" and inserting in lieu thereof "except", and

(B) by striking out "delegate." and inserting in lieu thereof "delegate, and except that the tax imposed by paragraph (8) shall be paid at such time after 60 days after the date of enactment of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6412(a)(1) (relating to floor stocks refunds on passenger automobiles, etc.) is amended by striking out "January 1, 1966, 1967, 1968, or 1969," and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1966, April 1, 1968, or January 1, 1969,".

(2) Section 209(c)(1)(G) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (relating to general provisions for transfers to the Highway Trust Fund) is amended by striking out "section 4226(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4226(a) (other than paragraph (8) thereof)".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles sold after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Sec. 202. Communication Services.

(a) POSTPONEMENT OF RATE REDUCTIONS.—Section 4251 (relating to tax on communications) is amended—

(1) By striking out subsection (a)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(2) The rate of tax referred to in paragraph (1) is as follows:

"Amounts paid pursuant to bills first rendered—	Percent
"Before April 1, 1968	10
"After March 31, 1968, and before January 1, 1969	1"

(2) By striking out subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(c) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of subsection (a), in the case of communications services rendered before February 1, 1968, for which a bill has not been rendered before April 1, 1968, a bill shall be treated as having been first rendered on March 31, 1968. For purposes of subsections (a) and (b), in the case of communications services rendered after January 31, 1968, and before November 1, 1968, for which a bill has not been rendered before January 1, 1969, a bill shall be treated as having been first rendered on December 31, 1968."

(b) NONPROFIT HOSPITALS.—Section 4253 (relating to exemptions from tax on communications) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) NONPROFIT HOSPITALS.—No tax shall be imposed under section 4251 on any amount paid by a nonprofit hospital for services furnished to such organization. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'nonprofit hospital' means a hospital referred to in section 503(b)(5) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a)."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to amounts paid pursuant to bills first rendered on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 15 days after the date on which this Act is enacted for services rendered on or after such first day. In the case of amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered on or after such first day for services which were rendered before such first day and for which no previous bill was rendered, such amendments shall apply except with respect to such services as were rendered more than 2 months before such first day. In the case of services rendered more than 2 months before such first day, the provisions of subchapter B of chapter 33 of the Code in effect at the time such services were rendered, subject to the provision of section 701(b)(2) of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, shall apply to the amounts paid for such services.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any committee amendments?

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have two such committee amendments, the first of which is on page 32 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: Page 32, strike out lines 5 and 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"If the number determined under the preceding sentence is not a whole number, the fraction shall be disregarded; except that, if the number determined is one-half or more but less than one, it shall be increased to one."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, permit me to take the opportunity of explaining this amendment, if I may.

This amendment concerns the procedure for claiming withholding allowances contained in your committee's bill. Taxpayers who anticipate that, based on

prior experience, they will have large itemized deductions relative to their income may claim these withholding allowances, which have the effect of withholding exemptions. By doing so, they will be able to adjust their withholding to prevent the excessive overwithholding which might otherwise develop.

The number of withholding allowances which may be claimed is based on the amount of excess itemized deductions. Excess itemized deductions are equal to estimated itemized deductions in excess of 12 percent of income up to $7,500 and 17 percent of income above this figure.

Under the bill as it now stands, no withholding allowance may be claimed unless the amount of excess itemized deductions equals a full $700. It has come to the attention of your committee that this stipulation makes it difficult for families with low and moderate incomes to take advantage of the withholding allowance procedure. A family with an income of $5,000, for example, would have to have itemized deductions of $1,300, or 26 percent of its income, before a withholding allowance could be claimed.

Your committee is of the opinion that the bill should be amended to make it easier for taxpayers with modest incomes to avail themselves of the withholding allowances. The committee therefore proposes an amendment to H.R. 12752 which will permit a taxpayer to claim single withholding allowance if his excess itemized deductions equal $350 but are less than $700. Thus, in the above example an allowance could be claimed when itemized deductions totaled $950, or 19 percent of income, the average for itemized deductions as a percent of adjusted gross income.

This amendment only applies to the first withholding allowance. Two withholding allowances could not be claimed unless excess itemized deductions equalled or exceeded $1,400, three could not be claimed unless the excess totaled $2,100 or more, and so forth.

The amendment will be of chief importance to those with moderate incomes and relatively heavy itemized deductions. The importance to such taxpayers is indicated, however, by the fact that if two-thirds of those eligible for withholding allowances solely as a result of this amendment claim those allowances, the amount of withholding will be reduced by $400 million a year.

This amendment will go into effect in the calendar year 1967 as a part of the entire withholding allowance procedure. As a result, it will not affect fiscal 1966 revenues at all and will reduce fiscal 1967 revenues by only $65 million.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to adopt the committee reported amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in complete support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was perfectly clear when the administration first presented the proposal for a change in the withholding system that it was going to considerably aggravate the problem of overwithholding that has existed in the past and which will even still exist in the future; a situation whereby our taxpayers by law are forced to pay in during the course of the year in excess of their real tax liability, and then wait for a refund in the following year.

I suggested during the course of the hearings to the Treasury that I thought they could devise a formula whereby at least some of this overwithholding could be alleviated, by giving recognition to the deductions that the taxpayer might have in excess of the standard deduction.

Mr. Chairman, that is the case which results in the usual situation of overwithholding.

When we acted in the committee, we acted on the basis of individual income tax statistics prepared by the Treasury. The Treasury representatives agreed to a formula for avoiding overwithholding. After we considered the matter and concluded our executive sessions, new statistics were prepared. I was not satisfied. I believe it imperative that the committee take another look at what we had done during our normal consideration of this particular problem, in view of the later, and presumably more accurate, statistical data that we received.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the chairman of the full committee thought likewise, and that this matter was reconsidered and a further liberalization was made so as to reduce even further the extent of involuntary overwithholding.

I would say, however, Mr. Chairman, to you and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I hope that our staff and the staff of the Treasury Department will still focus their attention on the problem of overwithholding that still exists. I feel it is intolerable and inexcusable that we do not do everything we can to try and bring the tax withheld down to as close to the liability of the individual as is possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of us know we can never hit it right on the head. But at least we can avoid the overwithholding that is current in our system today.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has made some real progress in partially correcting the situation, but I feel there is much more to be done. I hope the attention of the Treasury staff will be directed to that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which is clerical and technical in nature.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MILLS: In each of the tables beginning on pages 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, and 27 strike out "14 percent of wages" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$0".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

The Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having resumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 736, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] rise?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. UTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. UTT moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 12752) to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 and 8.

Page 47, strike out line 4 and all that follows through line 9 on page 51.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that in the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" had it.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 187, nays 207, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—187

Abbitt	Adair	Andrews,
Abernethy	Anderson, Ill.	George W.

Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bandstra
Baring
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Callaway
Cameron
Carter
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dole
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Giaimo
Goodell
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Henderson
Hicks
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kupferman
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Mackie
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stalbaum
Stanton
Stephens
Taylor
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Utt
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Weltner
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NAYS—207

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Casey
Celler
Cleveland
Colmer
Corbett
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Laird
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Senner
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Watts
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young

NOT VOTING—38

Baldwin
Blatnik
Burleson
Cederberg
Chelf
Cohelan
Cramer
Dowdy
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Farnsley
Fisher
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Kee
King, Calif.
Martin, Ala.
Matthews
Miller
Moorhead
Pool
Redlin
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
St. Onge
Scott
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Toll
White, Idaho
Willis
Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cramer for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana for, with Mr. Miller against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. White of Idaho against.

Mr. Martin of Alabama for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Farnsley against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. King of California against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Fallon.

Mr. Hogan of Georgia with Mr. Redlin.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. DE LA GARZA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. POAGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KUNKEL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 146, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—246

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Corman
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Downing
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagen, Calif.
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Kupferman
Laird
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Redlin
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Sickles
Sisk
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Watts
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Young

NAYS—146

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Cameron
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Clevenger
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Craley
Cunningham

Curtin	Johnson, Pa.	Robison
Dague	Jonas	Roncalio
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Roybal
Derwinski	Jones, N.C.	Rumsfeld
Devine	Kastenmeier	Satterfield
Dickinson	King, N.Y.	Saylor
Diggs	Kornegay	Secrest
Dole	Landrum	Selden
Dulski	Langen	Shipley
Duncan, Tenn.	Latta	Shriver
Edwards, Ala.	Lennon	Sikes
Ellsworth	Long, La.	Skubitz
Erlenborn	McCulloch	Smith, Calif.
Fino	McEwen	Smith, N.Y.
Ford, Gerald R.	McMillan	Stalbaum
Ford, William D.	MacGregor	Stanton
	Mackie	Stephens
Fountain	Michel	Talcott
Fulton, Pa.	Minshall	Taylor
Fulton, Tenn.	Mize	Thomson, Wis.
Fuqua	Moore	Tuck
Gettys	Morton	Tuten
Goodell	Mosher	Utt
Griffin	Nedzi	Waggonner
Griffiths	Nelsen	Walker, Miss.
Gross	O'Hara, Mich.	Walker, N. Mex.
Grover	O'Konski	Watkins
Gurney	O'Neal, Ga.	Watson
Haley	Ottinger	Weltner
Hall	Passman	Whalley
Halleck	Poff	Whitener
Halpern	Quie	Whitten
Hansen, Idaho	Quillen	Williams
Harsha	Race	Wilson, Bob
Henderson	Randall	Wyatt
Hicks	Reid, Ill.	Wydler
Horton	Reifel	Younger
Hutchinson	Reinecke	
Jennings	Rhodes, Ariz.	

NOT VOTING—41

Baldwin	Gubser	Rogers, Tex.
Bandstra	Hagan, Ga.	Roudebush
Blatnik	Harvey, Ind.	St. Onge
Burleson	Hébert	Scott
Cederberg	Kee	Senner
Chelf	King, Calif.	Slack
Cohelan	Martin, Ala.	Smith, Iowa
Cramer	Matthews	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Miller	Toll
Duncan, Oreg.	Moorhead	White, Idaho
Edwards, La.	Patman	Willis
Fallon	Pool	Zablocki
Farnsley	Resnick	
Fisher	Rivers, S.C.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Scott against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Teague of Texas.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Rogers of Texas.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Slack.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Bandstra.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. HALPERN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the bill just passed immediately prior to the conclusion of general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those of us who spoke on the bill in general debate may revise and extend our remarks and include such extraneous material in the form of tables and so on in relation to such remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 744) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 744

Resolved, That THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of New York, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., RECEIVES SPECIAL MERIT CITATION FROM POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN FOR OUTSTANDING COOPERATION WITH POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT IN ZIP CODE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Springfield, Mass., is now in its 115th year of operation. Over that period of time, it has grown into one of the largest life insurance companies in the country and today ranks 10th largest in assets of the more than 1,600 life insurance companies in the Nation. Its growth has been marked by conspicuous and outstanding leadership. It has made incalculable contributions to its home office city. Its officers and employees have been in the forefront of community campaigns to make their locality a better place to live, work, and play. It has been cited many times for its cooperation in community and governmental activities.

On January 14, 1966, Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. was presented with a special merit citation for outstanding cooperation with the Post Office Department in ZIP code and other programs. I know it was particularly pleasing to Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien to confer this citation upon a company from his own home city. The presentation, the first of its kind since he assumed the Cabinet post, was made by Postmaster General O'Brien to Mr. Charles H. Schaaff, president of Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. in appropriate ceremonies in the Postmaster General's office. I was privileged to attend the event along with the postmaster of Springfield, Mass., Arthur B. Morin, officers of the company Second Vice President J. Walter Reardon, Secretary Harrison B. Clapp and Communications Department Manager Alexander T. Muir.

In citing Massachusetts Mutual, one of the first major life insurance companies in the Nation to complete the addition of ZIP codes to its master files, Postmaster General O'Brien said:

> Naturally, I am proud that a company from my hometown is being honored, but today's award has nothing to do with the fact that we both come from Springfield, Mass. It has everything to do with the kind of vision, spirit of cooperation and creative innovation that the Post Office needs from the business community and which it is most certainly receiving from Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Mr. O'Brien noted that 80 percent of the Nation's 74 billion pieces of mail is generated by business and that the Massachusetts Mutual "is 100 percent behind the Post Office in our drive for better service." He continued:

> The award is richly deserved. This example of leadership also means better service for the company's policyholders.

Earlier in the week Mr. O'Brien said in a press release:

> Massachusetts Mutual has played a leading role in the Mail Users Council in my hometown of Springfield and has actively presorted its mail as a cooperative effort with the postal service. The firm has given technical assistance to other companies to bring about improved mailing procedures and has been helpful to the Post Office Department in scheduling its mailings.

Upon accepting the award from Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Schaaff made these remarks:

> Thank you, Mr. Postmaster General. I am very pleased to receive this award on behalf of my company, the Massachusetts Mutual Life, for at least two good reasons. First, we are naturally anxious to cooperate with our Government in every way and in your effort to have everyone participate in the ZIP code program; and, second, because I am very certain that this accomplishment of ZIP coding our entire file will result in greater efficiency in our operations for the benefit of our policyholders.
>
> I also want to compliment you on your postmaster in Springfield, Mr. Arthur B. Morin, who has helped our company in many ways over the years, and made a particularly important contribution to the accomplishment which led to the presentation of this award. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride that the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. is located in my congressional district. It is housed in a magnificent and elegantly beautiful building that is a splendid credit to its officers and employees and the thousands of its policyholders throughout the world. The history of this great company is a proud and notable one. Under unanimous consent I include it with my remarks:

HISTORY OF THE MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

The Massachusetts Mutual was founded on May 15, 1851, with capital of $100,000 raised through subscriptions from 30 citizens of Springfield, Mass., then a town with a population of 12,000. This stock was retired in 1867, and the company has been a mutual organization ever since.

Three chairs, two desks, two pictures, a stove, table, and city map were the company's first assets, and net receipts for the first year were $5,000.

The company's first full-time employee was Francis B. Bacon, who received a salary of $800 a year. The first president was Caleb Rice, who had gained fame as sheriff of Hampden County. Devoting only part of his time to this position, he received a salary of $50 the first year, and $100 the second. He became Springfield's first mayor when the city was incorporated in 1852.

The first policy was issued on August 2, 1851, to Harvey Danks, who also became the company's first sales agent. There were anxious moments in the early days, particularly at the thought of claims any mail might bring. For example, one early policyholder insured for $3,000 succumbed after paying only one premium. It was some 3 months before the claim was settled, and, even then, the money had to be borrowed. But the records show that there has never been another such delay in the almost 115 years that have ensued.

The company's early growth was largely confined to New England, but, by 1855, agencies had been established in New York City, Albany, Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit. By 1868, when an agency was opened in San Francisco, the Massachusetts Mutual spanned the continent.

The first home office was a single room in a downtown Springfield building. By 1868, the increase in business necessitated larger quarters, and a new building was constructed, also in downtown Springfield.

Caleb Rice died 22 years after the company was founded, and was succeeded by Ephraim W. Bond. That same year, the new home office was extensively burned, and the building was subsequently rebuilt and reoccupied. Col. Martin Van Buren Edgerly was elected president in 1886 and served until 1895, when John A. Hall was elected. Mr. Hall died suddenly while on a trip to London in 1908, and was succeeded by William W. McClench.

A few weeks after Mr. McClench was elected president, the company moved into its second building, erected on the site of the building which housed the original one-room office. Mr. McClench held the presidency from 1908 to 1928, guiding the company through the days of World War I. Total war losses were just over a half-million dollars, while the influenza epidemic of 1918 had a far more serious impact on the company.

The home office staff, which numbered 100 in 1907, had grown to some 400 by 1924. Insurance in force had passed the $1 billion level just 1 year earlier. In 1927, the company occupied its present home office complex, at 1295 State Street in Springfield, some 4 miles east of the city's main business district.

William H. Sargeant was the company's chief executive through the worst years of the great depression. Policy loans hit abnormal figures, and, by mid-1932, more business was going off the books than was being issued.

The company, along with the rest of the country, began to recuperate from the shock and the initial effects of the depression, however, and in 1936 Bertrand J. Perry was elected president of the still-growing company. Mr. Perry served as president until 1945, when he became chairman of the board. When he retired as a director in 1955, his association with the company spanned 58 years. Alexander T. Maclean had succeeded Mr. Perry as president and served until his death in 1950. On May 19 of that year Leland J. Kalmbach became president and served in that position until 1962, when he was elected chairman of the board and chief executive officer, and Charles H. Schaaff became the company's 10th president.

In 1951, the company's 100th anniversary year, its assets were $1.4 billion. Insurance in force totaled $3.2 billion. New insurance delivered that year amounted to nearly $348 million.

This past year—1965—new insurance delivered amounted to well over $1.9 billion. Insurance in force passed the $12 billion level. And assets, which have doubled about every 12 years since 1928, increased to more than $3.3 billion. New alltime records in the sale of both individual and group life insurance were set during the year with individual insurance sales topping $1 billion for the 7th consecutive year. January of 1965 was the largest individual-life-sales month in the company's history.

Another milestone achieved in 1965 was the surpassing of the $1 billion level in outstanding mortgage loans. The company's first mortgage loan of $2,000 was made in 1859.

The company today ranks as the 10th largest in assets of the more than 1,600 life insurance companies in the Nation. It also is ranked among the country's top 22 financial institutions and the top 40 business organizations in general. The company lists more than 700,000 individual policyholders, and is licensed to do business in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Its Springfield home office staff numbers some 2,200 and its field force of 3,500 is distributed in 120 general agencies, 285 district offices, 42 group insurance offices, and 9 mortgage loan and real estate offices.

Also in 1965, the company occupied a four-story addition to its home office site. The new east building, which provides some 184,000 gross square feet of additional floorspace, is one of the largest commercial structures erected in the Greater Springfield area since the present home office was built in 1927. The entire home office complex now occupies some 85 acres of land.

The company also reported in 1965 that its new investments now average more than $1.5 million each working day. Total amount of the company's entire investment portfolio now at work in the Nation's economy is approximately $3 billion. The company's investment division comprises three major departments—securities, mortgage loans, and real estate.

The company is considered to have one of the outstanding field forces in the life insurance industry today. Substantiating this is the fact that one out of every eight company field men and women is a member of the industry's elite sales group, the million-dollar round table. The industrywide average membership in this group is 1 of every 72. In addition, one out of every five Massachusetts Mutual representatives is a chartered life underwriter, the industry's highest educational designation, compared to 1 of every 18 for the industry. Also, two of every five Massachusetts Mutual representatives have qualified for the National Quality Award, an industrywide honor, compared to 1 of 13 in the entire industry.

The company prides itself on its quality field force, as well as on its contracts and its policyholder service. The company's letterheads are impressed with the trademark, "In Our Second Century of Service."

Best's Life Insurance Reports, an annual edition reporting on many aspects of legal reserve companies, fraternal benefit societies, and assessment associations operating in the United States, makes these comments on the Massachusetts Mutual:

"The company, now in its second century of operation, is purely mutual and is particularly a policyholders' institution. It has long been most ably managed. It ranks very highly and enjoys a most excellent reputation in all respects * * *. Every important benefit and privilege which the company has given to new policyholders has been given to old policyholders on the same terms, except when expressly forbidden by State or other laws."

In another section, the report adds: "In operations a very important item is expenses, which have been kept remarkably low. Careful selection and underwriting of business has produced a very favorable mortality experience. Policy lapses and surrenders have been low. Net cost to policyholders is remarkably low."

Throughout its history, then, one of the company's foremost objectives has been superlative service to its policyholders. Though the implementation of ZIP codes to its master file is merely one area of service, it points up the company's constant efforts toward that foremost objective. The company, in this area alone, has at all times cooperated with the Post Office Department. Since its inception in July 1961, company secretary, Harrison B. Clapp, has chaired the Springfield Mail Users Council, which has sponsored discussion meetings on the nationwide improved mail service program, the accelerated business collection and delivery program, the ZIP code program, and the scheduled parcel post program. Communications manager Alexander T. Muir has spoken on postal matters to various groups, and through nationwide test mailings has assisted Springfield Postmaster Morin and the New England regional office to provide substantially improved airmail service for the area.

In this area of policyholder service and in every other area, the company, indeed, takes pride in Best's comment that the Massachusetts Mutual is "particularly a policyholders' institution."

POLICY BACKED

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Thailand understands the domino theory much better than some of us back home, the Atlanta Constitution is convinced.

Editorially the paper declares:

We are in Vietnam to make it clear that communism may not achieve cheaply, through the guise of wars of liberation, what it knows would be costly on the open battlefield. For if we are found wanting in the will to resist covert aggression, we are in

effect inviting use of the method again in other parts of the world.

Thailand knows it is "one of those parts of the world," the paper continues, adding that the Vice President visited Bangkok "to assure our Thai allies of aid in case of guerrilla aggression, as well as to discuss economic development of the area."

Because this editorial discusses an issue on which we are committed to stand firm, it will be of general interest to my colleagues and I, therefore, am making the article available in the RECORD.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Feb. 15, 1966]

THAILAND UNDERSTANDS

Vice President HUMPHREY'S mission to Thailand pulls back into focus the underlying reasons for our massive commitment in South Vietnam. That focus often slips away in the day-to-day heat of battle and debate over specific tactics.

We are in Vietnam to make it clear that communism may not achieve cheaply, through the guise of wars of liberation, what it knows would be costly on the open battlefield. For if we are found wanting in the will to resist covert aggression, we are in effect inviting use of the method again in other parts of the world.

Thailand is one of those parts of the world. The kingdom's rulers know it. Already, externally trained or inspired guerrillas are practicing terrorism in northeastern Thailand.

In fact, Thais are concerned that if the war is ended in South Vietnam, Chinese and North Vietnamese efforts may be centered on Thailand. So they are less than enthusiastic about a negotiated settlement.

Thailand has been a consistent friend of America in southeast Asia. It provides air bases that bolster our Vietnamese operations. And if we should later find it necessary to expand our troop commitments extensively and attempt to seal off the Vietcong's supply routes from the north, Thailand would be a base of our operation.

So the Vice President is in Bangkok to assure our Thai allies of aid in case of guerrilla aggression, as well as to discuss economic development of the area.

To the Siamese leaders, the domino theory is not such an object of ridicule as it is to some back home.

LANDOWNERS BATTLE BRUSH PROBLEM TO RESTORE GRASS AND SAVE NEEDED WATER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, landowners of my State and probably of your State are engaged in a real fight to repulse the spread of moisture-stealing, worthless woody plants and brush—more than 50 percent mesquite—that threaten to engulf the land.

It may sound like so much science fiction, but these dense, prolific brushes are suffocating the livestock industry throughout many other sections of our country, robbing the ranchers of soil, water, and livestock grazing.

The Soil Conservation Service and its range conservationists have surveyed the problem twice in the past 18 years and verify the alarming situation that more than 80 percent of the grassland in Texas has become infested with brush.

Neither livestock operators, nor the Nation, can afford grasslands in poor condition, nor can we afford to lose the millions of acre-feet of water consumed annually by brush and weeds. Water lost to brush is water lost to all beneficial use. In Texas alone there is more water lost in 1 year to brush alone than is used by the city of Los Angeles. Just this morning the President sent this Congress a special message pointing out our critical shortage of water. Where can we hope to save so much water as cheaply as we can through adequate brush control?

In the face of this tenacious enemy, farmers and ranchers, not only in Texas, but throughout the rangelands of the entire country, are struggling to restore the abundant grasslands that once covered our plains and prairies.

The landowners in my district—the 11th Congressional District of Texas—are excellent representatives of the stalwart stewards of soil, water, and grassland who are waging this battle all across the United States.

The whole Nation owes these people a continuing debt of gratitude for their efforts at increasing grassland agriculture, to maintain its role in production, and to protect American agriculture.

Though treatment is going on all the time, the progress being made against the woody invader is far from encouraging. Treatment is costly, it is complex, and there is the disheartening probability of reinfestation on treated acres after a few years. Actually, most treatment results only in control, not elimination of brush.

This is a serious matter and Texas landowners have no illusions about the toughness of the job. On the other hand, I have no misgivings about their competence and will to handle it, but they must have the cooperation of their Government, and above all, we must not lose the enthusiasm and the momentum which has been built up over the years. The Nation will suffer or benefit as these landowners lose or win the struggle.

The Soil Conservation Service is keeping close watch on the problem and providing technical assistance in treatment programs. Its plant materials centers are working at adapted grasses and legumes to recapture the land from brush, but a great deal more research and work is needed, and important as it is, brush control is only one of the many problems which should be studied in a grass and forage research center. Until such a center is a reality, one of the largest and most vital segments of our food supplying effort is going to be without needed coordination.

REDWOODS

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on restoring the quality of our environment is a remarkable document. In addition to masterfully summarizing the problems we face, and the opportunities which we have neglected, it sets the stage for a meaningful exposition of the whole problem in the public forum. It is time that we begin to give our best thinking to this vital subject.

I am at heart an optimist. Therefore I have concentrated my attention on the opportunities outlined in the message. The various recreation proposals which are outlined in the message seem to me to be the essence of these opportunities.

The proposal that we establish a Redwood National Park is a case in point. But it is not one on which we can ponder long. We must not allow hesitation or procrastination to overcome the need for quick action. Even as I talk, the last of the great redwoods forest is being felled. Only a fraction of virgin forest still remains and the lumber industry is making short work of that fraction.

The redwood is a valuable resource. The wood has many unique and desirable characteristics. It resists rotting. It is almost impervious to insect attack. It weathers well. It is beautiful and can be worked easily. This is the reason there is a steady demand for its use in lawn furniture, house siding, and decorative fences. Its resistance to insects is also the reason why it lives for thousands of years in its native state.

But the redwood is also a national resource that must be preserved. I do not suggest that we deny the lumber industry the right to use redwoods. I do suggest that, considering their needs, we devise some way to preserve part of the forest for future generations.

Redwoods are fast-growing trees. They replace themselves as usable lumber within 100 years. It is my feeling that it would serve all purposes, the naturalist and the public, and the lumber industry, to preserve part in virgin stand and allow the remainder to be managed in the manner the lumber industry does so well, to provide sustained yields of a valuable lumber.

Establishing a Redwood Park does not preclude lumbering. Preserving a unique and unparalleled scenic masterpiece is not antithetical to the interests of the lumber industry.

You have all heard of the cedars of Lebanon. I am told that a bare remnant is left. In fact, this storied grove of trees existed mostly intact well into this century. Now the remaining virgin forest is measured by individual trees, some of which are a thousand years old. The visitor today is not struck by the beauty of the individual trees in their unique majesty, but rather is appalled at the short-sightedness of the men who allowed all but this pitiful remnant to be cut and used. I propose that, when the administration's proposal for a park reaches this House, we find a way to enact it quickly, lest we be judged in the

same manner the stewards of the cedars of Lebanon are now judged.

TRAILS

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the President has addressed our attention to the problem of restoring the quality of our environment. It was a disturbing message. I admire his courage in detailing, in such graphic form, our society's "sins of omission."

We did not consciously set out to destroy our environment, but rather like Topsy, it "jest growed that way." But whatever the reason, it is time we faced our obligations squarely and set about righting the wrongs we have visited on what most of us consider the most beautiful piece of real estate in the world.

I was particularly impressed with the President's reference to the establishment of a nationwide system of trails. A visit to the C. & O. Canal on Sunday illustrates the universal appeal a pleasant surrounding and a path have for our citizens.

There is no reason why we cannot encourage this type of facility throughout the country. By the turn of this century it is estimated that 85 percent of our people will live in cities as opposed to 65 percent now. As the cities grow the land that is available will be put to some use. Part of that land should be reserved for just such simple pleasures as the weekend stroll. It would have been a tragic waste of good real estate had the C. & O. Canal been filled in and converted to residential or industrial use. But throughout this country this is exactly what is happening to other lands within or adjacent to our great cities. No one is consciously planning its destruction and removal as a recreational asset, it is just happening because there has been no thought given to this type of use. This certainly is a sin of omission.

We can stimulate local communities to provide facilities for the stroller, the walker and the hiker. They should be located near him.

A nationwide system of trails will stimulate local communities to provide their own systems.

A program to encourage the establishment of trails and hiking paths need not be an expensive one. The land and water conservation fund will surely encourage development but mostly it requires that government provide the vision and the leadership by judicious designation of areas already in the public ownership. By making such a designation of suitable areas the Federal Government can stimulate the development of a trails system which will meet the needs of both the urban dweller and the serious outdoorsman. Wyoming is pleased to recognize this national need and to help fulfill it, Mr. Speaker.

BENNETT CITES NEED TO CHANGE SYSTEM OF ELECTING PRESIDENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, since 1959 I have introduced and supported legislation to change the system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States. I am gratified that there is a renewed interest in this major constitutional problem and I am hopeful that positive action will take place in the 89th Congress.

I am today reintroducing legislation first introduced by me on the opening day of the 87th Congress dealing with this important subject.

My amendment falls into the proportional plan proposals and it is the one I feel is both fair and needed by our Nation at this time. The proportional method was first proposed in the 1870's and it was approved by the Senate in 1950, but not by the House.

The legislation which I am introducing today would abolish the electoral college system, preserving only the electoral vote. Each State's electoral vote would be equivalent to the number of Representatives and Senators from that State, thus preserving the concept of States rights. Each presidential candidate would receive the same proportion of the electoral vote as his share of the State's popular vote. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President would be elected, if such a number is a majority of the whole number of electoral votes.

If there were no majority for any candidate, then the Senate and House of Representatives in joint session would choose the President from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes. A majority of the votes of the combined membership of the two bodies would be necessary for a choice. The Vice President would be chosen in a like manner.

I believe this proposal to be the nearest thing to electing a President by direct popular vote of the people while at the same time retaining and preserving the present relative strength of each State in the election of a President.

There are other important arguments in favor of my amendment:

First. The election of a candidate with a minority of popular votes would be prevented under most if not all circumstances.

Second. Minority parties in States where there is a dominant major party would have their votes count, thus giving the single voter an opportunity to affect the outcome of an election.

Third. Fraudulent voting or vote-counting and accidental circumstances would be less likely to defeat the choice of the voters.

Fourth. Sectionalism will tend to be abated.

Fifth. Proportionate voting would strengthen the two-party system in the States.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my amendment will be given careful consideration by the Congress and enacted into law at an early date.

A copy of my resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 842

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby established. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within forty-five days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person have a majority of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes for President the Senate and the House of Representatives sitting in joint session shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of

Representatives shall be necessary for a choice.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate and the House of Representatives may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, which preceded the fourth paragraph thereof insofar as they relate to conditions of eligibility for the office of President, and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution, are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the tenth day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

A SNEAKER ON SNEAKERS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Customs Bureau's recent adoption of new guidelines for the tariff evaluation of rubber-soled footwear has threatened the continued prosperity of one of the principal employment areas of my congressional district, Connecticut's Naugatuck Valley, the home of the United States Rubber Co.'s footwear division. I have today introduced legislation to reverse the Customs Bureau's action.

Since August 19, 1965, when the Customs Bureau published notice of its intention to reduce the tariff on rubber-soled footwear through the adoption of revised valuation guidelines, I have made numerous administrative efforts to prevent this action and to avert its obvious threat to the employment security of a large number of my constituents.

I have had voluminous correspondence with the Secretaries of State, Labor, Treasury, and Commerce and with the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Gov. Christian Herter, as well as with the Commissioner of Customs, and I have set forth in detail in our correspondence and conversations the hazards of the adoption of these new guidelines. In this endeavor I have had the full and personal support of representatives of the labor and industrial segments concerned, and I am convinced that these efforts were favorably received in several areas. I had been encouraged by many expressions of sympathetic consideration of the Naugatuck problem from various Federal officials, and while working closely with representatives of management and workers of Naugatuck's footwear plant, I was again especially pleased to note the very receptive audience accorded these officials by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz who heard their complaints at a special meeting in October of 1965.

Despite these presentations, however, the Customs Bureau has adopted these new guidelines, and moreover, it has announced its intention to apply this tariff reduction retroactively to include imports which entered this country over 3 years ago. On February 4, 1963, the Customs Bureau served notice on all appraising officers to suspend evaluation of all imported rubber-soled footwear which had not then been liquidated for tariff application. Now, after postponing the importers' obligation to pay any tariff for over 3 years, the Bureau is retroactively reducing the tariff which has accrued during that period. In view of the large Federal revenue loss involved in this measure, this action deserves further scrutiny, and to assist the Committee on Ways and Means in its deliberation on this matter I have requested from the Commissioner of Customs an accounting of the number of pairs of footwear which have not been dutied, as well as a calculation of the amount of uncollected duty involved.

This highly discriminatory treatment of imported footwear is not a new phenomenon. It is paralleled by prior policies of allowing imported rubber overshoes containing synthetic rubber to escape full tariff application and by the gradual whittling away of the traditional pattern that is still appropriate for our domestic footwear industry. The results of these practices and policies appear most vividly in the Department of Commerce trade statistics which reveal an incredible rate of import growth within the past decade. In 1955, imports of protective rubber footwear totaled 185,412 pairs, or 0.63 percent of domestic production. By 1963 this figure had skyrocketed to 12,812,518 pairs or 55.25 percent of total U.S. output.

As imports of rubber-soled footwear continue to rise in volume—from 40,000 pairs in 1954 to in excess of 21 million pairs in 1965—it is becoming clear that the recent Customs decision is another step in the wrong direction. When one considers that the foreign producers have multiplied their 1954 volume of shipments by 500 times, rising from less than 1 percent of domestic production in 1954 to about 20 percent in 1965, while domestic shipments have advanced by only three times in the same period, it becomes clear that the importers have been allowed to capture more than their fair share of our domestic market growth in rubber-soled footwear, and that the time has come to apply the brakes before our entire domestic industry is irreparably injured in the process.

My bill will put on the brakes. It calls for the continued application of the basis of valuation established by Presidential proclamation in 1933 to all rubber-soled fabric footwear imports which have entered this country since the date when Customs suspended valuation. This action will restore to the Treasury the full measure of accrued back duties which have been owing since early 1963, and it will avert a major economic problem for this vital industry and its thousands of employees.

I am confident that the Members of this House will recognize the merit of this legislation and its importance to the thousands of hourly rate wage earners who depend on its protection. I strongly recommend its early passage.

MISSISSIPPI HEADSTART PROGRAM

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to read in this morning's Washington Post, the announcement that a contract had been signed by the Office of Economic Opportunity for a continuation of the Mississippi Headstart program. I should like to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Shriver, the Director, Mr. Berry, the Assistant Director for Community Action, and Dr. Richmond, the Director of Headstart, for refunding one of the most worthwhile Headstart programs in the country.

Since all of the facts were not given in the newspaper stories, I would like to bring to your attention the resolution of some of the issues which have delayed the signing.

The total project will cost 6.2 million of which the Federal share is 5.6 million. It is a 6-month program and will enable 9,135 children to attend Headstart training classes. There will be 122 training centers all over the State in every congressional district.

In order to avoid some of the problems of the previous year OEO has worked out certain new procedures. For example:

The agreement signed yesterday provides for a new personnel and management team who have experience and training in budget and money matters.

A new accounting firm, Ernst & Ernst, of Mississippi, has been retained.

A prominent Jackson attorney will be counsel and the office has been moved from Beulah.

In addition, three additional highly qualified people, all Mississippians, will be members of the new board—a professor of psychiatry, an educator, and a pediatrician.

A new handbook on accounting and fiscal procedures has been developed.

New payroll and personnel procedures will be adopted.

Because of the desperate need of the children in Mississippi for this kind of help and in order to eliminate one of the points of contention arising out of the previous program, a $35,000 escrow account has been established from private sources to cover any disallowances which may arise from last year's programs in the final audit.

Hopefully, none of this money will need to be used but it is there because of the concern of these private organizations to see this desperately needed program go forward.

I was one of the Congressmen who greeted the little Headstart lobbyists from Mississippi when they came to tell us about their classes a week or so ago. I am sorry that more of you were not able to meet these future citizens. The Headstart program has been an outstanding success all over the country but its meaning for the poor children of Mississippi is uncalculable.

I believe that we need more Headstart programs in Mississippi and I have been assured by OEO that additional money is available for any organization offering an effective program which abides by the war on poverty regulations and the civil rights law. I am glad to know, too, that the Labor Department and OEO have funded a program to retrain 7,500 displaced migrant laborers in Mississippi. This is most welcomed news and I trust that State and local authorities are cooperating fully in getting this project underway as rapidly as possible. Similar projects in other parts of the State are desperately needed.

It is also good news that the surplus food distribution is going to go forward and will be increased.

Not too long ago I joined my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], in bringing to the attention of the House the desperate plight of the poor people of Mississippi. We intend to pursue this matter even though the announcements of the last few days are most reassuring.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING—EFFORTS OF CONGRESSMAN LINDLEY BECKWORTH TO ASSIST STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND OTHERS TO OBTAIN SUMMER EMPLOYMENT IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AND OTHER EFFORTS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am 52 years of age and have held elective legislative offices 26 years—one-half of my life. I have represented the Third Congressional District 24 years. I was in the Texas Legislature 2 years.

Each Texas Member continues to represent and will until January 3, 1967, the congressional district or area from which he was elected in 1964. Because I was reelected for a 12th 2-year term in November 1964, which term began in January 1965, I am now and shall continue to be the Congressman from the nine counties—Smith, Gregg, Van Zandt, Upshur, Wood, Camp, Rusk, Panola, and Shelby—of the present Third Congressional District until January 1967. A new congressional term will begin in January 1967. The 1966 elections will determine who is to represent each of the newly formed districts.

Our present Third Congressional District is to be abolished as of January 3, 1967. A new Third Congressional District is to be located in the western part of Dallas County and will border Tarrant County of which Fort Worth is the county seat—as of January 3, 1967. The 1960 population of the Fourth District was 216,371; the 1960 population of the First District was 245,942; the 1960 population of our Third District was 293,942. Five of the nine counties of our Third District—the five with county seats are Camp—Pittsburg; Panola—Carthage; Rusk—Henderson; Shelby—Center; Wood—Quitman—are to be placed in Congressional District No. 1 which has in it Paris, Marshall, and Texarkana.

Four of our nine counties—the four with county seats are Gregg—Longview; my home county of Upshur—Gilmer; Smith—Tyler; and Van Zandt—Canton—are to be placed in Congressional District No. 4. Neither the First nor Fourth District lost a county. I have run for office every 2 years in two of the nine Third District counties—Camp and Upshur—for 30 years; I have run for office in eight of the nine counties—Camp, Upshur, Van Zandt, Smith, Gregg, Panola, Wood, Rusk—every 2 years for 28 years. I have run for office in Shelby county 8 years.

I quote from an article that appeared in the Tyler Courier Times January 13, 1966 concerning Hon. Brady Gentry, an outstanding and beloved citizen of Tyler:

> On the Washington scene 4 years and seldom raising his voice in the House, Gentry won recognition as one who diligently informed himself on bills and voted his convictions with apparently no regard for party lines or political expediency.
>
> Yet, in his one bid for reelection, against a formidable foe, he came out on top. In 1954 he defeated the man who had preceded him. LINDLEY BECKWORTH of Gladewater, who in 1952 made an unsuccessful bid for the U.S. Senate against Price Daniel.
>
> But Gentry won in a close vote and BECKWORTH returned to Congress in 1957 after Gentry stepped down. Ironically, the only election Gentry ever lost was a congressional election back in the 1930's.
>
> The victor in that race was a former schoolteacher by the name of LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

The post offices in the present Fourth Congressional District are as follows:

Collin County: Allen, Anna, Blue Ridge, Celina, Copeville, Farmersville, Frisco, Josephine, Lavon, McKinney, Melissa, Nevada, Plano, Princeton, Prosper, Renner, Westminster, Weston, Wylie.

Fannin County: Bailey, Bonham, Dodd City, Ector, Gober, Honey Grove, Ivanhoe, Ladonia, Leonard, Randolph, Ravenna, Savoy, Telephone, Trenton, Windom.

Grayson County: Bells, Collinsville, Denison, Dorchester, Gordonville, Gunter, Howe, Pottsboro, Sadler, Sherman, Southmayd, Tioga, Tom Bean, Van Alstyne, Whitesboro, Whitewright.

Hunt County: Caddo Mills, Campbell, Celeste, Commerce, Fairlie, Floyd, Greenville, Lone Oak, Merit, Quinlan, Wolfe City.

Kaufman County: Crandall, Elmo, Forney, Kaufman, Kemp, Mabank, Rosser, Scurry, Terrell. Rains County: Emory, Point.

Rockwall County: Fate, Rockwall, and Royse City.

Two colleges and one university that are in the seven counties to which four of the nine counties of our Third Congressional District are to be added are East Texas State University, Austin College, and Grayson County Junior College. I attended East Texas State Teachers College. Also my folks, A. S., W. P., David Paul Slaughter, and others went to East Texas. My father and twin sister—SFA graduates—taught. My father, a native of Georgia, and his second wife, Pearl Sloan Phipps, taught last in Smith and Upshur Counties. I taught school 3 years. While teaching I coached basketball and drove a schoolbus. I feel sure some students from these schools referred to above as well as other colleges would welcome the opportunity in the future to obtain summer employment with the Government in Washington. I say this as one who also attended Sam Houston State Teachers College, SMU, Baylor—law—and Texas University—arts and sciences and law. Also I did some work through Abilene Christian College. In the newly created Fourth District there are about 40 newspapers, 18 radio stations, and 2 TV stations. Dallas television and radio programs reach many people in the new Fourth District.

I was born in Kaufman County June 30, 1913. I lived in Henderson County. My mother, Josie Slaughter, daughter of Elder W. W. Slaughter, a Primitive Baptist preacher, of Edgewood, taught in Henderson County. I now live and have lived for 24 years in the same house in the Union Grove community in Upshur County, Gladewater, Route 2. This is about 9 miles from Longview, the last city on the eastern side of the new district and about 150 miles from Denison and Sherman and Gordonville on the northwestern side of the new Fourth District. I married Eloise Carter, daughter of Barney and Mattie Palmer Carter, Tyler, Tex., in 1942—nearly 24 years ago. We have five children, Gary, Carter Otis, Mary Eloise, Linda Louise, and John Barney, all of whom attend school.

In the Texas Legislature I was a member of the Education—Hon. Charles Tenryson was my chairman—and Appropriations Committees and dealt with problems of education, institutions of higher learning, and State hospitals. In the Congress I was second ranking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—the committee of which Speaker Rayburn was chairman—and I have served on the Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service Committees. I have practiced law—I am a member of the Gregg County Bar Association—farmed, worked on a cattle ranch, in a tailor shop, grocery, filling station, and cafe. I have shoveled gravel on the State highway and done oilfield work. Because of these varied school and employment experiences, I have been and am convinced that people sincerely desire to learn more about how their Government in Washington works. My bill, H.R. 242, will help students get summer employment in Washington, D.C., in my opinion.

I include some remarks I made on the floor of the House of Representatives July 12, 1965.

This is the third Beckworth bill which has been brought to the floor of the House of Representatives to apportion summer jobs among people of the States and the District of Columbia. The purpose of H.R. 242 simply is to pave the way for more equitable distribution of Government summer jobs in the Washington area among young people from all of the States. Even though the Civil Service Commission has recently made a sincere effort to provide for wider representation among the States in filling these summer jobs, the Commission's program has only scratched the surface as I see it. This is attested by evidence presented at our public hearings that approximately two-thirds of the 6,000 temporary employees appointed here in the summer of 1964 were residents of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. This obvious disparity clearly results from lack of a firm statutory directive which will insure young people in all of the States a truly equitable opportunity to participate in the unique summer experience of working in the Nation's Capital.

My father and mother were teachers and first prepared to be teachers in Commerce, Tex., and, incidentally, were married in Greenville while they were attending school in Commerce. They were always interested in governmental activities as I always have been. My mother taught in Van Zandt County and my father went to school in Kaufman County and was teaching and farming on halves in Kaufman County when I was born. My parents taught their pupils the importance of being interested in governmental activities. My wife and I have three sons and two daughters. We have urged them to be interested in government.

In the time when my parents were in school and first began to teach, few people undertook to come to Washington to work, particularly in the summertime. Times have changed. Many types of people seek employment with the U.S. Government. Particularly teachers and boys and girls who are students wish to come to work in Washington in the summertime in order to learn about the workings of their Government. The requests for these jobs are many.

My bill H.R. 242 is identical to my bill H.R. 5968 of the 87th Congress which passed the House by a vote of 301 for to 18 against and is similar to my bill H.R. 10 of the 88th Congress which passed the House by a vote of 309 for to 19 against. I most sincerely hope that the House will again approve the very practical and necessary reform embodied in H.R. 242.

I quote from my remarks during a hearing in the Senate on my bill H.R. 242:

On July 12, 1965, the House again passed this legislation on a record vote of 336 for to 22 against. I most sincerely hope that your subcommittee and your full committee will approve the very practical and necessary reform embodied in H.R. 242.

As a former teacher, I have always favored and I strongly favor educational benefits for our servicemen and veterans. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 7724, "a bill to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term 'change of program of education or training' as used in such section." A favorable report was given on my bill by the American Legion on July 15, 1959.

I quote the pertinent part of a letter written to Representative DORN by Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, of the American Legion:

"In connection with H.R. 7724, while we have no resolution on the subject matter, I would advise that the American Legion's rehabilitation representatives feel such an amendment to section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code is desirable. We, therefore, trust the subcommittee will favorably consider H.R. 7724."

The Veterans' Administration gave a favorable report on my bill. The bill was reported favorably by the Dorn subcommittee on July 21, 1959, and its provisions have now become law.

I consistently have supported and do support the policy of standing firm in Vietnam.

As a member of the Texas Legislature and a Member of Congress for 24 years, I have supported the conservation, preservation, development, and proper utilization of our natural resources such as water and soil. This I shall continue to do.

I supported the so-called GI bill for World War II veterans and I always have favored and do favor generous pay and benefits for service people and their dependents and generous benefits and pensions for veterans and their dependents. I supported the most recent GI legislation, H.R. 12410 and S. 9 which passed the House February 7, 1966. I quote the pertinent part of a letter written me April 26, 1944 from Austin, Tex., by Harry E. Rather, of the American Legion of Texas:

DEAR LINDLEY: Thanks for your prompt reply in regard to the resolution passed by the department executive committee regarding the Legion's GI bill of rights for World War II veterans. We know that you are for this legislation. We have known it all along and we are very pleased to find that you were at least one of the Congressmen from Texas to sign discharge petition No. 8.

I quote part of a letter written December 31, 1945, which I received from Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo.:

I have the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinting your remarks and the various communications you have received in connection with your activities in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and I wish to express my appreciation for your efforts along this line.

Also I quote a part of a letter which was written to me March 13, 1963, by one of the outstanding leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

You are known to have supported all veteran legislation.

I have tried to help our unemployed, including our older workers. Some evidence of my efforts is shown by my statements and the tabulations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 3, pages 2857 and 2862. I quote two paragraphs from a letter written me by Senator PAT MCNAMARA, March 25, 1964. He is chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging:

Thank you for calling my attention to the material you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 13 concerning Federal employment of older workers. The staff of the Senate Special Committee on Aging tell me that they noted the data when you inserted it in the RECORD and that it is one of the best discussions of the subject.

You are certainly to be commended for your zeal in combating age discrimination in Federal employment, and I wish you well in your further activities along this line.

HOURLY MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS FOR HARVEST WORKERS IN OREGON

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to extend the hourly minimum wage provisions to agricultural harvest operations would have an effect on farm labor in Oregon quite contrary to the stated intentions of the authors of the proposal. I am referring particularly to workers in fruit, vegetable, and berry harvest operations where payment is customarily made on a piecework basis.

The provisions of H.R. 10518 would not raise the wages of professional harvest workers in Oregon. The present piecework payment, translated into an average hourly wage, already exceeds the proposed $1.15 per hour minimum for such a worker. Information compiled and published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture demonstrate that farm wage rates in the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and California are higher than in any other area of the Nation.

I am concerned here today, however, with the fact that the bill would have a major detrimental effect on part-time employment opportunities for students, housewives, pensioners, the partially disabled, and others who, through choice or through no fault of their own, might not consistently earn the equivalent of the minimum wage. Thousands of workers in these categories would be effectively excluded from earning the supplemental income, the spending money, or the college education fund that has customarily been available to them through piecework harvest employment.

The producers of these crops are suffering from the cost-price squeeze, and if H.R. 10518 is enacted they will be forced to limit employment to those whose potential for production and whose performance is clearly sufficient to equal the minimum wage. If, because of severe labor shortages, the farmer is forced to employ all available help regardless of capability, then the minimum wage provision would be a serious and unjustifiable economic penalty.

I want to quote briefly from an article in the February 1 issue of the Flying Eagle, the student publication of the Harrisburg Union High School, Harrisburg, Oreg.:

Thousands of youngsters work a few weeks each summer harvesting Oregon's pole bean and berry crops. They are needed, they want to and like to, but most of all they help because it gives them the opportunity to earn their own money.

But they may have to enter the ranks of the unemployable. That is, unless those

who believe they should have the opportunity to work do something about it. Thousands of youngsters may be legislated out of their jobs.

The bill before Congress makes no provision for those who work on a piece-rate basis.

These young people want to work, and we should be providing additional opportunities for their employment instead of reducing their chances as is proposed in H.R. 10518.

The bill, as presently written, would prohibit youngsters under 12 from working, except in fields owned by their parents. Considering the number of youngsters under 12 who eagerly seek the opportunity to earn spending money during the summertime, after school, or on weekends in fields near their homes, this is an unreasonable limitation. For those between the ages of 12 and 16 and for full-time students, the bill provides for a minimum wage of 85 percent of the adult rate. For all others, the minimum hourly wage would apply.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of the migrant worker are many, but in all candor, I must say that as far as Oregon is concerned, the enactment of an hourly minimum wage for harvest work is not going to solve a single one of his problems. It may, in fact, serve to reduce the total income of a migrant family by preventing or discouraging the employment of the young and the aged. One of the major problems of the migrant worker is underemployment, a situation brought about by the limitations of the harvest season, not by an overabundance of workers in the labor market. To the contrary, when the crops are ready to be picked, there never seems to be enough workers to go around for the short period of harvest.

At this point, someone might well suggest that if wages were higher, there would be a sufficient labor force to meet the demand. The fact is that competition for experienced pickers is such that the piecework rate can provide a substantial hourly wage. Let me cite just a few examples of the earning capabilities of steady, experienced workers in Oregon harvest operations.

At the 1965 rate of 4½ cents per pound for picking cherries, a man and his wife earned $1,009 in 10 days in Marion County, Oreg. This was slightly over $50 per day for each of them for a 10- to 11-hour working day. During the same period, in the same orchard, a single man earned $492.05.

At the rate of 3 cents per pound, a good worker in the pole bean harvest in western Oregon can earn up to $20 per day.

In one apple orchard, at the 1965 harvest rate of $4 to $4.50 per bin, 40 percent of the harvest workers averaged $3.05 per hour.

In the blackberry fields, a family of 4 picked 578 crates at 55 cents per crate in a period of 4 days. This was a father, mother, and two high school children—total earnings for 4 days, $317.90.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention here to suggest that every worker earns the type of wages cited in these examples, but I do want to emphasize that Oregon growers offer piecework rates that encourage earnings well in excess of the proposed minimum wage. These producers would be delighted, I am sure, if every worker in the field earned the maximum wages possible, but not every person who hires out for harvest work is capable of maintaining a consistently high rate of production, and many are simply not motivated to do so. Among these are high school and college students, housewives, and the active elderly who find that picking berries, beans, or fruit is a healthful and enjoyable way to earn extra dollars, but who are not dependent upon the income for their total livelihood. Because of the chronic shortage of full-time harvest workers, however, these people play a vital role in Oregon's $75 million hand harvest operations.

Testimony before the General Subcommittee on Labor discloses that the hourly rate for certain farm labor in some parts of the United States is as low as 50 cents per hour. I recognize that it is the intention of the sponsors of H.R. 10518 to help correct that kind of inequity, but it should not be done in such a way that it limits employment opportunities in areas like Oregon where average wages already exceed the proposed minimum.

I am opposed to the bill in its present form, and urge that the minimum wage provisions be eliminated in agricultural harvest operations where payment has customarily been made on a piecework basis, and that the bill be amended to permit youngsters of all ages to continue to seek afterschool employment in safe and suitable harvest work.

THE 68TH ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the 15th of February is an anniversary that will be observed by Spanish-American War veterans as long as any remain, and it is my hope and prayer that later generations of Americans will continue the observance of the anniversary on which the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana harbor and the United States of America was started on the road to world leadership.

It was the commencement of what future historians will call the 50-year war—the War with Spain, an interlude of peace and preparation, then World War I, another interlude of peace and preparation, and World War II—the 50-year war that changed the face of history and started the peoples of all the world on a march to higher heights of human welfare and universal brotherhood.

As the last veteran of the Spanish-American War in this body, I have sought as best I could to help in placing the war with Spain in its rightful place in American history. The spirit of 1898 was one of the noblest manifestations of unselfish idealism of the ages.

In a large sense the Spanish-American War is the war of our country only casually remembered, misunderstood at the best, and grossly undervaluated as a direct and driving force in the expansion and the moral enrichness of our own country and the mighty changes that have come as earthquakes of humanity all over the world.

It is no exaggeration to say that when the *Maine* went down, with 266 precious American lives, in the harbor of Havana on February 15, 1898, a force was ignited that would not dull until benefiting change had come to every nation of the world and some measure of benefit to every human being everywhere.

As the years roll on, Mr. Speaker, the war with Spain will come more truly into its rightful place in the history of our country. It is natural that in the rapid succession of events at the advent of the 20th century the war with Spain and its tremendous impact upon the development of our country as a world power should have been minimized if not overlooked.

Since I have been a Member of this body, I have never failed to observe the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* on February 15 or the day closest thereto when the House was in session. This year we were not in session on February 15, and by unanimous consent my special order was reset for today.

Today I am including in my remarks the address on February 14, 1906, of Lt. Col. Alfred C. Sharpe, 30th U.S. Infantry, secretary of the army of Santiago de Cuba, at the dedication of the battle monument on the ruins of Fort El Viso at El Caney in Cuba. That was 60 years ago.

Please note that this address was made 8 years after the Santiago campaign and at a time when the President of Cuba, the Government and the people of Cuba, all were grateful to the United States and the American soldiers and sailors who had come to the aid of Cuba in her distress and misery.

I might explain that Colonel Sharpe's address is included with other addresses in the report of the Santiago Battlefield Commission issued from the press of John S. Bridges & Co. of Baltimore in 1906. It is listed in the Library of Congress as E717.1.S67.

This Santiago Battlefield Commission on February 15, 1906, visited Siboney, Cuba, as guests of A. E. Borie, vice president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and selected, we are told, "the site for the proposed monument, to be erected by the Juragua Iron Co., commemorating the landing place of General Shafter and staff and Kent's 1st Infantry Division, and the subsequent reenforcements of the V Army Corps in Cuba, as well as the location of the base hospital of the Santiago campaign from which all the wounded and sick were sent back to the United States."

In due time the monument was erected at Siboney by the Juragua Iron Co. I saw that monument at Siboney in 1955,

some 57 years after I, with my comrades of the 33d Volunteer Michigan Infantry, had landed there in late June of 1898, wading ashore from small boats, holding above us our Springfield rifles high in the air. The 33d Michigan was the first volunteer regiment after the Rough Riders to land in Cuba. Yet the monument at Siboney made no mention of the 33d Michigan.

If the monument at Siboney is still standing, I know that Archie House, past commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans, will join me in the suggestion that someone at some time set that monument right as a historian. Archie and I are the only ones left of Company I, 33d Michigan, and we know that our regiment, even though unmentioned in the inscription on the monument, was among the very first to land.

Mr. Speaker, here is Colonel Sharpe's address of 60 years ago:

ADDRESS OF COLONEL SHARPE, AT DEDICATION

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we have come across the seas to dedicate on this historic field a monument to the memory of brave comrades who here gave up their lives in battle. Unlike most wars whose glowing campfires and flashing guns have thrown their lurid glare across the pages of history, the conflict in which these men fought and died was waged neither for the defense of cherished institutions at home nor for subjugation and conquest abroad.

They were not actuated by sordid ambition and lust of power which have been the cause of so many cruel struggles among the children of men. They came not at the behest of loyal princes struggling for the succession to a throne, nor yet for the extension of commerce nor for the acquisition of new domains. Their mission here was of a far different nature and so unique in its motive and so brilliant in its achievement as to be perhaps without a real parallel in the history of war.

UNHAPPY PLIGHT OF CUBANS

The people of Cuba had long been struggling to cast off the hated yoke of Spain; without recognition as belligerents, without a treasury, without a navy; hunted down and penned like animals in camps of reconcentration; half naked and dying by thousands of starvation; with poor arms and limited ammunition, they yet maintained the unequal struggle through years of suffering and horror such as has seldom blackened the annals of the race.

Deeply moved by these sad conditions, so shocking to every sentiment of humanity, the great heart of the American people went out to these unhappy neighbors in unfeigned compassion and sympathy and began to demand how long in all good conscience this reign of desolation could be permitted to endure.

The right of one government to intervene in the internal affairs of another had long been debated by the publicists and discarded as a pernicious and dangerous doctrine. Our own Washington had even warned the fathers to beware of entangling alliances. But anyone the least acquainted with the genius of our institutions and the character of our people could not have failed to foresee that sooner or later the cry of these sorrowing Cubans would pierce the soul and rouse the conscience of the great Republic of the north, and then woe to him who should stand in the way of their swift and righteous judgment.

BRITAIN'S DECLARATION OF WHITEHALL

It was not difficult, perhaps, for the people of England to understand the feelings of their American kindred in this delicate situation. They had themselves been similarly circumstanced a hundred years before when in the famous Declaration of Whitehall, after recounting some of the horrors of the French Revolution, they declared:

"This state of affairs cannot subsist in France without implicating neighboring powers; without giving them the right and imposing upon them the duty of arresting the progress of an evil which only exists by the successive violation of all laws and every sense of propriety, and the subversion of the fundamental principles which unite men by the ties of social life."

But in that instance England was intervening to restore a throne—not to emancipate an enthralled people. And in the American Revolution several years prior to that date the aid which came to the colonies from France was recognized not so much as an intervention in behalf of the colonists as an effort to humble the power of England.

To the nations of continental Europe, however, the kindly impulses of the American people were not so readily intelligible. They hugged the delusion that sectional differences were still smoldering among us and that united action on any great question of policy, especially one so serious as to involve the possibility of war, would be next to impossible.

Accustomed to suppress individuality and keep the faculties of the mind among the masses inert, they did not realize that ours is indeed and in fact a government by the people, and that in point of intelligence, generous sentiment and spontaneous individual initiative the American character, as some one has justly declared, is probably the most striking and positive which the human family has produced.

Such a people, once convinced of the righteousness of a cause, do not stop to count the cost nor calculate the benefits. Strongly imbued with the militant missionary spirit, their leaders are not only encouraged to lead on, but even impelled further possibly than they originally intended to go or deemed it expedient to go. So it was in the great War Between the States in 1861; and so it was again in the war of 1898.

MCKINLEY SEES APPROACH OF STORM

President McKinley and his able advisers saw the approach of the coming storm; with noble forbearance and high statesmanship they exhausted every resource of diplomacy to find, if possible, some basis of pacification and adjustment without an appeal to arms. And it is only fair to Spain to remember that these overtures were received and treated with a consideration which gave promise of ultimate peaceful success.

But suddenly, like the flash of an electric bolt, a horrible event in the harbor of Havana dissipated all possibility of settlement and passed the question from the deliberations of cabinets and diplomats to the forum of the people. The explosion of the *Maine* seemed to set the Republic on fire. Its reverberations shook the remotest hamlet in the land.

The story of Cuba's wrongs became the theme of daily conversation and the burden of the daily press; it was told with touching pathos in the Halls of Congress; from ocean to ocean pulpits rang with burning philippics and the congregations again began singing the grand old war song, the sublime "Battle Hymn of the Republic":

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightnings of his terrible swift sword;
His truth is marching on.

"In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;
As He died to make men holy let us die to make men free;
While God is marching on."

VOTE IN CONGRESS IS UNANIMOUS

And so the war began; obedient to the will of the people and without one dissenting vote, the Congress made an appropriation of $50 million at the immediate disposal of the President. This remarkable unanimity of action, obliterating all party lines and discovering the undivided Nation in solid phalanx behind the President as their Commander in Chief was perhaps one of the happiest surprises which surprising America has ever given to the nations of the world. And had they learned no other lesson save this, the opportunity to proclaim in such an unmistakable and splendid manner the absolute unification and solidarity of our great country would of itself have been worth all the money the war cost.

It is gratifying also to recall at this juncture the resolute attitude and good will of our cousins in old England. We are told that when approached by some of the continental powers with a proposition for a coalition in behalf of Spain the British Government declined absolutely to consider it; and upon being pressed as to her attitude in case such coalition were formed without her, replied that in that event she would stand by the United States.

I am aware that the truth of this statement has been seriously questioned, and it must be confessed that the tone of the British press at that time was by no means friendly; but whether the report be true or false we certainly know this: that ever since the memorable victory which here crowned our arms 7½ years ago, British respect for America has been steadily growing and has been seeking expression on every proper occasion in words and tokens of esteem.

Contemplating these happy conditions and hoping that England and America may continue to draw still closer and closer together "hands clasped across the sea" and girdling the world with the benign influence of Anglo-Saxon institutions, who shall measure the results of the war of 1898?

NATION MOBILIZE FOR WAR

We will not stop to review the dramatic scenes which followed the declaration of war: the hasty mobilization and embarkation of Shafter's splendid corps; the disquieting rumors of phantom warships; the long, tedious voyage; the skillful landing under protection of our gallant fleet; then the affair at Guasimas, followed by the prompt advance and the final glorious culmination here on that memorable July 1 when Capron's guns opened the day at El Caney. Those stirring events are vividly remembered by all and need not here be recounted.

But it is gratifying to recall the fact that American prowess on this field was fully maintained at the high standard of its best and loftiest traditions.

We had been taught by former wars to believe that when troops in action had sustained certain losses approximating 14 or 15 percent, it would be necessary to bring up the supports, and when such losses reached the alarming proportion of 25 percent, the morale would be seriously shattered and further advance without reenforcements would be effectually checked.

But it remained for the American Army on this field to establish a new world record. Without supports, without a man in reserve, and after a most exhausting march through the torrid jungle, the single thin line which rushed to the assault of these entrenched

positions lost more than 15 percent, before it had traversed half the bullet-swept zone: yet they gallantly pressed on, many of the regiments, exposed to direct and converging fire, such as the 7th of Lawton's, and the 6th, 13th, and 16th of Kent's, leaving upward of 30 percent lying along the bloody path across the deadly plain.

DEFENSE OF NATION IS IN PREPAREDNESS

It may not be inappropriate to pause just here for a moment to repeat, as it should be repeated on every proper occasion and in every proper place, the lesson here impressively emphasized that if we would reach across the sea and strike a blow as quick and crushing and decisive as was struck here in 1898, we must have the most perfect instrumentalities with which to do it; we must have not only an adequate modern Navy but a highly specialized and adequate Military Establishment as well.

Relying with confidence upon our splendid battleships to do their part, we must, nevertheless, remember that their action stops with the shore. A ship, however magnificently equipped and handled, cannot fight on land; neither can a navy spare its vessels for transportation. Nor should we be satisfied with a contemplation of our vast resources and fall into the fatal belief that a land force can be suddenly improvised. Military resources and military strength are two widely different things and must not be confounded.

We may possess untold wealth in the one and be sadly destitute in the other. The speedy organization, equipment, and embarkation of some of the dashing volunteers who participated so honorably in the Santiago campaign, was indeed a fine exhibition of American initiative and organizing power.

But our admiration for their bold and gallant action should never be permitted to obscure the fact that an immediately available and well-trained force cannot be suddenly created. In addition to the preliminary work of organizing and equipping, the training of the modern soldier demands an irreducible amount of time, and time in the operations of war is an element which neither gold nor genius can command.

MUST ALWAYS BE READY FOR WAR

I know these are familiar and oft-repeated truisms, but, we regret to say there is still great need of their repetition. And they should be repeated and repeated again until our people come to a realization of their full meaning. We should never grow weary of reciting the old Roman proverb, as true today as when it was first uttered, that if we would have commerce, if we would have national stability, if we would have honorable and lasting peace, we must be ready for war.

This is the first and second and third duty of the state. Had we been compelled in 1898 to postpone the invasion of Cuba until we could have organized and prepared a sufficient volunteer force, training them in all the scientific appliances of the present day, the strategic advantages would have been entirely lost, the enemy would have gained time to prepare a more formidable defense, the threatened coalitions would probably have been consummated, perhaps our command of the sea interrupted, and the story of Cuba would have been far different.

After the roar of battle has ceased to resound in our ears, after the armies are called home and affairs have resumed their normal course, we are prone to look back upon the conditions which led to the conflict as something out of the ordinary and as not liable to happen again.

NEW RESPONSIBILITIES AS WORLD POWER

But human wisdom cannot foresee the varied form in which opposition to our wide-expanding, world-engirdling Republic may next appear; having become a great world power we certainly shall be expected to meet the obligations of a world power; without an effective and immediately available land force backed up by a properly organized and trained reserve, no suddenly improvised transports however numerous, and no hastily assembled levies, however brave and patriotic, will suffice.

It is encouraging to see that the President of the United States, himself a veteran of the Santiago campaign, is leading the thought of the country in this important matter. In his last annual message to Congress he declares:

"We cannot consider the question of our foreign policy without at the same time treating of the Army and Navy."

He points out the importance of thorough preparation and training, and adds:

"Only by such training in advance can we be sure that in actual war field operations and those at sea will be carried on sucessfully."

If the campaign of Santiago shall have brought our people to a serious contemplation of these vital truths, leading them to delevop and resolutely maintain an adequate transport service against all the arguments and influences of the intense commercialism of the day and a rational system of National Reserves capable of immediate and effective action, we shall recognize another debt of gratitude to the prompt and ready men who came over the seas to give battle here in 1898.

TRIBUTE TO SOLDIERS AT SANTIAGO

Time will not permit us to call the roll of our heroic dead—lustrous with the names of the invincible Lawton, the knightly Ludlow, the brave Wikoff; yea, bearing also the names of Liscum, and Hamilton, and Egbert, and Haskell, and Forse, and Fornance, and the two Caprons, and scores of others less conspicuous, perhaps, in military rank but of no less conspicuous virtue.

Many of them fell here gallantly charging these gallantly defended trenches; others succumbed to wounds or sank under wasting disease here contracted; and others still escaping the storm of shot and shell which swept down from these embattled heights, survived only to fall on other fields of glory in far away Luzon or under the walls of ancient Pekin.

Soldiers every one of them. "Men who put their creed into their deed" and who, though conscious they were participating in a great drama on the stage of life, never stopped to act a part, never looked to the crowd for applause. And yet, what paeans of applause their splendid achievements did evoke!

The President of the United States cabled to General Shafter:

"The President of the United States sends to you and your brave army the profound thanks of the American people for the brilliant achievements at Santiago, resulting in the surrender of the city and all of the Spanish troops and territory under General Toral. Your splendid command has endured not only the hardships and sacrifices incident to campaign and battle, but in stress of heat and weather has triumphed over obstacles which would have overcome men less brave and determined. One and all have displayed the most conspicuous gallantry and earned the gratitude of the Nation."

FORTITUDE, GALLANTRY, SACRIFICE

And the major general at the head of the Army telegraphed from Washington:

"Accept my hearty congratulations on the record made of magnificent fortitude, gallantry, and sacrifice displayed in the desperate fighting of the troops before Santiago. I realize the hardships, difficulties, and sufferings and am proud that amid those terrible scenes the troops illustrated such fearless and patriotic devotion of the welfare of our common country and flag. Whatever the results to follow their unsurpassed deeds of valor, the past is already a gratifying chapter of history."

And General Shafter, describing in his official report the charge of Kent's division, declared: "In this fierce contest words fail to do justice to the gallant regimental commanders and their men."

But why dwell on these splendid tributes of praise. "True fame demands not panegyric aid."

The memory of these modest soldiers is not only dear to their comrades; not only revered by their countrymen; it is embalmed also in the gratitude of all patriotic sons of Cuba; yea, it is enshrined everywhere in the heart of humanity.

LASTING MONUMENT TO VALOR

In erecting this monument to these valorous men we would also proclaim, not only to the people of Cuba on whose soil it stands, but to every stranger who may chance in coming years to visit this hallowed spot, the magnitude of the event and the sacredness of the principles which it commemorates.

We wish it to stand here so long as stone and bronze may endure a fit emblem of stalwart heroism and unbending devotion to duty.

We desire here to mark the spot where the last vestige of absolutism in the Western Hemisphere was forever struck down and a struggling people lifted to honored place among the nations of the world.

Above all we cherish the hope that it shall remain an enduring reminder to the inhabitants of this beautiful island, not only of the men and events in memory of which it is raised, but of the priceless boon of civil and religious liberty here won for Cuba with such costly blood, and that this precious heritage can be preserved only by the same unwavering fidelity to duty which led these soldiers from the northland across the tropic seas.

And while we consecrate this monument as a memorial to the unmeasured benefits conferred, not only upon Cuba, but upon the cause of human freedom in all lands under the sun, we would also leave it here as a shrine to which every child of this young Republic can turn and receive fresh inspiration for the duties of a pure and noble citizenship.

PATRIOTISM AND DEVOTION OF CUBANS

Let not the people of Cuba look upon this monument merely as a tribute to the soldiers of a foreign land. Let it remind them, also, of their heroic compatriots, who under the brave and unconquerable Garcia, struggled so many long and bloody years in the cause of Cuba libre.

Well do we recall those final days of June, when in the midst of drenching rain and mud almost impassable, we saw them moving steadily to their appointed positions under the leadership of Castillo, and Sanchez and Benitez, and Marti and Rabi and Lora and their other dauntless commanders; their scanty clothing torn and tattered, many of them in bare feet and bare heads, and carrying their meager supply of food in bits of rags twisted and tied in the form of sacks. Gladly our generous men shared their rations with them and bade them Godspeed in their splendid struggle.

And so I repeat that while we establish this monument especially to commemorate the achievements of our own country, it would certainly fall short of our purpose did it not also bear testimony to the dauntless patriotism and devotion of those heroic sons of Cuba.

And to those who survived that long, sad period of darkness and are permitted to see

the joy of this auspicious day, we extend our sincere felicitations, wishing them and their happy country a bright and glorious future. Ciudadanos de Cuba. Nostros os saludamos, como a la aurora de risueno dia; y os decimos: Adelante, a conquistar el porvenir con honor y gloria.

LOOKING WITH CONFIDENCE TO FUTURE

Comrades of the Army of Santiago de Cuba, we do not forget that we are here to speak of the dead, not to praise the living. But in turning from this hallowed ground and casting our eyes over this once distracted but now happy and prosperous land, the soldiers who fought at Guasimas, El Caney and San Juan and Kettle Hills can find a fitting reward for their valor.

And the consciousness of having been permitted to contribute in some small way to such a splendid result is a satisfaction which all will carry with them to the end of life. This monument which we here affectionately dedicate may indeed molder away; the very ground on which it stands may be submerged by the onrolling waves of yonder restless sea; but the eternal principles of humanity and justice which summoned the soldiers of the great Republic of the north to this field and for which our fallen comrades here laid down their lives shall never fail nor grow dim.

Standing on this historic height which marks another step in the mighty march of human progress, we can look with unwavering confidence to the coming years, realizing that these imperishable principles which constitute the very form and fabric and substance of our own national and social existence, are surely, irresistibly, spreading throughout the world, and have at last, through the shedding of much heroic blood, found a firm and impregnable lodgment in the heart and conscience of mankind.

We are justly proud of the splendid part which our own beloved country has had in exemplifying these high and holy principles and in enlightening the world with the effulgence of their glory; and now on this consecrated ground and as we depart from this sacred shrine, we would renew to her, our native land, our heartfelt vows of fealty and pledge to her again, as did our fathers of old, "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

TRIBUTE BY VETERAN WASHINGTON NEWSMAN

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in my *Maine* anniversary address of 1966 an article by Bascom N. Timmons, in the Houston Chronicle of February 15, 1966, that was called to my attention by my friend and colleague, the Honorable BOB CASEY. For myself and my fellow veterans of the war of 68 years ago I wish to express to Mr. Timmons our appreciation of his tribute to the high caliber of the veterans of the war with Spain whom he knew at the commencement of his distinguished career as a chronicler of the Washington scene. His article follows:

LAST SURVIVOR IN CONGRESS TO TALK AGAIN ON 1898 WAR

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

A Congress in which action on its floor and in top committees gives priority to a war 10,000 miles away in Vietnam will pause briefly this week to mark the anniversary of a disaster which triggered the Spanish-American War 68 years ago. It will hear a speech by one of its oldest Members, Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, of Illinois, last congressional veteran of that long-ago day when this Nation stood face to face with destiny.

As in all our wars we were unprepared for the Spanish-American War. We had an Army of only 25,000 Regulars when Congress declared war on Spain, the fourth most powerful nation in the world at that time. Every man who fought for the United States in that war was a volunteer. President McKinley asked for 125,000 men; more than a million offered their services.

Few armies have ever suffered more than the AEF of 1898 in Cuba, in Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. There were cholera, typhoid, yellow fever, malaria, dengue fever, and tropical epidemics which could not be coped with in those days.

Perhaps the high rating this writer places upon the soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American War is because there were so many of them of high caliber around when he began to report the Washington scene.

Adm. George Dewey was there and I came to know him well. I was also to know Gens. Arthur MacArthur and Nelson A. Miles. There were John J. Pershing, Peyton C. March, Leonard Wood, and others who became generals.

Theodore Roosevelt, of San Juan Hill Rough Rider fame, had been President of the United States and one of my cherished assignments was to accompany him when, as a private citizen, he ran for a third term on the Bull Moose ticket.

Congress had many Members who had been Spanish-American War soldiers or sailors. (I believe that in all 93 have served in its Halls.) Best of all I remember Richmond Pearson Hobson, of Alabama, who as the heroic young commander of the collier *Merrimac*, with a volunteer crew of seven men, under a hail of fire sank his boat in Santiago Harbor to obstruct the escape of the Spanish Admiral Cervera's fleet.

The one Spanish-American veteran who still serves in Congress is Representative BARRATT O'HARA, a sprightly and youthful 83 years old. How does it happen that a man of 83 could have fought in a war only a little less than 68 year ago? Well, O'HARA, a 15-year-old high school sophomore, enlisted in the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry and landed in Cuba 3 days after the arrival of Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders. O'HARA, as a doughboy, participated in the siege of Santiago de Cuba.

The valiant Spanish-American War men who have become our senior war veterans—the deans of our fighting men—are few in number now. And once again O'HARA will arise in the House of Representatives to keep what he calls "a solemn obligation in comradeship with those with whom he served in his youth, to keep aflame in a modern world the spirit of 1898."

NEW YORK ELECTION DEMONSTRATES THE ABSURDITY AND DISCRIMINATION OF THE SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Congress passed legislation last year which authorized a Federal takeover of election machinery in States that polled less than 50 percent of their normal voting strength in the previous Federal elections. They called it the "voting rights bill." It is generally agreed that the proposal was conceived in the liberal mind of our Attorney General, the Honorable Mr. Katzenbach.

Of course, the idea was to concoct a formula that would reach certain States, of which my own was one, and exempt others. There is no doubt that the distinguished Attorney General had in mind the exemption of his own, that of our President, and other favored areas.

Following passage of this most discriminatory legislation and the unusual ceremonial signing thereof by our President, the Department of Justice dispatched carpetbagger registrars to some counties in some States which the legislation was designed to affect. As time passed registrars have been sent to other counties in these States. As the pressures are applied, others most probably will be sent in.

Regrettably, a large segment of the Nation's population, though qualified and registered, just will not take the time to vote. Another large segment will not vote unless the candidates, teams of speakers and precinct workers are beating the drums, knocking on doors and doing other things to arouse interest and coax the electors to the polling precincts. At times it is even necessary to arouse animosities, evoke an occasional ruckus, scandal or just a plain physical scuffle to get certain voters to the polls. Even when all these things are done, we still have a very substantial number who just will not vote and also another substantial number who even refuse to take the time to register.

But no matter for what reason the actual voting within a State fell under the 50 percent formula, the State was automatically brought under Mr. Katzenbach's voting bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was an election held in the 17th Congressional District of the State of New York. I am told that this is generally known as the Silk Stocking District of Manhattan. Their per capita income is very high. Their educational opportunities and training are said to be exceedingly good. This is a constituency that keeps itself informed; at least, this is what we are told.

The campaign was quite spirited. It made national headline news. The news media in New York City and all over the country gave it tremendous coverage. It was hailed as a prestige battle between the citys' new mayor, John V. Lindsay, and the State's junior Senator, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, both of whom are frequently mentioned as potential candidates for President. Indeed, these two can match headlines with any in the country. Incidentally, each of them was out front a year ago in the fight for the so-called voting rights bill as prepared by Mr. Katzenbach. They were terribly concerned about the vote in some States falling under the 50-percent potential. Both were crying out for a law—a Federal law—which would authorize Uncle Sam to move in and take over local election machinery, down South, that is.

Press reports indicate that nothing was left undone by the candidates and their respective forces in this recent congressional campaign. Considerable money was expended. Party bigwigs

were called in for stimulating speeches. Precinct workers toiled long hours day and night. No door knocker was allowed to catch dust. This was the campaign—the campaign—to decide who was the strong man of Manhattan, Mayor Lindsay or Senator KENNEDY.

Notwithstanding the extraordinary effort and tremendous stimulus, thousands upon thousands of these well-informed people never showed up to vote. The turnout was a dismal flop. Considerably less than 50 percent of those registered voted and since quite a large number are not registered, the turnout was far, very far, under the 50-percent potential, the formula set forth in the Johnson-Katzenbach voting rights law.

So, the returns in this congressional election brings the election and the district under Mr. Katzenbach's theory of "Federal suspicion." If the theory of the Johnson-Katzenbach voting rights law is applied, then the light vote calls for and demands Federal intervention.

But have those who last year cried out for a Federal voting law complained? Has Mr. Katzenbach, the President and others, who last year were so concerned about those areas whose voting strength fell under the 50-percent formula expressed any concern? Have they suggested Federal intervention? Do they plan to take to the television for a late night show to tell the country, "We shall overcome?"

Mr. Speaker, if this election had been held in my State, and had the returns been comparable, official Washington would be in the throes of painful contortions over the plight of the people down in poor little ole Mississippi.

But what we have discussed here, Mr. Speaker, all happened in the great State of New York. To the liberal politician that makes it quite a different thing. It is perfectly all right, above suspicion and just fine if an election up-the-country produces only a nominal vote; but if such happens in the Deep South, well, it is serious enough to warrant a complete abandonment of responsible duties in Washington, take to the television for a night show and subsequently to the Halls of Congress to pass a law.

Although I have been listening, no word has come from the Department of Justice, the White House, or other sources in Washington that consideration will be given to passing some kind of law that will henceforth correct the light voting in the 17th Congressional District of New York. In view of the interest last year by proponents of the so-called voting rights law, I think just for the sake of consistency it might be appropriate that they take a look and speak out. What about it, Mr. Katzenbach?

Mr. Speaker, the highly regarded columnist and editor, Mr. David Lawrence, commented on this election in his column which appeared in the press on February 13, 1966. I include same as a part of my remarks, as follows:

GIVES NATION EXAMPLE OF ABSURDITY OF VOTING LAW

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—New York City has just given the Nation a significant example of the absurdity of that section of the 1965 voting-rights law which permits the Federal Government to intervene in any State or district which employs a literacy "test or device" to qualify voters and in which 50 percent of persons of voting age do not go to the polls. Such a situation is supposed, on its face, to be evidence of discrimination. Though it is obviously a form of "government by suspicion," nevertheless several States are subject to Federal penalties because a certain number of persons did not vote in the presidential election of 1964.

In New York's 17th Congressional District, on Tuesday of this week, there was an election to choose a successor to Representative John W. Lindsay, who resigned to run for mayor of New York City. The results show that THEODORE KUPFERMAN, the Republican nominee, received 44,225 votes, while Orin Lehman, the Democratic nominee, got 43,-230. The conservative candidate, Jeffrey St. John, received 7,810 votes. But all these together totaled only 92,265 votes. Yet there are 219,814 registered voters in the district. So here is a case where less than 50 percent of even the registered voters went to the polls.

Under the voting-rights law, 50 percent is the yardstick. If 50 percent of the voting-age population is not registered or fails to vote, this is supposed to be a sign of discrimination. In the 17th Congressional District in New York City—an environment where "liberalism" prevails—the voting-age population unquestionably is far in excess of 219,814. But many persons eligible to vote do not take the trouble to register just as those who are registered often don't bother to vote. In New York County only 50.5 percent of the voting-age population went to the polls in 1960 and around 50 percent voted in 1964. Does this prove that there was plenty of discrimination but not quite enough to get under the 50-percent mark?

The argument against the South is that Negroes are prevented by "literacy tests" from registering. But there are "literacy tests" in New York State, too. The State law provides that a person is not eligible to vote unless he can read and write the English language or has completed six grades in a school in which the primary language of instruction is English. This has been brushed aside now by the Federal statute which says that eligibility to vote cannot be conditioned solely on ability to read or write the English language.

The motives that guide a citizen in not bothering to register or in failing to vote are numerous. The new voting-rights law, however, takes it for granted that in one section of the country this must be due to discrimination. In order to be consistent and apply the law equally throughout the United States, it becomes necessary for the Federal Government to assume that, whenever and wherever less than a 50-percent vote is cast, something is wrong and that this is deliberately caused by discriminatory acts.

The spotlight of the country has been focused on the South, because many of the voting districts there show less than 50 percent of the voting-age population went to the polls in the November 1964 election. The election specified by the voting rights law as the test was a presidential election. This usually attracts in some parts of the country a large percentage of voters, but just the opposite may happen in other parts. In the South, for example, where the Democratic party has been dominant for many years and the party for which the State's electoral votes will usually be cast has for a long time been a foregone conclusion, many citizens feel their vote would be superfluous.

Yet the law says that in any State where a literacy "test or device" existed and the turnout was less than 50 percent in the 1964 presidential election, either statewide or in a subdivision, Federal voting examiners may be appointed and the tests suspended, while the State is penalized for a period of 5 years. The Supreme Court is now dealing with the constitutionality of these provisions, and in the recent arguments before the Court some of the Justices questioned the basis for the 50-percent rule.

The New York City election is a conspicuous illustration of how inconclusive or irrelevant the 50-percent yardstick can prove to be.

REV. DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP, CHAPLAIN

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned last night of the death of our beloved chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp. In these troubled times we all leaned heavily on his spiritual guidance and inspiration. The prayers he offered at the opening of our daily sessions were filled with wisdom and deep concern for our Nation.

Mr. Braskamp was a most conscientious and devoted servant of mankind. His own great personal integrity, his loyalty and dedication have been an inspiration to all of us. I believe it is the universal sentiment of the House that he has endowed us with a spiritual enrichment that we shall long remember. He gave us renewed strength and courage in difficult times.

For 40 years Dr. Braskamp served as pastor of churches in the Washington area and then in 1950 assumed his duties with the U.S. House of Representatives as its first full-time Chaplain. We were fortunate indeed to have the benefit of the ministrations of a man of his caliber, and I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his everlasting memory.

REDEDICATION TO THE CAUSE OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent pleasure to be invited to speak at an observance of the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day.

The program, held in Beverly Shores, Ind., was sponsored by the American-Lithuanian Club of Beverly Shores and featured a colorful presentation of Lithuanian folk songs and dances, with participants wearing native costumes.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the observations I made on that occasion, Sunday, February 13:

ADDRESS BY Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK

In one sense I am happy to be with you today. Happy, particularly to meet with

you, to enjoy your friendly hospitality and to take part in the observance of a historic occasion.

On the other hand, apart from the feeling of fellowship, we cannot really rejoice that the 48th anniversary of Lithuania's independence must be celebrated "in exile," so to speak. We would all rather, very much rather, that the situation might be otherwise—that we could be celebrating a continuation of Lithuania's independence and membership in the world's family of free nations.

But I can say, honestly and sincerely, that I am proud to be here.

I am flattered that you have asked me to be with you on this ceremony of rededication to the cause of Lithuania's independence.

In a larger sense what you are doing here today is rededicating yourselves to the cause of freedom for all mankind.

You are demonstrating your opposition to tyranny in whatever form.

Certainly nobody knows better the meaning of the words "freedom" and "tyranny" than the Lithuanian people.

Throughout their difficult history they have had to take up arms against invading armies.

To the people of your gallant nation, tyranny is not just a word found in speeches.

It is a real and terrible experience.

By the same token, to the Lithuanian people freedom is not something to be taken for granted, like the air we breathe.

Freedom is something for which they have for centuries fought and died.

Let's review a little history.

Forty-eight years ago, almost to the day, the Lithuanian nation proclaimed its independence. This marked the survival of this country, with its long history and rich traditions, in spite of more than a century in the hands of the Russian czars.

Reborn in the midst of World War I, Lithuania was able to assert her independence only after Soviet troops, which had moved into her territory, had been driven out with Allied help.

On July 20, 1920, in a treaty with Lithuania, the Soviet Government declared "the right of all nations to free self-determination" and, on this basis, recognized "the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian state."

The Soviet Government further renounced for all time "all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

During the two decades of Lithuanian independence which followed, the Soviet Government reiterated these pledges in other agreements with the Lithuanian Government.

As late as October 1939, while forcing Lithuania to sign a "mutual assistance pact," the U.S.S.R. claimed to guarantee Lithuania's independence.

By that time, as we now know, the Soviets had already reached secret agreements with Nazi Germany under which the Baltic States were to fall within the Soviet sphere of influence.

Thus Lithuania, as so many times before, had again become a pawn on the chessboard of European power politics.

By the summer of 1940 Lithuania had been occupied by Soviet troops and, after rigged elections during July of that year, the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

And, as we all know, "incorporated" means that Lithuania was declared to be an integral part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

It is not merely a satellite country, but has been totally swallowed up, with not even the pretense of a separate nation.

Thus did the Communists betray their earlier promise to recognize the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian state. It was typical of Soviet treachery.

Everyone recognized that the claim of self-determination was pure fiction—an insult to the intelligence of all loyal Lithuanians.

The United States was quick to denounce this illegal act and has consistently refused to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R.

And in spite of the walls behind which the Soviet Union seeks to hide it, we know that the Lithuanian people have not accepted the denial of their independence.

I recall that some years back, a committee of the House of Representatives exposed the Soviet use of deportation, persecution, and economic exploitation in an effort to consolidate its control of Lithuania.

But none of these actions has destroyed the enduring will of the Lithuanian people for freedom and independence. In short, the U.S.S.R. has been unable to either "Russianize" or "Sovietize" the Lithuanian people. I know that you are not surprised at this.

Nor do I think that anyone who knows the character of the Lithuanian people is surprised that a nation which has produced such great champions of liberty as Mindaugus and Vytautas the Great—and which got the sweet taste of freedom under President Smetona—refuses to forget its own history.

We are not surprised that a people as vigorously independent as the Lithuanians refuses to submit to forced "collectivization."

Nor are we surprised that such a deeply religious people refuses to renounce God.

And we are not surprised that a people with such a rich and distinct ethnic and cultural background and tradition refuses stoutly to even pretend to be "Slavic."

In a word, the free world is not surprised at the courage of the Lithuanian people now struggling under the stifling hand of communism, or at their determination to one day regain the independence they have temporarily lost.

For history has demonstrated, time and again, that Lithuania is a nation with a fighting heart.

But I have an idea I know who is surprised: the rulers in the Kremlin.

Because they have failed to destroy the Lithuanian nation as a distinct people.

For that is exactly what the Red regime has tried to do.

But all of the well-known Communist techniques—from use of outright force and terror to sly propaganda and "re-education"—have not succeeded in subverting the Lithuanian character or in destroying the Lithuanians' sense of identity and love of freedom.

The stalwart resistance they have shown and are showing cannot help but be a source of inspiration to others suffering under the same yoke.

And especially is it an inspiration to those of us living under a flag of liberty.

By observances such as this you are reminding yourselves and free men everywhere that human bondage has not yet been wiped from the face of the earth and that much needs yet to be done.

The way may well be long and hard for all of us.

Freedom was never easily won. It is never easily held.

Four times since I was a young man in the uniform of World War I, my country has come to the defense of freedom.

We are in such a conflict today, and we must be prepared for whatever else may be demanded of us in the months and years to come.

As we look ahead, it might be well to recall the words of the late John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State under our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Speaking at the congressional inquiry into the incorporation of the Baltic States by the U.S.S.R. 13 years ago, Secretary Dulles said this:

"What of the future? First of all, let us never lose hope that there is a future."

"I recall," he said, "I was looking in my Bible yesterday—some of the earliest history recorded in the books of the Old Testament. The nations there mentioned are such as Israel, Arabia, Egypt, and Lebanon. How many times have these nations of many thousands of years ago been submerged, to rise again?"

"The Baltic peoples," Secretary Dulles continued, "in the face of every imposition, retain their will to be free and maintain their steadfast opposition to Soviet despotism. Terrorism has been prolonged now for 13 years. Many of their courageous and noble representatives have been executed, deported, or driven into exile. But their martyrdom keeps patriotism alive."

Then Secretary Dulles said this:

"Some may say that it is unrealistic and impractical not to recognize the enforced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We believe, however, that despotism of the Soviet type cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over hundreds of millions of people who love God, country, and who have a sense of personal dignity.

"The Soviet system which seeks to expunge the distinctive characteristics of nation, creed, and individuality must itself change or be doomed ultimately to collapse. The time of collapse depends largely on whether the peoples who remain free produce spiritual, intellectual, and material richness; and whether we have a faith that can penetrate any Iron Curtain; and we must be sure that captive peoples know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and above all, we are not prepared to seek illusory safety for ourselves by a bargain with their masters which would confirm their captivity."

Let me say now for myself: As majority leader in the U.S. House of Representatives at the time Mr. Dulles made that statement, I shared those sentiments with him.

I still hold to them.

We would be guilty of wishful thinking if we believed the collapse of the Soviet Union is imminent.

But there is a growing evidence that all is not well with the Red conspiracy.

Cracks are beginning to show in the Communist front.

Mr. Castro, who not so long ago was welcoming the Red Chinese to his shores and boasting of his alliance with them, now accuses them of bad faith.

Red China, in turn, is increasingly belligerent toward Russia, accusing the U.S.S.R. of all sorts of things, while the Kremlin casts an increasingly wary eye at the intentions of Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung.

Apparently there has been a falling out among thieves.

This is the weakness of gangsters, whether they are gangster lords of the numbers games or gangster nations.

They rule only through terror and violence. There is no sense of honor within their own ranks.

And there is room for only one at the top on the world of dictators.

I learned with gratification that the recently completed Ecumenical Council in the Vatican consecrated two Lithuanian bishops. This, it seems to me, is a significant development for Lithuanians here and abroad.

And I read with a great deal of interest that Communist masters are becoming increasingly concerned about the generation of young Lithuanians.

As I understand it, they are becoming a touchy problem.

It seems they just are not conforming the way they are supposed to.

They refuse to be brainwashed.

We hear there are commotions when Communist Party or governmental decisions have been published and when the campaign to explain them and enforce them is underway.

In other words, a lot of Lithuanians just are not buying this business of government from the top down.

Thus is history repeating itself in this brave country.

Because through the ages, whether occupied by German, Polish, Swedish, or Russian forces, the people of Lithuania have remained faithful to their culture, their history and their church.

Every year in the House of Representatives many Members arise to join with you in the observance of the anniversary of your Independence Day.

And I find one theme running through the remarks by my colleagues on this occasion—a universal respect for the character of the Lithuanian people.

Today, as I am sure you know, the largest Lithuanian community beyond the borders of your native land is here in America, with more than a million of your countrymen having been welcomed to our shores.

Here you are giving full measure of your energies and talents to help us produce that spiritual, intellectual and material richness that will speed the end of bondage for all freedom-loving people.

One thing the Communists either refuse to believe or just do not understand: that "Truth, crushed to earth shall rise again."

There is solid evidence that truth is rising again in Lithuania in spite of all Soviet efforts to keep it down.

Our task here in this great land of freedom and opportunity, of blessings and bounty, is to make sure the people of Lithuania know they have a powerful and faithful friend who has not forgotten and will not forget their hopes and aspirations.

Thank you for inviting me to take part in this significant occasion.

BOXCAR SHORTAGE IS YEAR-ROUND PROBLEM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the boxcar shortage at harvesttime has grown into a year-round problem, and I have called this situation to the attention of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I have asked the distinguished chairman of that committee to request a rule on the Senate-passed bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional rate-setting powers that would lead to an adequate supply of boxcars in all parts of the Nation. This is the bill for which hearings were held by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee last fall, in which many of our colleagues, including myself, spoke in support of passage.

The Interstate Commerce Commission tells me that the boxcar shortage has been in existence in varying degrees of severity for 17 years, and that the Commission would be in an excellent position to remedy the situation if the House joins the Senate in passing this bill giving the ICC the authority to establish reasonable per diem rental rates on boxcars.

The House Committee completed the hearings on this bill last year, and all that now needs to be done is for the committee to request a hearing from the Rules Committee so that the bill can reach the House floor for action. I hope this is done without delay, so an end can be put to the deplorable situation that sees the Nation's boxcar supply decreased by over 2,000 cars a month. With mounting international problems and plans to increase food shipments to needy nations, the United States cannot afford to have a further deterioration in the railway freight system.

HE DID AND IT HAPPENED

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in last Saturday's Akron Beacon-Journal a most interesting letter to the editor appeared. Imagine the plight of this poor man.

TO THE EDITOR:

I was told in 1964 that if I voted for Barry Goldwater that taxes would go up and there would be further war in Vietnam.

They were right—I voted for Goldwater and taxes have gone up and there is more war in Vietnam.

CHARLES CHURCH,
First National Tower Building.

WHEELING NEWS-REGISTER AND CHARLESTON GAZETTE PUBLISH FORTHRIGHT VIETNAM EDITORIALS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting concern in my State about our involvement in Vietnam. Two prominent Democratic newspapers in West Virginia have published forthright editorials reflecting this concern. They are the Wheeling News-Register and the Charleston Gazette.

So that my colleagues will have an opportunity to read these penetrating editorials I include them in my remarks.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register, Feb. 21, 1966]

WHERE THE REAL DANGER LIES

In arguing for the administration's stand in Vietnam, Secretary of State Dean Rusk constantly seeks to draw a parallel between Vietnam and the war against Hitler, thus arousing all the complex emotions bound up with World War II and its aftermath.

Yet any analogy between an international war precipitated by a dictator's career of brazen territorial conquest, and the consequences of a social revolution arising from the ashes of colonialism, is utterly false.

There has been aggression in Vietnam, we admit. But the essential facts are that an indigenous national revolution began there during the Japanese occupation, that under Communist leadership the revolution swept away French colonial rule, that to fill the vacuum an international agreement was reached at Geneva providing for military neutralization and self-determination for all of Vietnam, and that the United States then set out to upset the Geneva pacts by establishing a military satellite in South Vietnam.

North Vietnam's response, first by supplying and training guerrillas and then by sending in its own troops, was certainly aggressive, but it was above all a response. To equate it with Hitler's aggressions across national frontiers is a spurious debating tactic and nothing more. Were the two situations comparable, the United States would have no trouble winning support and sympathy from the overwhelming majority of U.N. members, as we did in resisting a genuine case of internationally indicated aggression in Korea. Support and sympathy in the U.N. on Vietnam is something we conspicuously do not enjoy.

As long as Mr. Rusk and others high in the administration insist on distorting and misrepresenting the true facts of this situation the greater the chances of an even wider war at the expense of thousands of American lives.

If we will stop confusing the containment of China with the containment of communism, we will understand that the best barrier to Chinese national ambitions is the indigenous nationalism of southeast Asia—which Ho Chi Minh represents in Hanoi whether we like it or not, and which a neutralized coalition regime could represent in Saigon.

Some fear that if we left it to the Vietnamese to make their own choice the two Vietnams might later be reunified under Communist control. This is not at all certain. Yet even a Communist Vietnam, truly expressive of popular aspirations and militarily neutralized under Russian, American, and perhaps U.N. guarantees, could stabilize the area far better than an open-ended American military commitment which generates its own instability. The issue is not one of ideology, but native, anticolonial revolution.

The real danger in the administration's blind position with Vietnam is the generalizing of this particular adventure into a doctrine of counterrevolutionary responsibility. To say that we have a duty to wage a war of antiliberation wherever the Communists choose to wage a war of liberation is to fulfill their own prophecy for them. America has in fact no obligation to police the world against social uprisings, and could not do so if it tried. Whatever the outcome in southeast Asia, let us avoid being trapped by Marxist dogma into accepting a role the Marxists invent for us.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Feb. 22, 1966]

VIETNAM RAISES QUESTION OF WHO'S BEING CONTAINED

Assuming even that South Vietnam's Government is prepared to initiate the desirable and necessary reforms outlined by President Johnson at Honolulu, no one should get the idea that the war will suddenly terminate.

To begin with, Laos received, under the Kennedy administration, more aid per capita than any other country. Yet, as Arthur M. Schlesinger, in his recent book makes clear, "Laos simply did not have the national or social structure to absorb the remorseless flood of American bounty." South Vietnam, of course, is considerably worse off than Laos ever was.

And in the second place, the assumption that Marshal Ky's privileged regime is anxious to spread the wealth around ranks on

a par with the assumption West Virginia's Board of Public Works is panting to support executive budget and short ballot amendments. By this time Americans should have realized the vested elite, home or abroad, never surrenders prerogatives and powers voluntarily.

"There are" said the New York Times, about a week ago, "no shortcuts out of the Vietnamese morass."

Indeed, if there were, the world may rest assured President Johnson long ago would have discovered them and acted upon them. The President, whose political antenna, in any event, is as sensitive as any man's, is well aware of the divisive force the Vietnam war has become in our society and what that division can do to wreck consensus government.

To quote the Times again:

"The United States is in for a long, hard, more costly, and more dangerous war."

France found this out during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

Unwilling to learn from France's bitter lesson, apparently the United States must suffer through a similar harsh experience.

Despite advice from every acknowledged Far Eastern expert, including General MacArthur, that the United States has no business getting bogged down in a land war on the Asian Continent, the United States is now in a full-scale land war on that continent and daily pouring additional American lives down a vast, bottomless maw.

The war is being pursued and carried out largely on the advice of diplomats and militarists who have consistently and unerringly erred in their predictions as to what was required to win the war and who have yet to admit they and their panaceas have been everlastingly wrong.

The eternal excuse for failure has been not enough. Not enough firepower was brought to bear, not enough bombs were dropped, not enough of the right targets were hit, not enough American troops were committed to South Vietnam's defense, not enough of our allies have wakened to the seriousness of the situation, not enough resolve has been demonstrated by the United States to convince Hanoi and the Vietcong of our purpose in Vietnam. Always not enough—never a doubt that no matter what is tried or how much is waggered in materiel and in manpower, the bet may not be enough to counter the stakes shoved in by the other side.

Thus, the United States has been gradually and steadily upping the ante.

In a brief 3 years its complement of troops has risen from about 25,000 to more than 200,000. Within 6 months thousands additional cannon fodder will have been transported across the Pacific by boat or air. In fact, the same brilliant tacticians who've recommended covering all bets are today cautiously proclaiming that some time during 1967 the United States will need and will have 600,000 youngsters fighting for the fatherland in Vietnam.

This is what our foreign policy of the last 18 years is leading to. This is the policy known as containment, conceived under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, continued under Secretary of State John Dulles, and still chugging along under Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Somehow, isn't it time someone asked the question:

"Who's being contained—them or us?"

TVA BRIDGE ACT

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would amend the TVA Bridge Act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain highway and railroad bridges.

This amendment is necessary to give the authority to use appropriated funds to the TVA in order to raise, widen, or reconstruct bridges which have become obstructions to navigation on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. There are several points where bridge alterations would permit more effective use of the waterway but especially important is the Tennessee State Highway 58 bridge over the Hiwasee River, near Charleston and Calhoun, Tenn. When this bridge was originally constructed there was little prospect of great water traffic. Now, however, the Hiwasee services a tremendous industrial complex, including a giant Bowaters papermill and an Olin Matheison plant. The TVA has deepened the present channel to accommodate present and potential traffic but the full benefits of this vital waterway cannot be fully realized until bottlenecks have been removed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of the Public Works Committee to favorably consider this important legislation.

NEED FOR BAIL REFORM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the attention of the country was focused upon an incident that happened in Pennsylvania involving 19-year-old Tyrone Collins, who, while free on $500 bail pending the trial of an assault charge in Mobile, Ala., moved to his new home in Pennsylvania in alleged violation of the conditions of his bail. Alabama bondsmen, without the aid of Pennsylvania law enforcement authorities, or any search or arrest warrant or any other judicial process, summarily removed Collins from his home in Norristown, Pa., by force during the middle of the night and, without the interposition of any judicial authority, removed him some 1,000 miles away to Alabama.

The country was shocked, not because it felt that Tyrone Collins should not have to stand trial on the charge levied against him by the authorities of the State of Alabama, but because of the procedures employed by the bondsmen to return Collins to Alabama. The decision of private citizens, motivated simply by a desire to protect their financial investment, using summary action and force to abduct their quarry from the domain of the sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to a distant part of the country, without any judicial sanction and consequently without any assurance of procedural due process, was more than most people believed tolerable. Yet, according to longstanding court decisions, what happened in the Collins case was not proscribed by the due process guarantees of the Constitution, nor by any other provision of Federal law.

The Collins incident brought to light a situation not generally known to the public: that at common law a bondsman possesses the power to take a bailee into custody summarily at any time and return him to the authorities who initially sanctioned his release, and that this power may be exercised even when the bailee has fled to another State or jurisdiction. Virtually no restriction is placed upon what the bondsman may do to effectuate this return. There need be no compliance with State arrest procedures, with procedures securing persons against unreasonable searches and seizures, or with any requirement that a person taken from one State to another without his consent be given a judicial hearing on the reasonableness of the removal. In short, the bondsman can act without the sanction of any State or Federal tribunal. This common law rule is still the law today.

Not only had the integrity and sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania been flaunted by what had happened, but it was also apparent that there had been, at least by modern standards, a violation of individual rights that in analogous circumstances could never legally occur. It was evident that this situation could no longer be tolerated. No longer could society condone a philosophy that regarded the bailee as nothing more than the bondsman's chattel—a mere piece of property that the bondsman-owner could abuse in any way without answering to the law for his actions.

The irony of the Collins situation was made all the more poignant by the fact that when the State officials request the return of a fugitive from justice who has taken refuge in another State, they comply with very strict procedures, specified by article IV, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, which utilize the executive authority of the refuge or asylum State for taking the fugitive into custody. Only after the fugitive has been given a hearing in the asylum State by the authorities of that State, and it has been determined that he has left the jurisdiction of the demanding State in violation of law, can the fugitive be turned over to the authorities who seek his return to the State whence he originally fled. If a public official must go through this sort of procedure to get back a person who is already a convicted criminal, how strange it was, people thought, that a private person, owing no allegiance and no sense of public duty to any State authority, answerable to nothing but his own conscience, could ignore such procedures in seizing an individual who was not a criminal but simply an accused, presumed by the law to be innocent of the charges pending against him.

Recognizing that something should be done, I resolved to correct this state of affairs, so as to make bail bondsmen subject to minimum standards of procedural due process, as are State authorities in comparable situations.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill, which has also been introduced in the Senate by Senator TYDINGS and is being cosponsored by several of his colleagues, which will provide for the implementation of these minimum standards in cases such as that involving Tyrone Collins. In formulating the content of the bill, we were fortunate to have the counsel and advice of Mr. Ronald Goldfarb, a noted authority on bail problems, whose recent book, "Ransom," pointed out the need for reform in this area.

Simply stated, the main provisions of the bill I have introduced are these:

First, when a bondsman seeks the return to another jurisdiction of a person who has violated the conditions of his bail, the bondsman must apply to a judicial officer of the United States—either a Federal judge or a U.S. Commissioner—for a warrant authorizing the taking into custody of the fugitive bailee.

Second, if the bondsman is able to show probable cause that the person named in the warrant application has violated the terms and conditions of his bail, the judicial officer shall issue the warrant, and the person is to be brought promptly before the judicial officer for a hearing.

Third, at the hearing, the fugitive bailee is to be informed of the nature and purpose of the proceeding against him, of his right to retain counsel, of his right not to make a statement, and of the fact that any statement made by him may be used against him. He also is to be given reasonable opportunity to consult counsel.

Fourth, at the hearing the bondsman must establish that the identity of the alleged fugitive bailee is as he asserts, that the bondsman and the fugitive are in a bail relationship, and that the conditions of bail imposed to secure the fugitive's appearance in a future judicial proceeding have been broken.

Fifth, if the necessary showing is made at the hearing, the judicial officer is to issue a warrant for removal of the fugitive bailee, promptly and directly, to the appropriate authorities of the jurisdiction whence he has fled.

Sixth, violation of these procedures by the bondsman is made a Federal crime, punishable by a fine of up to $5,000, or imprisonment of up to 2 years, or both.

It is my hope that this legislation will receive the prompt attention of both Houses of Congress and that hearings will be held at the earliest possible date.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this effort to remedy a long-standing and grievous flaw in the pattern of existing law.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 27, 1965]

AN ALABAMA INVASION

We are glad that Tyrone Collins has been restored to his family in Norristown after a harrowing experience with two Alabama bail bondsmen during the previous week. It was quite a Christmas story.

And it is to be assumed, of course, that with the proper recourse to proper legal procedures, he will yet answer whatever bona fide charges may be facing him in Mobile. In any event, it should be made clear that Pennsylvania is not in the business of being a refuge for persons wanted in out-of-State courts.

Nevertheless, the manner in which young Collins was virtually kidnaped from his home a week ago by the two bondsmen—in a manner too reminiscent of old-time bounty-hunters—was such an outrageous infringement of the laws and procedures of this Commonwealth that it should not be forgotten or brushed aside.

Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania in whose district the highly illegal "grab" was made, has interested himself rightly in this case since the start and is intent not only on investigation but corrective legislation, if it is needed, in Congress. In view of the appearance of an armed invasion of this sovereign State by citizens of Alabama, which the Collins case presents, it is evident that some very specific legislation may be required.

In Alabama bail bondsmen may not need warrants in "hot pursuit" of their quarry, but in Pennsylvania they do. We expect visiting bondsmen—or law officials, for that matter—to abide by this Commonwealth's rules of procedure when they are in this jurisdiction. It does not seem much to ask—but if it requires Federal law to make the point, then let us have such a law on the books.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Dec. 29, 1965]

THE COLLINS CASE LESSON

A rap on the door on a Sunday night. Men bursting in to snap handcuffs on a suspect—men with the effrontery to demand money from a mother, "if you want this boy to eat." Then a trip of hundreds of miles to put a bail bond jumper named Tyrone Collins back in Alabama.

Such tactics are repellant to Pennsylvanians' sense of fair play. They sound too much like the gestapo, or the Soviet secret police. Therefore there was instant indignation in this part of the country when Tyrone Collins was grabbed at his Norristown home by representatives of a Mobile bonding firm. Not only the NAACP was outraged; thousands of Pennsylvanians felt the same, including a Congressman, a Governor, an attorney general.

The charge on which young Collins presumably skipped bond was serious enough—knifing a fellow high school student. It developed that this was not the only charge against him. He had racked up two counts of driving without a license since his return to Norristown. But though it began to look as if Collins was not the ideal teenager, the idea of bail bondsmen breaking and entering, without a warrant, still was repugnant. Surprisingly enough, some legal experts dug into their books and read them to say that the bondsmen were legally right.

There is, therefore, a lesson in the case of Tyrone Collins, though perhaps not what it first seemed to be. The point is that America's laws on return of bail skippers are primitive and need statutory correction. Certainly, no felon ought to be given refuge merely because he crosses a State line; but a man on bail is not yet tried, and therefore is presumed to be innocent. An orderly, legal procedure ought to be necessary before he can be dragged out of a home at night. The Collins case makes the need for revised laws evident.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 29, 1965]

BAIL BOND ABDUCTION

Pennsylvania authorities are properly investigating the alleged abduction of 19-year-old Tyrone Collins from his home in Norristown by two bail bondsmen. We hope the inquiry will be thorough. The seizure of young Collins at his home in Pennsylvania and his transportation in handcuffs to Alabama, presumably without a legal arrest or any court action, raise grave questions about the law and its application in such cases.

The bondsmen are reported to believe that they acted in accord with Pennsylvania law. But how could Pennsylvania authorize bondsmen from Alabama to seize a Pennsylvania resident, without a valid Pennsylvania warrant, and transport him beyond the jurisdiction of the State? If any statute purports to give such authority, it should itself become the subject of searching analysis. For it would appear to sanction an outrageous encroachment upon basic Federal rights.

The issue here is not, of course, any crime that the young man may have committed in either Alabama or Pennsylvania. If he is fairly convicted of violating the law of either State, he should be punished for the specific offense. But bondsmen who have guaranteed the appearance of an accused person in one State cannot be permitted to kidnap him in another State and return him against his will, without regard to the orderly processes of extradition.

It is worth remembering that the Lindbergh Act provides stiff Federal penalties for anyone who knowingly transports across a State line any person who has been unlawfully seized or carried away "and held for ransom or reward or otherwise." While this law was passed to deal with the typical interstate kidnaping, its terms are broad and it illustrates the seriousness of abducting a person and carrying him across a State line illegally for any purpose. If the overly eager bondsmen violated any law in this case, State or Federal, they should be prosecuted. And if the law itself seems to justify such dubious seizures, without waiting for extradition authorities and the courts to act, it should certainly be modified.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 3, 1966]

BAIL JUMPERS AND THE LAW

Under the Constitution of the United States, it should not be necessary to write a special law to require bail bondsmen to observe due judicial process in seeking to recover alleged bail jumpers across State lines.

The fourth amendment is quite specific: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

In should not be necessary to spell out that amendment to be sure that bondsmen get the message, but it is. Just before Christmas two Alabama bondsmen came to this State and, though told specifically by Norristown police not to seize a suspect without a warrant, proceeded to do so—at gunpoint and in the middle of the night—and carried a teenage youth back to Alabama with them.

Thus we believe that the bill introduced jointly by Representative SCHWEIKER, of Montgomery County, and Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, deserves, and should get, prompt consideration and speedy passage by Congress. It merely requires the bondsman in pursuit to obtain a warrant from a Federal judge or U.S. Commissioner, and assures the suspect of an immediate preliminary hearing before being hauled back to the original court of jurisdiction.

It is shocking in this day and age to find that a basic citizen right of this kind has been so fragilely protected. It is time to

correct the situation—or constitutionality has lost its meaning.

[From the Harrisburg Patriot, Feb. 7, 1966]

BAIL REFORM

The Schweiker-Tydings bill to reform bail bond procedures should be given careful attention by the Congress.

Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, want bondsmen to be required to get warrants and institute extradition proceedings before they chase bail jumpers across State lines.

Back in December, Alabama bondsmen abducted Tyrone Collins, 19, of Norristown, claiming he had jumped $500 bail. Under law, Collins was virtually the chattel of the bondsmen and they could direct his actions in any fashion they wished. The law goes back centuries and resembles the Fugitive Slave Law of the pre-Civil War era.

Bail serves a useful purpose in our system of justice, and bail jumping is a serious offense. Those who jump bail must be apprehended for the public's safety and to uphold the power of the courts. But bail bondsmen should have to observe some tighter legal procedures when crossing State lines. The Schweiker-Tydings bill would correct the abuses inherent in the present process without allowing those who jump bail to get away with it.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 1, 1966]

SCHWEIKER SEEKS INTERSTATE CURBS ON BONDSMEN

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, on Monday introduced a bill providing that bondsmen who fail to obtain a warrant before removing an alleged bail jumper to another State would face Federal prosecution.

SCHWEIKER's legislation was prompted by the seizure shortly before last Christmas of 19-year-old Tyrone Collins by armed Alabama bondsmen who forcibly entered his home in Norristown, Pa., at night, handcuffed him at gunpoint, and took him back to Alabama to await trial on an assault charge.

The case focused national attention on the sweeping, virtually unsupervised power of bonding agents to pursue alleged bail jumpers.

The Schweiker bill would establish for the first time a formal statutory removal procedure to be followed by bondsmen which would be supervised by U.S. judicial officers in the State to which the alleged bail jumper had moved.

It would be a simplified form of the current extradition process which law enforcement officers must follow to regain custody of a fugitive who had fled to another State.

The bondsman would first be required to procure an arrest warrant from a U.S. commissioner or U.S. judge in the asylum State and then bring the accused before that judicial officer for a prompt hearing.

At such a hearing, the bondsman would apply for a warrant for removal from the asylum State, at which time the judicial officer would inform the accused of his right to counsel and to waive the hearing if he so desired.

If the accused requested a hearing, the warrant for his removal would not be granted until the judicial officer had heard evidence from both parties and satisfied himself as to the identity of the accused, that the accused had been admitted to bail in the State in which he had been charged; that the accused had violated the provisions of the bail agreement, and that the bondsman was a valid representative of the bonding company.

A bondsman convicted of failure to comply with the specified procedures would be guilty of a Federal crime and be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

The Collins case, SCHWEIKER said, "points up the need for Congress to develop formal removal procedures governing the conduct of bail bondsmen in recovering custody of alleged bail jumpers who have crossed State lines."

"The dangers," he added, of the present system have been clearly demonstrated by the actions of the bondsmen in this case. At present, the law does not prescribe procedures in this field, and I believe that due process of the law can only be insured by the enactment of the bill we are introducing today. This legislation would merely require bondsmen to follow the same procedures now used by policemen under similar circumstances."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 2, 1966]

BONDSMAN'S POWER QUESTIONED—COLLINS SEIZURE CASE REVEALS NEED FOR CURB

(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—Tyrone Collins is a lanky, light-skinned Negro youth of 19 who stands 5 feet, 9 inches tall, weighs 137 pounds and has blue eyes and a beatnik-style haircut. No stranger to trouble, he is accused of slashing a Mobile, Ala., high school student in 1964 and more recently got into a scrape in Montgomery County, Pa., over a couple of traffic violations.

He is not exactly the sort of person Central Casting might have recommended for the leading role in the tug of war between Pennsylvania and Alabama that received nationwide headlines and television coverage this holiday season.

DRAMATIZES POWER

And yet whatever the youth's shortcomings, the Collins case is important to the American people. His seizure by armed Alabama bondsmen who invaded his Norristown home in the dark of night just 6 nights before Christmas has served to dramatize as never before the sweeping, virtually unsupervised power of bonding agents in pursuit of alleged bail jumpers.

Competent legal authority supports the effort of Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, in whose congressional district the Collins seizure took place, to impose some judicial restraints on this power. The argument is that under present procedures, abuses can arise—and have arisen.

IMPOSTERS CONVICTED

Examples are not hard to find. A few years ago in Ohio two bail bondsmen posed as FBI agents, and held a man and woman captive for 11 hours while they questioned them about a bail truant. The imposters were convicted in a Federal court.

Even closer to the Collins incident was the case involving a pipeline worker from Pangburn, Ark., named Watt Ralph Williams. While on a construction job near Ravenna, Ohio, in 1958, Williams was charged with drunken driving, paid a $50 fee and obtained his release pending trial on a $500 bond.

ASLEEP IN HOME

Williams jumped bail, and the bonding company assigned a special investigator named Rawney Trunko to find him. Trunko was an unpaid special deputy of Summit County, Ohio, and did indeed find Williams on March 28, 1959, in the middle of the night, asleep in a bedroom with his wife and infant child at the home of Williams' elderly father in Pangburn.

U.S. District Judge J. Smith Henley described the scene.

"The court finds from the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that Trunko and Pratt (a companion) entered the house," Judge Henley wrote in his decision in the case, "that Trunko inquired as to the whereabouts of Watt Williams after showing his badge to the latter's father; that Trunko upon being informed that Watt Williams, his wife, and infant child were asleep in an adjoining room, entered that room without knocking, and that he shone a flashlight on Watt Williams and directed him to get up and dress.

DISPLAYS BADGE

"When Williams and his wife requested an explanation of Trunko's presence," Judge Henley continued, "the latter displayed his badge as a special deputy sheriff and also exhibited the Ohio bench warrant, and permitted Williams, his wife, and possibly his father to see the pistol that Trunko was carrying."

Judge Henley found that Trunko's actions, "all of which was done under color of law and State authority," was "wrongful and illegal, amounting to a violation of Williams' right not to be deprived of his liberty without due process of law, a right clearly protected by the 14th amendment."

The judge refused to convict Trunko because he found the agent had posed as a law officer for his own convenience and not with the willful intent to deprive Williams of his civil rights. In announcing this decision, Judge Henley made it clear, however, that he was not condoning Trunko's conduct.

"In the court's estimation," Judge Henley said, "Trunko's conduct is properly characterized as highhanded, unreasonable, and oppressive." He went on to describe it as an affront to the duly constituted authorities of White County and the State of Arkansas, and of a nature tending to bring law enforcement into disrepute.

Currently pending in Congress is a bill calling for a wholesale revision of the bail system as it applies to Federal cases, and an attempt is expected in the wake of the Collins case to amend that measure to meet some of the issues raised by the case.

"It certainly is a bad situation," said an aid to Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, chairman of the Senate's subcommittee on improvements in judicial machinery.

RETIREES, RESERVISTS, AND CONGRESS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to speak before the Peninsular Retired Officers Club, the Reserve Officers Association and the Polaris Chapter of the Naval Reserve Association at a meeting in my congressional district.

I believe that some of the views I expressed might be of interest in other areas:

RETIREES, RESERVISTS, AND CONGRESS

(By Congressman CHARLES S. GUBSER, 10th District, California)

While our attention is properly focused on the heroic deeds of our active military forces who are under fire tonight in the jungles of Vietnam, in the air above it and the sea around it, those of us who daily deal in military matters cannot forget the retirees who have served this Nation in past wars and the reservists who stand ready to serve it now.

Both groups have contributed and are still contributing to the strength of our forces now in combat.

Tonight I'd like to talk about retirement legislation and about Reserve legislation, and my reasons for talking about the two groups are precisely the opposite—the retirees because they have been somewhat forgotten by Washington, and the Reserves because, unfortunately, they haven't been forgotten by Washington.

Some of you retirees may feel neglected but as the reservists present can tell you—take heart, as long as you are neglected you are not reorganized.

Retirees are justified in feeling neglected because they have seen some of their traditional, cherished benefits whittled away and because we have been too long in finding solutions to some of their problems. But, actually, this has been a time of ferment on retired issues in the Nation's Capitol. A Presidential Commission only recently finished an extensive study of all Federal retirement systems and the study, as might be expected, was attended by all sorts of rumors about a contributory retirement system, elimination of 20-year retirement, switching to a high-five system, as in the civil service, and so on. In the light of the rumors, I think we can say the Commission did the military retirement system a great favor by leaving it alone.

But a special House Armed Services Subcommittee on Retirement—of which I happen to be a member—has been conducting its own study of retirement and I am hopeful we will come up with some important recommendations and, possibly, some legislation. These may cover such important areas as survivor benefits, retired pay entitlement, and assured medical care. On the last item—medical care for retirees—the Defense Department is due to submit legislation and I am especially hopeful we can pass some legislation in this area. In fact, under normal circumstances I would hazard a prediction that we would, but, of course, you realize that the present circumstances are not normal. We are engaged in a war in Vietnam. American boys are fighting and American boys are dying and their needs must be the first consideration of the Congress. And it is possible the exigencies of that tragic problem may prevent us from getting to some needed personnel legislation.

So with that reservation, let me discuss some of these retirement problems with you.

But first, I want to pull a switch on you. I want to discuss the situation with the Nation's Reserves because I want to do a bit of lobbying with you. Turnabout, they say, is fair play. I want to ask you to influence your fellow citizens in behalf of a strong Reserve. The Defense Department seems determined to reduce the strength and readiness of the Reserve, and even though Congress has given clear mandates to the contrary, the Department is, in part, succeeding. Make no mistake about it—if it is succeeding it is because public opinion, if not wholly on its side, is at least apathetic. Charles Dudley Warner said, "public opinion is stronger than the legislature, and nearly as strong as the Ten Commandments." If public opinion were aroused against the so-called merger of the Reserve Forces you could make book on it that the Defense Department would desist from the whole idea.

Don't misunderstand me, I think there is much Congress can do. I have an idea how the threat can be fought on Capitol Hill and I hope to have an opportunity to vote for that idea before this session is over. But if the battle is to be permanently and surely won—the people must understand it and believe in it. The members of this club—and of the several other organizations represented here—are uniquely qualified to be the Johnny Appleseeds of this education process, spreading the germ of understanding among your fellow citizens. I suppose, after all, that in Massachusetts 200 years ago there were people who didn't understand what those Minutemen were doing, running out in the middle of the night and making all that fuss.

The Defense Department's treatment of the Reserve reminds me of the story of the philosopher who was trying to teach a horse to live without eating. He had the horse down to one straw a day, but then the horse ruined the experiment by dying.

The Defense Department failed to give the Reserves the equipment they need to be 100-percent combat ready and then said the Reserve had to be reorganized because they weren't in a high enough state of readiness. So DOD decided to reorganize them out of existence.

When the Defense Department announced its first plan to merge Reserve forces—in December 1964—it declared grandly that it could do the whole thing without bothering the Congress. It bothered the Congress, however, a lot more than DOD ever dreamed it would. The plan was sold to the public—as so many things in Defense are these days—as a streamlining and a cost reduction. It was to save $150 million a year, Defense said.

You know the story of what followed. A subcommittee of our Armed Services Committee held lengthy hearings, chaired by the renowned F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana. At the conclusion of the hearings the Secretary of Defense conceded, in a public statement, that legislation would be necessary before the merger could take place.

The Secretary then submitted legislative requests, the subcommittee considered these requests and concluded its hearings with this statement: "On the basis of extensive testimony * * * in both open and closed sessions, the subcommittee believes that the present proposal of the Department of Defense to merge the Army Reserve components is not in our national interest."

The subcommittee also said that it is—and I quote—"strongly opposed to any departmental action which would, for practical purposes, destroy the Army Reserve by transferring all of its organized training functions to the 50 State National Guard organizations. Therefore, it will not support the proposal to merge the Army Reserve into the National Guard as presented by the Department of Defense."

On top of that, the defense appropriation bill, signed into law in September of last year, contained restrictive language prohibiting use of any funds appropriated for the Army Reserve to implement a realinement or reorganization of the Reserve Components. The appropriation language, I might add, continued to carry strength figures for the Reserve, including 270,000 for the Army Reserve and 380,000 for the Guard.

There just could not be any clearer expression of congressional will on the subject.

The ink was barely dry on the appropriation bill when Defense announced it was setting up a highly trained, selected Reserve, made up largely of Guard units, and at the same time was deactivating other units with a combined total strength of 55,000 Army reservists. Defense publicly announced the plan had been cleared with Senator STENNIS, of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Senator promptly took the Senate floor to deny he had ever agreed to the proposal.

On November 13, just about 3 weeks after Congress adjourned, Secretary McNamara deactivated 751 Army Reserve units in one fell swoop.

Then, on November 18, Defense did a complete flip-flop and in a message to all of its regional component corps commanders announced "DOD and DA continue to support the 8-division, 16-brigade, 550,000 structure, all in the National Guard * * * When Congress reconvenes in January, DOD and DA will urge the Congress to support the reorganization plan as originally proposed and to enact the * * * legislation * * * necessary to accomplish fully the objective of the proposed reorganization." The memorandum then laid out precise plans to start effecting the reorganization by July 1, noting "reorganization planning in accordance with the foregoing will be resumed." The budget, as submitted for next fiscal year—fiscal year 1967—presupposes approval of the reorganization.

If that isn't as arrogant a disregard for the Congress as could be exercised I don't know what is.

Of course, all of this planning upheaval is, of itself, hurting the readiness, to say nothing of the morale, of the Reserve Forces.

Now there are two things about the original merger proposal that I think we should not forget and which I don't think most people understood.

The more important is that it was not just a merger but a great reduction in the size of the Reserve. Frankly, this is what worries me the most. I hold no brief for the Army Reserve over the National Guard or vice versa. I think both have important missions. But what the original plan would have done is greatly reduce the number of people being trained to defend this country in time of emergency. Let's look at some figures: There were 8,000 drilling units in the Reserves—about 4,000 each in the National Guard and Army Reserve. The McNamara plan would reduce this to 6,000. The total Reserve strength would have been reduced to 700,000 to 550,000.

The cuts would not have fallen solely on the Army Reserve by any means. I think even some National Guardsmen misunderstood this. Both forces would have been weakened. For example, the plan contemplated elimination of 21 divisions; 15 of them in the National Guard.

The other point I think should be understood is that the so-called saving is not tied to merger, it is tied to reduction. You can always save money on the Armed Forces—by cutting them. Some of us happen to think that is penny wise and pound foolish. Secretary McNamara's minions could not defend the alleged savings during the hearings. The figures varied repeatedly. It was finally conceded that it would be years before any savings were realized. But the point that was blurred is that savings would come about by reducing the size of the force, with only a miniscule part attributed to any management saving because of merger.

Just how anybody can defend a cut of our Reserve Forces at a time like this—when we are in a grim, shooting war in southeast Asia, with the end not in sight—is beyond me.

The Army Reserve furnished 68,833 men and 294 units for active duty during the Berlin crisis in 1961. During the Korean war it furnished 244,800—not counting the Reserve officers already on active duty.

Now we are in a war where the committed force is on a level with what we used in Korea. And still the Defense Department moves ahead with plans to scale down the Reserve.

I notice that even such McNamara fan club members as columnist Joseph Alsop, who never tires of heaping praise on the Secretary, has twice urged a callup of the Reserves in recent columns. Specifically, Alsop said this: "The increase in General Westmoreland's troop requirement, from 6 to 9 division equivalents, in turn means requirements for more U.S. troops than can be rapidly provided without calling up the Reserves."

He added that "specialized troop units, easily obtainable by a callup, are needed to break the logistical logjam" in Vietnam.

As that character in Alice in Wonderland said, "Things get curiouser and curiouser."

What can we do to stop it? The idea I have is one first mentioned by Mr. HÉBERT. It is simply legislation by Congress completely spelling out the composition, strength, organization and administration of the Reserve components. The Constitution says the Congress shall raise and support the Armed Forces and decide on their organization. And I think we'd better start doing it for the Reserve while there is still something left to support.

A good Reserve is a very inexpensive national insurance policy.

But remember what I said: the effort can only succeed with public opinion behind it. And that is your job.

Now, turning to retirement, I know at the very mention of the word big, red letters light up in every retired officer's mind and they spell: Recomputation.

I don't think I have to tell you how I stand on recomputation. The fight I helped lead on the floor of the House in 1963, to provide recomputation in 1963 pay scales to pre-1958 retirees, was one of the toughest I've had in 14 years in the House and the victory was certainly the most satisfying. Nothing would give me more satisfaction than reestablishing the principle permanently this year—at least for those who were promised it throughout their careers.

I would be less than candid with you, however, if I did not tell you that our chances are pretty slim. We won that fight in 1963. But even then it was a tough battle. And we paid a price. Many Members in both Houses voted for the bill with the understanding it would be the last go-around for recomputation. The bill was presented in the Senate in that light. In fact, the spokesman for a leading retired group, under questioning before a Senate committee, conceded it was his understanding that approval of the bill would settle the recomputation issue and in the future only the cost-of-living system was to be used.

With that kind of background, it would be exceedingly difficult to get the Congress to reverse itself again and reinstitute the recomputation system of raising retired pay. It would be difficult to get through the House and almost impossible to get through the Senate, and it could endanger the passage of other worthwhile retired legislation that we have a reasonable hope of getting enacted this year or in the near future.

I don't know if you would have fed me dinner had you known I was going to say that, but those are the facts of life, no matter how much you and I might wish they were otherwise. I assure you, however, that the right in the cause of recomputation will never be swept under the rug as long as I am in Congress. I shall always be looking for the opportunity to correct an injustice and when it comes, many of us will be ready.

But our practical problem of today does not mean that substantial improvements cannot be made now in laws for retired personnel.

While I can't say at this time just what our subcommittee will do, I feel there are some important areas where benefits can be expanded—or at least better protected.

One of these is giving military retirees a better equity in their retirement. We hear endless figures quoted to us about the size and cost of military retired rolls, how annual cost is over $1 billion today and will top $2 billion by 1970; how there are over 462,000 retirees today and will be over 800,000 by 1975; how the average 20-year retiree will be drawing retired pay for over 32 years, given normal life expectancy.

What we don't hear is how many survivors are left without any equity in retired pay. If, for example, a 30-year military retiree goes out and gets himself run over by a truck 1 month after retirement, his retirement equity dies with him.

The only protection survivors of military retirees have is the retired serviceman's family protection plan, which is a little like term insurance bought late in life. An idea of its shortcomings can be gained from the fact that only 15 percent of military retirees participate in the plan. The rest have no protection for their survivors.

By contrast, more than 80 percent of civil service retirees participate in the civil service survivor annuity plan—for the very good reason that a modest deduction allows them to leave a substantial annuity to their survivors.

I don't see why we can't provide a comparable system for military retirees and I intend to do everything in my power to see that we do.

Another benefit I want to talk about is medical care for retirees and their dependents. And I'd like to go into this in some detail because it is an area where there has been great neglect and where there are new and hopeful signs of action.

I introduced a bill on this subject in the 88th Congress primarily as a vehicle to get some action—and action we got. A subcommittee under the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, who is now chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, conducted an outstanding study. And it discovered what some of us had been saying all along: that medical care for retirees is a traditional benefit provided for more than 100 years; that military men had been clearly promised such care as an inducement to make service a career; and that the Defense Department policy of no longer programing beds for retirees in military hospitals was rapidly destroying this benefit.

The subcommittee concluded the Government had a strong moral obligation to provide care to retirees and their dependents. But it recognized that it would be impossible to provide all this care in military facilities in the future. So it told the Defense Department to "promptly submit recommendations for necessary legislation to resolve the retired military health care problem in an equitable and feasible manner."

Well, "promptly" by Pentagon standards has turned out to be about a year and a half, but such legislation is on its way. Technically, the legislation is still in the Budget Bureau, which, as you undoubtedly know, is the land of stillbirths for much military legislation. But we have reason to believe the bill will be sent to Capitol Hill shortly, and I have seen a copy of it.

Generally what the bill would do is extend the Dependent Medical Care Act to military retirees and their dependents. Those who have served 30 or more years or who retired involuntarily would pay a $25 deductible for each hospital stay, or $1.75 a day—whichever is greater. This is the charge now levied for active duty dependents. The retirees would pay a 20-percent deductible for outpatient care.

However, for those who voluntarily retire with less than 30 years, the deductible would be $50 for each hospital admission and the outpatient treatment deductible would be 40 percent.

Retirees and their dependents would continue to be eligible for care in military facilities, subject to availability of space.

The bill has these other features:

A system of priorities would be set up for care in military facilities giving higher priority to 30-year retirees and their dependents than to retirees with less than 30 years.

Beds would continue to be programed for retirees in military hospitals, the number to be determined by the service Secretary on a case-by-case basis, taking into account professional training requirements for doctors and availability of beds in civilian hospitals in the area. (The Rivers subcommittee had recommended 10 to 20 percent of new beds for retirees and I understand this is what the Surgeons General prefer.)

At age 65, retirees who are eligible for social security medical care would be transferred to that program. Those not eligible under social security would continue in the military retiree program.

In provisions not related to retirees, the bill also provides outpatient care to active duty dependents and long-term care for retarded children of military personnel. Both are new benefits, and both are extremely worthwhile.

The program would cost about $120 million in fiscal year 1968, its first full year of operation, and could be expected to rise gradually to an annual cost of about $190 million.

Now, of course, I don't want to prejudge the legislation before our subcommittee has had a chance to consider it. But it has some obviously attractive features. Some retiree beds would continue to be programed in military facilities. Retirees would get a program of care in civilian facilities for the first time, and those who live far from a military hospital would no longer be denied this important benefit.

Some of the other provisions are going to take careful study. The social security medical care supplemental program has some features, such as nursing care, which are not available under the Dependent Medicare Act. These may prove desirable to military retirees. On the other hand, we are going to have to take a close look at cost to see the individual is not charged more at a time in life when he is least able to pay.

The provision for higher charges for those with less than 30 years service is also going to need close scrutiny. With so many laws designed to encourage retirement before 30 years, there may be serious questions of equity as well as problems in administering the provision.

Speaking personally, I cannot approve the section which establishes higher priority of availability of medical facilities for 30-year retirees than those with less than 30 years. I can justify a reduced deductible payment for the 30-year retiree because he has contributed of himself for a longer period. But as long as we have laws which allow retirement at less than 30 years, I cannot discriminate against any retiree on the basis of availability of hospital facilities. When a retiree is sick, a hospital bed should be available—period—whether he served 20 years or 40.

The Department of Defense has created discrimination against some retirees with its ill-advised recomputation system—let's not create another type of discrimination.

But these are details to be worked out. The important thing is to have a bill the executive branch supports that we can shape into acceptable legislation.

Admittedly, this bill is quite different from the legislation I first introduced on the subject which was based on a program proposed by the Fleet Reserve Association. But, as I indicated, that was meant to be a catalyst. Frankly, I am not so concerned with the method as with the principle. We never get everything that all of us want in any one bill. But what is important is to prvoide for all of our retirees an assured program of care, one that cannot wither away because of administrative neglect.

We are in a time when the Government is making an enormous effort to improve the health of all citizens. Most of you will probably be quite surprised to hear that our annual Government expenditure for health programs of all types is in the neighborhood of $7 billion. In the face of that gigantic national commitment, it is simply unthinkable that we would let lapse the medical benefits of military retirees that have been provided for over 100 years.

Finally, and most important of all, we must reinstill in the hearts of all our retirees faith in their Government's promises, faith that

when their Government pledges them a benefit it will never be taken away.

The moral obligation of the Government to keep its word to individual military men is more important than any amount of dollars involved. I believe that during the recomputation fight and I believe it now.

And this time, I think we are going to win.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES FOR SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide cost-of-living increases in the benefits paid under the Social Security Act.

My bill would provide an automatic 3-percent increase in benefits whenever the Consumer Price Index reflects a similar increase in the cost of living. I am advocating these cost-of-living adjustments to social security payments because cost studies by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicate that this method, alone, among all the proposals for reasonable improvements in benefits can be accomplished without further increase in social security taxes.

The actuarial studies show that the growth of the economy would provide the necessary revenues to provide cost-of-living adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, the most effective action we could take to protect the earning power of those living on fixed incomes would be to stop Government-stimulated inflation which reduces the value of their dollars. Unfortunately, the administration has not demonstrated any inclination to hold-the-line on deficit spending. We, therefore, should make a strong effort to protect older Americans from the loss of income because of factors beyond their control.

From 1958 until the most recently enacted increase in social security benefits, recipients suffered a 7-percent loss in buying power. The bill I have introduced would prevent such loss of purchasing power in the future.

There are other changes which should be considered in the present social security system. One of these is a bill which I introduced during the first session of the 89th Congress. It is H.R. 7340, a proposal to pay 100 percent of primary benefit to widows under the Social Security Act. I urge that consideration be given to this legislation at an early date.

CELEBRATE GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ON SUNDAY PRECEDING AND CELEBRATE FREEDOM WEEK

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a House joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annual proclamations designating the Sunday of each year immediately preceding February 22—the anniversary of the birthday of George Washington—as Freedom Sunday, and to designate the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs, as Freedom Week.

For some years, Freedom Week has been celebrated by the members of Sertoma International. This is an organization of business, professional, and agricultural men who have come together in bonds of personal friendship—united in dedication to service of their communities. Sertoma, which has over 450 clubs throughout the United States, Canada, and Mexico, derives its name from the organization's slogan, "Service to Mankind."

Many Sertoma Clubs in the State of Kansas have visited schools this week, distributing to each student a copy of our Declaration of Independence. Certainly it is right and proper that America's young people be instilled with a sense of national heritage.

It is also proper that all Americans everywhere be given the opportunity to celebrate a week each year as a tribute to this same national freedom heritage.

SHORTAGES IN VIETNAM

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the ever-lengthening list of shortages being suffered by our fighting men in Vietnam is, in my opinion, a national disgrace and this Congress should investigate them forthwith. I believe these critical shortages can no longer be swept under the rug and ignored by this Congress. They have now become common knowledge to the parents of our servicemen serving in Vietnam and they are demanding to know why these shortages exist when we have been spending approximately one-half of our Nation's total budget for defense and related items. When one considers the staggering expenditures of the Department of Defense over the past couple of years, our fighting men in Vietnam should be the best equipped soldiers ever sent into battle. Instead, reports indicate that they are not only unbelievably ill equipped, but are improperly fed. It has been reported that until recently, an estimated 70 percent of our troops in Vietnam were eating C-rations as a steady diet because of food shortages and the shortage of food-storage facilities.

Soldiers from my district are writing home, as I am sure they are from every Congressman's district, asking their families to mail them such essentials as jungle boots, fatigues, underwear, socks, and so forth. The New York Times of Monday, February 21, 1966, verified the needs of our fighting men when it revealed:

> Shortages of winter and summer uniforms, overcoats, raincoats, fatigues, jungle boots, underwear, socks, and other items are widely reported. The Army has reduced considerably the normal amount of clothing initially issued to recruits, and the marines expect to issue only half a bag soon unless the shortages are relieved.
>
> In Vietnam there has been no ammunition rationing as such, but many different items, including 5.56-millimeter ammunition for the M-16 rifle, 2.75-inch rockets, illuminating shells, and 750-pound bombs, have been issued on an as available basis, which means these items are not always available without limitation.
>
> In part, these and other scarcities in Vietnam are due to Vietnam's inadequate port capacity and local supply problems.
>
> Spare parts of every type for aircraft, helicopters, communication and electronic equipment, engineering equipment, and motor transport are in short supply everywhere; it is not uncommon for a Navy destroyer to wait for months for spares for missiles, or generators. Even barbed wire, sandbags, and other field fortification materials have been in short supply.

A Toledo, Ohio, TV station has editorially revealed that a signal company repairman with the 1st Cavalry in Vietnam had written a Toledo, Ohio, manufacturer for parts for generators needed to supply communications for an emergency field hospital. In his appeal, the serviceman revealed that such a requisition would take at least 90 days to fill through regular military channels and since they were needed immediately, he was requesting them directly from the manufacturer. The Toledo company shipped the parts free of charge and received a thank you message from the serviceman's commanding officer. Other reports indicate that our fighting men are short of certain weapons, that machineguns have been stripped from tanks in Europe to be used in Vietnam and that a gas shortage at An Khe had restricted the use of jeeps and tanks. Marines at Danang are reported to have run out of mosquito spray in the midst of a malaria epidemic last November and were forced to evacuate 800 infected men.

A critical ammunition shortage arose when our one and only gun-powder plant was hit by a crippling strike last December—McNamara has now taken the advice of the military and ordered the reopening of another powder plant—namely, the Badger Ammunition Depot in Wisconsin, but it will not be in full production until June. During the time this powder plant was out on strike, we had to send to Europe for small arms ammunition for Vietnam. Someone has said this was like "robbing Peter to pay Paul." The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee has found that combat communications radios, spotting equipment for mortars, trucks, troop carriers, aircraft warning systems, bomber guidance systems, and even helicopters were in short supply.

In addition to all these shortages of vital equipment, we apparently have an enormous logistics problem which is affecting our war effort in Vietnam. It

has been reported that as many as 100 cargo ships have been backed up in South Vietnam harbors costing an estimated $1 million a day. There have been reports that ships have waited as long as 2 months to move dockside and unload. This backlog has resulted in hold orders to other ships on the west coast and in ports stretching from Hawaii to Tokyo. CBS Correspondent John Flynn, reported from Saigon recently that "ships carrying fresh vegetables sometimes wait so long that part of their cargo spoils."

If ever there was a need for a nonpolitical investigation of a war effort by Congress, it is now.

JOHN E. FOGARTY IS HEART-OF-THE-YEAR

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the American Heart Association conferred a singular and most deserved honor on our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. In recognition of his tireless efforts on behalf of the many health programs which have come before us in this body, and especially those which have supported the assault on heart disease, the gentleman was chosen to receive the Heart-of-the-Year Award.

Appropriately, the presentation was made at the White House under the approving eye of the President.

Our colleague's interest and dedication to the cause of health are not a new story to Members of this body. This award, as coveted and distinguished as it is, is but the latest in a long line of similar citations which have been bestowed on the gentleman. His deep commitment to the highest standards of public service have earned him the recognition, gratitude, and admiration of all of his countrymen, and of the world.

He has been cited for his work not only in the field of health, but on behalf of the youth of this country, of veterans, and of the business community.

He holds the Parents Magazine National Distinguished Service Medal for his work on behalf of the youngsters of the Nation. In 1959, he won the Albert Lasker Award for his work on behalf of medical research and public health. He donated the $5,000 honorarium of this award to the Rhode Island Parents Council for Mentally Retarded Children. He also donated an $8,000 honorarium some years later to what had become the John E. Fogarty Foundation for work with mentally retarded children when he won the Kennedy Foundation's Leadership Award for public service. A whole list of health and educational facilities in his native State have been named after him.

Our distinguished colleague is holder of a great many honorary degrees, many more than have been bestowed on public figures of far greater educational attainments. He is honorary doctor of laws at the University of Rhode Island, doctor of political science at Providence College, doctor of science at Rhode Island School of Pharmacy, doctor of humane letters at Bryant College, and doctor of laws at Brown University.

He has also received honorary degrees of doctor of laws from Salve Regina College, Brandeis University, St. Francis College, Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, Georgetown University, University of Notre Dame, Manhattan College, and Loyola University.

He holds an honorary degree of doctor of science from New York Medical College, and doctor of pedagogy from Rhode Island College. In addition, he holds honorary membership in a host of medical societies and organizations. It is rare, indeed, when the gratitude and respect of a professional community is so great as to manifest itself in so many ways.

During presentation ceremonies of the Heart-of-the-Year Award, the President offered some remarks in recognition of the event and of the illustrious record of our distinguished colleague which, perhaps in more graphic terms than any, underscore his personal crusade on behalf of better health for his State, his Nation, and for the world.

Under unanimous consent, I insert at this point, so that it will be a permanent part of the RECORD, an appropriate excerpt from the President's remarks on that occasion.

The excerpt follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON PRESENTATION OF HEART-OF-THE-YEAR AWARD OF THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY

Congressman FOGARTY, Dr. Taussig, ladies and gentlemen, when we read that a fully functioning heart is possible within 5 years, we pay tribute to congressional leadership, and particularly to Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

When we finally call a halt to the wholesale murder of heart disease, all of us will bless the day that Congress took effective action. JOHN FOGARTY represents the little State of Rhode Island in the U.S. Congress, but his crusade for better health has led him often to the first house of the land.

He came here last August 4 for the signing of the Community Facilities Act. He was back again the next day at the signing of the Community Health Services Extension Act, Community Mental Health Centers one week; Community Health Service Extension Act the next week.

Four days later he came back to see us as a sponsor of the National Institutes of Health for the signing of the Health Research Facilities Act. In October he was back at the White House again for the signing of the heart, cancer, and stroke amendments, to establish regional medical centers to help us in fighting these killer diseases.

Now he is back with us again this morning. He doesn't have a bill in his pocket, a congressional bill, I mean, but this, I think, I can tell you: When he comes to this house, he is always welcome.

For JOHN FOGARTY knows what we all must learn, and that is that no society can be great which is not first of all healthy.

NEW CARRIER SHOULD BE NAMED AFTER ADM. CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation calling for naming our next nuclear aircraft carrier after one of America's great naval figures, the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

I believe that Admiral Nimitz' career symbolizes our U.S. Navy. He was tough, adroit, well schooled in Navy tactics, every bit a leader of men of which our Nation can justly be proud. His job, after we were attacked in 1941, was to take a crippled Navy to sea, to stand off numerically greater forces, and to rebuild our might on the seas.

His epic battles in the Pacific brought the aircraft carrier into prominence, and proved that it could be a devastating instrument of war. The submarine was also brought into the Pacific sea war, and proved itself deadly.

No one can adequately measure the gratitude that our Nation has for the courageous and skillful leadership Admiral Nimitz gave our Pacific fleet when the chips were down. He had vision, daring, and an uncommon sense of strategy and planning.

Two decades after World War II we are again in perilous times. Our dependency upon the aircraft carrier increases as the danger of another large-scale conflict grows. It is only appropriate that we bestow upon our next nuclear carrier, the latest development in our nuclear Navy, the name of the man who made the aircraft carrier a potent and formidable element in sea warfare.

I am hopeful that my colleagues, who admire and respect the late Admiral Nimitz, will join with me in this effort.

HOME FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning the Committee on Public Works will open hearings on a bill introduced last Monday by my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] for the erection of a $750,000 home for the Vice President of the United States.

In the light of the speed with which the committee is acting on this proposal there is apparently some emergency with which we are not aware. But, paradoxically, there is no emergency from the point of view of the administration with

respect to furnishing proper housing for our servicemen.

Last September the Congress provided funds for military housing sorely needed. Some of our servicemen have been living in little more than barns, even in tents. Last December the Secretary of Defense arbitrarily shelved our appropriation for military housing. In testimony before our committee the Defense Department claimed that this unilateral action was taken because of other budget demands and that the expenditure would add to the inflationary pressures.

I concur in the desirability of furnishing proper housing for our Vice President. But why the rush?

And I should like to ask this question: Why should we at this time concern ourselves about furnishing an expensive house for the Vice President, admittedly needed, when the Secretary of Defense refuses to use the funds we have already appropriated to furnish proper housing for our fighting men?

If proper housing for our servicemen is to be deferred because of budget limitations and inflationary pressures, why should not the same principle apply in connection with an expensive house for the Vice President? First things first.

DISASTER STUDY NEEDED NOW

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, three times in recent months we have seen transportation tangled, communications snarled, commerce crippled, and Government stalled by regional disasters. It is ironic that this great Nation, while perfecting its defenses against enemy attack and sabotage, should remain so vulnerable to the whims of weather and the failures of any single public utility.

Northeastern commerce and industry have been gravely hurt by the transportation and communications breakdowns accompanying last November's blackout and the New York transit strike. During the blizzard last month, public services throughout the great Washington metropolitan area were virtually suspended, and the Federal Government alone lost $10 million in salaries on a single snowbound day. Most serious, of course, have been the human tragedies caused by these periods of temporary paralysis.

We have ample proof that our present precautions against such occurrences are inadequate. We need, right now, a full national survey to discover what resources we do need and where they can be found, so that all levels of American government and all public utilities might be prepared to meet every conceivable emergency.

I am today introducing a bill authorizing and directing the Office of Emergency Planning to study this question, in cooperation with State and local governments, and to make a full report to Congress by December 1, 1966. In my judgment the OEP is best qualified to take such an inventory for three reasons: First, because national security is directly involved; second, because the OEP already has relevant information; and third, because the leadership of the Federal disaster agency is essential in preparing to meet emergencies which do not respect State and local lines.

Through the survey I propose, the OEP should be able to submit reasonable recommendations to Congress, and also encourage local and State governments to evaluate their own resources and prepare realistic contingency plans.

While we may never be able to forestall all blackouts, or anticipate all storms, we should be able to combat their crippling effects. The study proposed in my bill would help us mobilize our resources and meet the challenge implicit in the following article, from the Washington Post of February 15:

MOSCOW CLEARS "IMPOSSIBLE" SNOW

Moscow, February 14.—Moscow turned out 2,000 snow-clearing machines today to attack what Tass called such an unprecedented snowfall that "even oldtimers cannot remember."

And, the Soviet news agency added, the machines "did the impossible: Transport services were not interrupted for a single minute." Tass said 27.5 inches of snow fell in "several hours."

THE TAX AND SPEND PHILOSOPHY

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration today asks the House to raise taxes by the tune of $6 billion by reimposing excise taxes on telephones and cars and by changing withholding tax collection methods. We are told these taxes are necessary to raise money to finance the war in Vietnam and to put the lid on inflation. We are told if we do not agree to these taxes, we will be deeper in debt.

I refuse to buy this line. This is not the only course open to Congress and this administration. The administration's Great Society budget is topheavy with domestic spending lard. There is no sound reason why it cannot be taken out to avoid this tax increase.

Cars and telephones are necessities. Why should users of these necessities be penalized when there are so many obvious areas where nonessential spending can be curtailed? The answer is that there is no more logic to this course than there is to cutting back existing, proved programs, like the school lunch and milk programs and the land-grant college programs, while at the same time moving to set up dozens of new, untried expensive programs.

The administration has ignored our constant warning that you cannot fight a major war of unpredictable costs while at the same time spending borrowed money at home harum-scarum.

It is time for Congress to insist that this administration start acting with fiscal responsibility. It is apparent the only way to insure that the spenders do so is to refuse to go along with their "tax and spend" philosophy which is damaging this Nation's economic foundations and sapping the strength of American taxpayers.

I therefore intend to vote no to this preposterous tax increase.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken and written about one of the greatest Americans of our time, John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This well-deserved praise has reached a climax in an article appearing in the Columbus Dispatch, February 20, 1966. This article is particularly significant in that it follows a question-and-answer technique which directly quotes Mr. Hoover on a number of law enforcement problems as well as making reference to internal security matters.

I feel it is important that every Member of the U.S. Congress have a chance to study the answers given by this dedicated and patriotic public servant.

J. EDGAR HOOVER VIEWS CRIME AND COMMUNISM—"COLUMBUS A KEY ESPIONAGE TARGET"

J. Edgar Hoover is the foremost authority on law enforcement and counterespionage in the world. Because of this, the Dispatch asked him a series of questions about rising crime and Communist activities in the United States today, and Hoover has taken time from his busy schedule to answer each one.

Hoover has been Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for more than 40 years. Now 71, he still vigorously directs FBI operations throughout the Nation in the endless war against crime and subversion. He has received numerous awards for his dedication and devotion to law enforcement.

Hoover has devoted his life to combating criminals and agents of foreign powers that would undermine our Government and change the American way of life.

In answering the following questions, Hoover discusses central Ohio as a possible target for enemy agents, the groups behind demonstrations at universities across the Nation, the extent of the Communist intelligence network, crime in general, police "brutality" charges, and juvenile delinquency.

Hoover also makes suggestions for correcting some of the evils that plague our people and our Nation.

SYMPTOM OF SICKNESS

Question. Mr. Hoover, you have long been the spokesman for law enforcement in the United States. Recently, the FBI reported more than 2.6 million serious crimes per year. What's wrong with us as a nation?

Answer. The steady growth of crime in the United States is a symptom of a tragic sickness which afflicts vast numbers of the American people. I refer to it as the "decadence disease." It is characterized by lethargy, indifference, neglect. In the lives of persons who are afflicted with this disease, pleasure comes before duty—integrity, industry, personal responsibility take a back seat.

We need to rededicate ourselves, individually and as a people, to the strong moral principles which are an inseparable part of our heritage of greatness.

Question. Pinpointing what precise factors are causing the recent upsurge in crime? According to your uniform crime reports, victimizing of innocent people is increasing six times faster than the population.

Answer. All categories of major crimes are increasing. During the first 9 months of 1965, compared with the same period in 1964, there was a 5-percent rise in crime. Aggravated assaults were up 2 percent; auto thefts, 3 percent; murders, robberies, burglaries, and larcenies of $50 or more, 5 percent; and forcible rapes, 6 percent.

Question. You have had more than 41 years as FBI Director; have you noticed any change in the morality of our Nation?

Answer. I have witnessed a number of changes. Look, for example, at the growing prevalence of sex and sadism on the shelves of magazine stands and bookstores. Look at the crowds who flock to motion picture theaters to see sensual trash which is little more than a pretext away from obscenity. And look at the mounting numbers of illegitimate births, the homes broken by divorce or infidelity, the growing acceptance of promiscuity.

Question. Why?

Answer. Dirt accumulates when there is no longer the pride nor the determination to do something about it. Americans, in growing numbers, are developing a dangerously indulgent attitude toward crime and filth and corruption.

Question. We are shocked that 57 law-enforcement officers were murdered in line of duty in a 12-month period, but even more so with your report that 1 out of every 10 police officers was assaulted. What is behind it?

Answer. We in law enforcement recognize that hazards are an inherent part of our work. These hazards exist whenever men of the law rise to meet the challenge of those who hold themselves above or beyond the reach of the law. Let me emphasize, however, that there is no room on the streets of America for the person who would deliberately strike down an honest, devoted officer. * * * Such individuals should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. If mentally or emotionally ill, they should be confined to an institution.

PROBLEM OF PAROLE

Question. A convict on parole or probation costs the Government a great deal less than one cooped up behind bars. How well is the system working?

Answer. A convict on parole or probation costs the taxpayer less money provided parole or probation does not serve as an avenue for him to commit additional crimes. * * * We know from hard experience that the "School of Easy Justice" has graduated too many failures. For example, during the 5-year period of 1960–64, no less than 225 police officers were killed by felons. Seventy-eight percent of the criminals had prior records of arrest, and more than half of this group had previously been arrested for crimes of violence. Almost one-third were on parole or probation at the time the murder of the police officer occurred.

We in the FBI believe in the humanitarian principle of parole and probation. We support reasonable and properly administered programs of rehabilitation. But, at the same time, we are unalterably opposed to the premature release of unreformed and unrepentant offenders to resume warring against society.

Question. If you were in charge of all paroles and probations, what changes would you make?

Answer. Let me repeat: We in the FBI support the humanitarian principle of parole and probation. Experience clearly shows that, in those areas where weaknesses exist, the fault lies not in the principle but in the administration.

Question. What are some of these administrative weaknesses? How can they be overcome?

Answer. First, I believe that every parole system should be divorced from political influence and that it should be insulated from other outside pressures. Second, I feel that the utmost care should be exercised in the selection of parole and probation officers—that the qualifications demanded, and the salaries offered, should be commensurate with the heavy responsibilities of the position. Third, an end must be put to the all-too-common practice of overburdening parole and probation officers with more cases than they can effectively handle.

Question. W. E. B. DuBois Clubs have been branded by you as a spawn of the Communists. What is the real extent of this movement and what strength does it have?

Answer. The W. E. B. DuBois Clubs were founded at a convention in San Francisco, Calif., in June 1964. The convention was organized, controlled and manipulated by the Communist Party. These clubs claim to be "Marxist-oriented" and not under party control, but such claims are mere attempts to hoodwink the American people. The DuBois Clubs represent a direct effort by the Communist Party to penetrate, infiltrate and influence college students in the United States.

The DuBois Clubs have ben strikingly successful. Today there are some 40 chapters of the DuBois Clubs in the United States, the majority on college campuses. In recent months, DuBois members have participated in the demonstrations against American policy in Vietnam. The DuBois Clubs represent one of the party's most effective techniques of influencing our young people.

Question. As a highly industrial community of aircraft, electronics, nuclear research, higher education and growing diversified business surrounded by prosperous rural and farm lands, we wonder if we qualify as an espionage target?

Answer. Columbus certainly would be a key Soviet-bloc espionage target. You are a growing city encompassing a vast variety of industrial and technical installations, both private industry and the Government. Your city certainly is not being overlooked by the Soviets.

SEVENTY PERCENT ARE SPYING

Question. How extensive is the Soviet network?

Answer. A Soviet defector has told us that an estimated 70 percent of the Soviet diplomatic officials in this country have intelligence assignments. We face not only the Soviets but also the spy networks of such satellite nations as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. The problem is most formidable.

Question. Is there a link between Communist Party, U.S.A., and Soviet communism? * * * with Chinese communism?

Answer. The Communist Party, U.S.A., is now, as it has always been since its origin in 1919, obediently loyal to Moscow. The party in this country closely follows the Russian line, supporting Soviet policies and denouncing this country.

A few party members did develop sympathies toward the Peiping position, but they were expelled. Many of these pro-Red Chinese expellees are currently leaders in the Progressive Labor Party and the May 2 movement, the two major Communist groups in this country supporting Mao Tse-tung.

Question. "What are the Progressive Labor Party and the May 2 movement? Do they operate in central Ohio?"

Answer. These two groups are pro-Red Chinese organizations in the United States. They contain, among others, former members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who broke with the party over the Sino-Russian dispute. The Progressive Labor Party and the May 2 movement have participated in recent demonstrations and protests against American policy in Vietnam. Primary strength of these pro-Red Chinese organizations is in the New York City and west coast areas.

They are not strong in the central portion of the country, though they seek new bases of operation. The May 2 movement is chiefly pointed toward young people and has the college campus as a key target. These are extremely militant groups which seek to undermine our security.

CITIZENS CAN HELP

Question. What can a businessman or a farmer or housewife do to help the FBI?

Answer. A citizen can help the FBI by promptly reporting any information in his possession concerning espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities. No person should undertake to conduct his own investigation—that is the FBI's job. It is amazing how often information furnished us by a citizen helps us solve a case.

Question. Recent demonstrations against our foreign commitments have been pretty widespread. What is behind them?

Answer. The Communist Party is today actively exploiting the demonstrations and protests against American policy in Vietnam. Party and DuBois members have helped plan the various demonstrations and have participated themselves. The Communists would like nothing more than to see these student protest demonstrations intensified and made more extensive. Not only would these activities be helping the party's cause, but they also would be undercutting our foreign policy. Not in recent years has the party had such a field day, working in every way to take advantage of student unrest.

Question. Are they indicative of disregard for law and resistance to authority?

Answer. In America we have the right to dissent—this is the very essence of free government. We must protect the right of any individual to freely and candidly speak his mind. However, the right of dissent is something vastly different from acts of civil disobedience—of trying to block trains, burning draft cards, and blocking traffic by lying in the street.

Our system of free government cannot continue if a person chooses to obey what laws he likes and disobey those he doesn't like. This is sheer anarchy. Far too many of the anti-Vietnam demonstrators have scoffed at our constitutional principles and mocked our democratic way of life.

They encourage the law of the jungle and are sowing the seeds of disrespect for law which can only damage our fight for freedom. Freedom does not mean license. It means responsibility and respect for the rights of others.

Question. Many teenagers seem to think adults of another generation are down on them and that teenagers are generally regarded as delinquents. What advice do you have for young people?

Answer. Perhaps there are some adults who too quickly condemn teenagers—all teenagers. The fact is there is less than 5 percent of our juvenile population involved in serious criminal activities. The great majority of our teenagers are honest young people. It is wrong for all juveniles to be condemned for the misdeeds of a few.

It is also a mistake for our honest teenagers to dismiss the juvenile crime problem

because only a relatively few of their generation are involved. They must realize they will be stuck with the troublemakers far longer than today's adult population. Hence, they have a much greater personal interest in seeing that something is done to control them and correct their destructive ways.

NEED DECENT PAY

Question. Back to crime. Will you discuss police salaries, personnel selection, training, and indicate whether these have a relation to the crime problem?

Answer. Police salaries, personnel selection and training are basic ingredients to effective law enforcement. Decent wages must be paid to obtain decent men. And, the greatest of care must be taken in selecting personnel for law enforcement work. There are few tasks more important to a democracy than the just enforcement of our laws—a task which must not be entrusted to unsuited individuals. Training, of course, is the hallmark of any profession. Attract good men, carefully select and expertly train them, and you will have a good law enforcement agency, one which can meet the onslaught of crime and avoid the pitfalls of legal technicalities.

Question. Columbus is the hub of central Ohio. How do we stack up as to crime and subversion?

Answer. A total of 12,864 crimes of murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny $50 and over, and automobile theft was reported in the Columbus area in 1964. This amounted to 1,583 serious crimes per 100,000 residents of the area. Burglaries led with a total of 5,752. There were 3,455 serious larcenies, 2,371 automobile thefts, 659 aggravated assaults, 506 robberies, 90 forcible rapes, and 31 murders.

Question. What is the Communist situation in Ohio?

Answer. The intense interest of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in Ohio is illustrated by the fact that the party recently sent one of its top organizers, Phil Bart, former national organizational secretary, to take over the Ohio district. Ohio, with its industrial complexes and military installations, naturally is a target for all types of Communist subversion. The Ohio district of the Communist Party has produced such current party leaders as Gus Hall, Arnold Samuel Johnson, and Hyman Lumer.

Question. Some citizens, perhaps too many, take police as a matter of course. Respect for law enforcement seems to have suffered. What should be done by police as well as citizens?

Answer. Through the years law enforcement has borne the brunt of attack of virtually every special-interest group. It is common practice for anyone who runs afoul of or opposes a law, whether it be the criminal, the juvenile rioters, the social reformer, to demean law enforcement, to shout "police brutality," to claim infringement of rights. All too often the charges are accepted as fact by well-meaning, if ill-informed, individuals and groups, and are given wide circulation. Rarely do the facts overtake the charges, and untold damage is done to law enforcement and its efforts to preserve law and order.

Naturally, every law enforcement officer must strive to perform his duties in a totally objective, impartial and legal manner. The great majority do this. But it is time for the majority of the citizens to be heard from. It is time for the honest citizens who look to law enforcement for protection to start providing more support and cooperation. It is time for them to call a halt to the baseless maligning of law enforcement by selfish individuals who fail to realize or simply do not care that the destruction of law enforcement will mean also the destruction of law and order.

HONORABLE PROFESSION

Question. Would you encourage a young man to prepare for a local law enforcement career?

Answer. Certainly. Law enforcement is an honorable profession. It is an essential job, and while its monetary rewards may not be great, it provides one with the satisfaction of knowing he is performing a true service for his country and his fellowman.

Question. What are the facts concerning the integrity of local law enforcement officers on the whole? Brutality?

Answer. The great majority of the men and women who comprise our Nation's law enforcement agencies are honorable and a credit to their profession. A few are not, and some are prevented from a just performance of their duties by corrupt officials above them. There are a few cases of brutality, as revealed by the fact that our investigations led to the conviction of six officers in fiscal year 1965. But there were 1,787 allegations of brutality in the year, many of which were unfounded, irresponsible and made purely for the purpose of intimidating local law enforcement agencies and harrassing the FBI.

Question. Columbus Police Chief George Scholer and Franklin County Sheriff Stacy Hall are FBI trained. Do they cooperate with you? Are they competent and reliable?

Answer. Both Chief Scholer and Sheriff Hall are graduates of the FBI National Academy, Mr. Scholer having completed the training in 1953 and Mr. Hall in 1958. There has been an excellent and beneficial cooperation among their departments and the FBI.

Question. Do some groups try to push you into fields not within your lawful province because of their special interests?

Answer. Yes, indeed. At various times, campaigns have been mounted and pressures exerted for the FBI to furnish physical protection to civil rights workers, or to investigate a local murder case, or to perform other functions outside our jurisdiction and authority.

Ironically, at the same time, we have also been criticized for carrying out certain duties which we are required to perform by law.

My answer to critics such as these is always the same. The FBI is not a policymaking organization. We investigate violations of laws enacted—and we carry out policies laid down—by others. So long as we have the responsibility to investigate alleged violations of a particular Federal law, we will continue to carry out that responsibility—thoroughly, promptly, impartially and without apology to anyone.

Furthermore, we will continue to avoid encroachments upon the sovereignty of other authorities, and we will refuse to yield to the pressures of special-interest groups who would have us perform functions not assigned to the FBI by Congress, the President or the Attorney General of the United States.

LAW NEEDS THE PRESS

Question. Does the press get out of line?

Answer. A small segment of the Nation's news media does get out of line. Some, in fact, make a career of being opposed to law enforcement. But the vast majority of our news media have been stanch supporters of law enforcement—true allies in the fight to preserve law and order. Law enforcement needs and welcomes the support of the press.

Question. We believe Dispatch readers have a right to know what happens in the community and Nation as long as we do not jeopardize security or litigation. In your view does publicity of crimes hurt or help? Should we publicize civil disobedience and acts of resistance against law?

Answer. Publicity of crime most certainly does help, but it should be complete publicity which records not only the crime, but its solution and the resulting court action. Too often news media will give tremendous coverage to a crime and later ignore or play down the solution. Complete reporting is needed.

The same would hold true with respect to coverage of acts of civil disobedience and the like. They should be publicized through "in depth" reporting—reporting which describes both sides of the issue, reporting which delves below the surface to expose any hidden objectives, any obscure groups which may be using the events to the detriment of our society. Alert newsmen, who have dug below the surface, have saved our Nation much grief and strife by exposing the tawdry nature of many demonstrations.

A PROUD HISTORY

Question. We are a home-owned independent evening and Sunday newspaper in its 95th year. FBI representatives have had many contacts with our staff. How can we help the cause of government under law?

Answer. Your paper has a proud history of service to its community. It is a typical example of the American free press striving to protect our freedoms, our heritage, our integrity. A newspaper has been rightly called the conscience of the community. Columbus, I believe, is blessed with a good conscience. As long as your paper objectively and honestly reports the news, it will continue to be a good conscience and a strong link in the chain of democracy.

NASSER RETREATS FROM HIS PEACE PLEDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great disappointment that President Nasser, in a recent speech at the University of Cairo, rejuvenated his warlike stance vis-a-vis the Yemen. This recent speech by President Nasser, wherein he threatened to maintain his Yemen intervention, contrary to treaty provisions, contradicts the widely voiced optimism that has reigned for some months.

President Nasser is quoted in this morning's New York Times as having said:

> If anyone thinks we have become tired because we have stayed in Yemen so long, let me say that we are a struggling nation, a fighting nation, a patient nation. We can stay in Yemen for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, or even 5.

Thus it appears that the Jiddah agreement, which provided for a staged withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen, is threatened. Nasser excused his belligerence by pointing to the sale of American Patton tanks to Israel, and claiming that conservative, reactionary forces in the Middle East, goaded by Western powers, were bent upon countering his influence and even plotting against his life. These are charges which, due to lack of adequate, firsthand knowledge, I can neither substantiate or reject.

But in the first instance, I cannot understand how 200 Patton tanks added to Israel's defenses could possibly, in a serious way, undermine the security of Egypt, in view of that country's massive procurement of Communist arms.

I am inclined to believe that President Nasser is an inherently suspicious ruler,

intemperate, and not to be trusted. Perhaps it is impossible to find the opposite in the Middle East, a region perpetually upset by extreme political shifts, personal feuds, and contradictory ambitions.

The truth is that it is foolish to expect, through aid commitments, that American policy can effectively influence the realities in the Arab world.

The Jiddah conference was an Arab initiative. It seemed that President Nasser had faced the hurtful consequences of his intervention, and had concluded that nothing useful could be gained by continuing a war which showed little prospect of political advantage or military victory.

This was the opinion expressed to me by many people.

I must say, however, that this tenuous supposition hardly justified the renewed aid agreement with the United Arab Republic, which was undertaken during the congressional recess and in spite of clearly understood congressional sentiment. The Jiddah accord spurred the optimists onward.

As I review recent history, I have come to doubt the wisdom of buying influence, particularly in an area of unique instability of constantly shifting loyalties.

Under the present circumstances, the United States is not justified under any pretext to render agricultural assistance to Egypt, when such assistance merely facilitates foreign intervention. Unless the United Arab Republic fulfills its treaty obligations with respect to the Yemen, we should not be expected to honor an aid commitment which the recipient can use to underwrite its hostile exertions.

Past American attempts to curb Nasser's obsession with foreign troublemaking have repeatedly failed. Officially, we have been setting unreal expectations. I cannot agree with the State Department that we are, in consequence of our generosity, gaining any so-called leverage over the course of events. In any case, these are not, in substance, for us to determine. It is contradictory to assist a developing nation which expends its meager resources on external adventure, intrigue, and excessive arms procurement.

The United Arab Republic has been spending millions of dollars to support its Yemini venture. Additional millions have gone to arms purchases, for the stated reason of contending with the so-called Israeli threat, but actually used as an instrument to bolster the power and prestige of Nasser's Egypt as against real and potential Arab rivals. It does not seem to me that this is a particularly promising field for the projection of American influence and, indeed, our mingling in this uncertainty may actually damage our cause. I thoroughly agree that it is in our national interest to support a balance of power in this troubled area, especially in view of Israel's threatened existence. But I doubt earnestly that this can be accomplished through periodic efforts to court the favor of inconsistent personalities. In any case, we invariably wind up in a very ambiguous, and often embarrassing, position.

If honest self-help is the new look in our foreign aid program, then perhaps we should take a longer view of Egypt.

President Nasser's recent threat to break the Jiddah agreement underlines the insurmountable contingencies with which, by force of our policy, we are faced with in the Middle East. It is an anxious warning to all who would place their trust too quickly and none too wisely.

I must add, Mr. Speaker, that it is particularly curious, and most discouraging, that Nasser's words came on the eve of Mr. Anwar el Sadat's good-will visit to this country. I fail to see what can be won through recourse to bluster and threats to the peace, lacking both validity and commonsense.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Clerk I am not recorded on this last vote. I was in the Chamber at the time the vote was being taken. If I had been recorded, I would have voted "yea" on the bill, H.R. 12752.

VIETNAM

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, among the many statements which appeared on George Washington's Birthday, there was one which particularly caught my attention because it shows what history still has to teach us.

In the New York Journal American an editorial quotes these words of our first President at the time of the Revolution:

> I am under more apprehension on account of our dissensions, than the effort of the enemy.

As the Journal American pointed out, those deeply concerned words could just as well have been spoken by President Johnson today.

We have nearly 200,000 American servicemen in Vietnam. Within recent days, the parents, the wives, and the children of these men—more than half a million of our citizens—have been treated to television programs, and a few newspaper headlines which seem to imply that our boys in Vietnam do not have the support of American public.

We are engaged with an enemy who does not believe that American public opinion will ultimately turn against our efforts in Vietnam and make it impossible for us to continue. This is a delusion, but one which the events of the last few days have undoubtedly strengthened.

Those who sincerely seek peace in Vietnam must be made aware of the fact that every newspaper headline and every televised speech which feeds the delusion of doubt in Hanoi and Peiping serves only to prolong the conflict. It is time to tell our soldiers and our enemy, alike, that the American public overwhelmingly supports our objectives in Vietnam. Furthermore, they support overwhelmingly the policies which President Johnson is pursuing to accomplish those objectives. Let us look at the facts.

On "Meet the Press" last Sunday, White House aid McGeorge Bundy—who has been the key national security adviser to both President Kennedy and President Johnson—pointed out that the President has been acting in Vietnam with the greatest of restraint. He cited as evidence that perhaps 10 percent of the public actually would like the President to go farther.

I have examined several recent opinion polls on this matter, and I find that the figures are even higher. Roughly one-third of the country believes the President should take much stronger military action than he himself has as yet found necessary.

For example, in December of last year according to the Harris poll, fully 33 percent of the American people believed that we should carry the ground war into North Vietnam. Some 39 percent believed that we should step up the bombing in North Vietnam at the very time when the President called for a suspension of the bombings to let the world see who was sincere, and who was insincere, about the desire for peace in southeast Asia.

Again, in January according to the Iowa poll, 36 percent of all Americans thought that we should bomb Hanoi and the other large cities of North Vietnam.

According to the Gallup poll, 31 percent advocated bombing the big cities of North Vietnam. As recently as this month, a Mutual Broadcasting poll reported 33.6 percent of Americans as saying that we should go all out and do whatever is necessary to defeat Hanoi.

At the same time, these same polls show that only a handful of Americans would favor a complete U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. The Harris poll puts the number at 9 percent; the Iowa poll puts it at 15 percent.

It is obvious from these and all the other polls that the policies our Government is now pursuing in Vietnam represent what the overwhelming majority of our citizens believe should be done.

President Johnson has said that we intend to stay. He has also said that we intend to do no more than is absolutely necessary to bring the other side to the conference table. This is a positive program which contains our best hope for peace, not only in Vietnam but throughout southeast Asia. The President's critics, as I have shown, represent no significant portion of U.S. public opinion, nor do they offer any sensible, workable alternative whatsoever.

The voices of dissent will continue. The timid, the uncertain, and the bewildered will continue to be heard. They

were heard during our Revolution, but in history, their echo becomes dimmer with every passing year. What is remembered now is the determination, the wisdom, and the restraint of the leader who brought us safely through.

I would like to assure the President that, in my opinion, history is going to repeat itself.

I fully expect that at some future time, a Member of this great body will rise to quote from an editorial concerning President Johnson in Vietnam similar to the Journal American editorial about President Washington which I hold in my hand, and which I now insert in the RECORD:

[From the New York Journal-American, Feb. 22, 1966]

NOW, AS THEN

"I am under more apprehension on account of our own dissensions, than the effort of the enemy."

The deeply concerned words could well have been spoken by President Johnson who has, indeed, expressed similar concern. But they were written by George Washington. They are as applicable today, as then, and his birthday makes their recollection appropriate in this time of national stress when our difficulties without are rendered more serious by dissensions within.

The quitters are in full, loud voice. They would have us pull out of Vietnam, willy-nilly, in virtual surrender and world disgrace, in shameful abandonment of pledge and honor.

There are, too, sincere doubters who believe our engagement in Vietnam should never have been started. These, too, are in demanding chorus.

And there are, of course, the outright Communists within our midst, and their duped peaceniks who seek by clamor to frustrate reason.

There are dissensions by many whose stature gives importance to their views and by many of low station whose importance is that their noise may convey to Hanoi the tragically mistaken assumption that our Nation prepares to unfurl a white flag.

But the flag still is and will be, to the day of victory, a banner of meaningful stars and stripes so historically made possible by George Washington and now so historically maintained by President Johnson and the vast majority of the American people.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States sent to Congress on February 10 a message in which he outlined his proposals to open up a new war of great importance to all Americans—a war against hunger. Let me quote for you the opening sentences of this message.

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter. These are the essentials of peace and progress. But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled. When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth. I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger. There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

With these inspiring words, President Johnson submitted his new proposed Food for Freedom Act to the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Populations are exploding today. Every nation in the world recognizes this. Yet, tragically, some of the most underdeveloped countries are girding their production to industry often to the manufacture of implements of war. But food for peace will mean just what it says if the President's proposal is approved—only nations that gear their own efforts to increased agricultural output will receive maximum aid from the United States. The key to the new program is self-help. Also, references to friendly nations would be deleted, taking food for peace out of the political sphere. The whole emphasis will be on giving agricultural aid to those countries which help themselves.

The second innovation in the President's proposal is his intent to eliminate the requirement that food aid be out of our own surplus. No longer would food allotments be based on mere availability in our storage bins, but the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to acquire food for world needs as they arise. This approach would be of tremendous benefit to the American taxpayer as well, because we would be spending less money to stockpile and store commodities. It would be a boon to the American farmer. For example, the President is asking for an increase of 10 percent in rice acreage in 1966. He is asking for permission to buy dairy products for distribution abroad, as well as at home. He is requesting an increase in soybean production this year, a supplement to earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. And finally, the President states that he is prepared to divert some of our 60 million acres now in conservation use if necessary in "the critical race between food and population."

A third major change in the President's program is a shift from acceptance of local currency in foreign countries to a dollar credit sale. This will be an orderly transition to be completed within 5 years, as the attempt will be to establish a pattern of loans comparable to present development loans. The thrust is to move out of local currency to the point where we will have a demand on the dollar resources of the countries involved. As a practical matter, most countries receiving aid would not be able to meet dollar commitments readily, nor would they be forced to do so, but this change would give us a claim on dollars on a long-term basis.

Summed up briefly then, the President's proposal will make self-help an integral part of our food aid program, eliminate the surplus requirement for food aid, emphasize the development of markets for American farm products, authorize greater food aid shipments over current rates, emphasize the building of cash markets and shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies, continue the financing of the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation, increase emphasis on combating malnutrition, continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs, and provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

Hearings have already begun in the House Agriculture Committee on the overall problem of world hunger. I am following the progress of these hearings closely, for I am deeply concerned with the problem of hunger in the world. While in India last year, I got a first-hand look at the suffering and misery that most Americans cannot possibly understand still grips much of the world. I am in total accord with the President when he says:

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

I believe this to be a task worthy of Americans. It calls upon us to give the best of ourselves, to stretch forth the hand of brotherhood to all who are in need. I am convinced that we cannot remain apathetic to the accelerating seriousness of the problem of world hunger, and I fully intend to support such a program that will increase American aid while still benefiting the consumer and the farmer at home. The new food-for-freedom program is a sound one and a visionary one, and I am hopeful that it will meet with quick approval by both Houses of the Congress.

OUR MOST NEGLECTED MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEM; EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following speech by Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness. He discusses how inadequately the needs of our emotionally disturbed children are being met.

OUR MOST NEGLECTED MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEM: EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

(By Mike Gorman, Washington, D.C., executive director, National Committee Against Mental Illness; fellow, American Psychiatric Association, honorary; fellow, American Public Health Association)

Last year, the American Psychiatric Association and a number of organizations in the field of child psychiatry sponsored two conferences on planning mental health services for children in the new community

mental health center program. As a prelude to their recommendations, they released what they regarded as the most reliable current data on the size and nature of the problem.

There is a seeming national consensus that there are about 4 million children under the age of 14 who are in need of some kind of psychiatric intervention because of emotional difficulties. Of this number, anywhere from a half million to a million children are so seriously disturbed that they require immediate psychiatric help.

Very few of these children are getting the treatment which they need. Although close to 300,000 children were seen in outpatient psychiatric clinics in 1963, in most cases the treatment consisted of 1 or 2 diagnostic interviews followed by the admission that there were no facilities in the particular area for prolonged treatment.

We have some fairly reliable data which indicate that about 14,000 of these children are confined in State mental institutions. We also know, on the basis of a trend which has been developing over the past 5 years, that by 1970 the number of children aged 10 to 14 hospitalized in these institutions will have doubled.

But those of us who visit a number of State hospitals each year are convinced that these estimates do not reflect the full extent of hospitalization for childhood mental illness. Furthermore, applications to the National Institute of Mental Health for hospital improvement grants over and over again include data which document the point that an amazingly high percentage of their long-term residents were first admitted as children or adolescents.

For example, an analysis of a 5,000-bed State hospital at Tuscaloosa, Ala., reveals that more than half of the male schizophrenic group who have been in that hospital 20 years or more were first admitted between the ages of 14 and 29. The Alabama report estimates that 1 in every 4 young patients "can anticipate being permanently hospitalized for the next 50 years of their lives."

It is my contention that the increasing flood of these young children in the hospitals is not being reflected in existing national data. For example, 10 percent of the 7,000 patients at Rockland State Hospital in New York are children under 16 years of age, and plans have already been completed for an additional 400-bed unit at that hospital to handle the rising tide of disturbed children being admitted annually.

If time permitted, I could cite comparable data from many other State hospitals across the land. In many of these institutions, where there is no specialized unit for children, the child is lost on an adult ward which is frightfully overcrowded and understaffed.

In addition to the State mental hospitals, there are a handful of residential treatment centers which care for about 2,500 children a year. In 15 of our States there are no such facilities, either public or private; in 24 of our States, there are no public units to care for children from low- and middle-income groups.

To sum up, it is an undeniable fact that there is not a single community in this country which provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children running the spectrum from early therapeutic intervention to social restoration in the home, the school, and in the community.

As a nation, we now have a precious opportunity to create a new pattern of appropriate services for these disturbed children. Every State in the country is now engaged in completing plans for new community mental health services; it is incumbent upon all of us to insist that services for children be an integral and major segment of these new community mental health centers.

I would like to underscore the hope that those of you who are designing these new services divest yourselves of any rigid notions as to what constitutes the proper facility for an emotionally disturbed child. Beyond an agreement with a position enunciated in a recent article in the American Journal of Psychiatry that hospitalization in most State mental institutions adversely affects the child because "he promptly loses the right to be a child," I would plead for a wide variety of services suited to the individual needs of each child and to the capabilities of each community.

There is a real danger, for instance, that we will overemphasize the need for residential treatment centers for children, thereby losing sight of the vast majority of disturbed children who do not need such 24-hour hospitalization. In this country, we tend to overemphasize hospitalization as the only way of handling a child who does not conform to the fierce and often conflicting demands of present-day living. Psychiatric leaders in many other countries have been quite critical or our inability to handle these children in other ways than by total confinement. We do ourselves a great disservice when we push many of these mildly disturbed children out of the community and into a faceless institution.

We need a more flexible, less doctrinaire approach to the whole problem of the disturbed child. It isn't all just black or white—successful adjustment or an institution several hundred miles away. It is in the intermediate areas where we can do the most effective job for the majority of these children—in the schools, in the mental health clinics, the day-care centers, the courts, and so on. By developing the screening and treatment potential of these familiar agencies, we don't run away from the problems—we face it and we bring many untapped human resources to it.

This need for a flexible, eclectic approach was enunciated admirably in a recent observation of Dr. William Beach, who is the coordinator of children's services for the California Department of Mental Hygiene:

"Children are ideal candidates for multipurpose programs close to home," he states. "If you can develop programs to meet his needs locally, so that he can study at home and stay in a normal environment at an early state in his illness, there would be no need to take him out of that home and consign him to an isolated State mental hospital.

"This becomes doubly important when you consider that our aim is not to adjust the child to an institution. What we want is to adjust the child to life in the community he is growing up in.

"Ideally, we do not want this child to adapt only to the teacher in the hospital school, to the doctor on the ward, to the technicians—all pseudo-parents. We want him to work out his problems in the setting in which he is going to live: his home.

"If he needs residential treatment, as a small percentage will, then this, too, should be available close to home, and for as brief a period as possible. If home conditions are utterly impossible in terms of the child's recovery, then a foster home with adults trained in caring for disturbed children is one answer. The child can still utilize the 'life laboratory' available only in the community."

There is also a need for differentiation of services according to the age of the child. As the American Psychiatric Association Conference on Planning Services for Children emphasized, inpatient service is not suitable for very young children who can best be served by therapeutic nursery schools. By the same token, services to school age children might concentrate on the provision of special classrooms and special teachers within the public school system. At the late school age and adolescent level, group therapy and therapeutic group recreational activities may be more effective.

I am particularly concerned with the enormous untapped potential of the schools in handling emotionally disturbed children. The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, which was unable to devote sufficient attention to the problems of childhood mental illness because of a shortage of funds, did issue a monograph titled "The Role of the Schools in Mental Health." It is quite an important document, laying the greatest emphasis upon the therapeutic role of the schools because of their central position in the child's life. In the study itself, there are key sections devoted to skilled nursery education, the spotting of difficulties in kindergarten, and the need for immediate intervention when basic learning difficulties become apparent.

To those of us who suggest these new approaches in settings other than rigidly psychiatric ones, there is the usual retort that we can never train enough psychiatric manpower to do this kind of job. I agree. It is sheer folly to think that we can ever train enough personnel to give individual psychotherapy to every disturbed child. It would not only be inadvisable to do so in terms of available manpower, but I submit that it would be totally unwise.

As the joint commission report noted, we must add to the skills of those who deal most directly and continually with the child.

For the past 4 years, an experiment has been going on in Tennessee and North Carolina in which selected teachers are being taught psychiatric skills and then used as teacher-counselors in specialized schools for disturbed children. This experiment follows the pattern of the French experience in which more than 3,000 of these teacher-counselors play a key role in working with emotionally disturbed children in that country. Called Project Re-Ed, the philosophy of its originator is stated very forcefully in a recent description of the first 4 years of the experiment:

"The problem of providing for emotionally disturbed children is a critical one requiring bold measures. Society will not continue to tolerate the assignment of disturbed children to detention homes, to hospitals for adults, or to institutions for the mentally deficient * * *. The United States does not have and will not be able to train a sufficient number of social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists and nurses to staff residential psychiatric facilities for children along traditional lines. It will not be possible in the foreseeable future, with manpower shortages becoming increasingly more acute, to solve the problem of the emotionally disturbed child by adhering to limited patterns * * *. For effective work with children, the worker's personal attributes weigh more heavily than his professional knowledge and technical skills. Re-Ed represents an explicit break with the predominant philsophy of developing professional people in our society, a philosophy that minimizes individual differences and relies most heavily on extensive and expensive periods of training to assure competence."

While it is too early to make definitive comments on the success of these experiments, there is every indication that it is preventing the institutionalization of many children. The average stay of pupils at the specialized schools in Tennessee and North Carolina is about 4 months; the close and continuing liaison between the specialized schools and the regular school systems in the area provides a natural transition back to full-time schooling when it is deemed advisable.

In order to work more effectively with children in the schools, we need many more teachers specially trained to work with those who are emotionally disturbed. The U.S. Office of Education recently estimated that

we need approximately 100,000 of these specialized teachers right now to staff classes of not more than 10 children each for the more than 1 million children it estimates need these individual psychological and educational services. How many do we have now? The best estimate I could get out of the Office of Education was less than 3,000.

I am therefore delighted to report to you that the mental health center staffing legislation which passed the Congress last year also included a tremendous boost in programs for training teachers of the handicapped. Over the next 3 years, $100 million is authorized for this purpose and, since the greatest need is for teachers of the emotionally disturbed, as pointed out in the Senate report on the legislation, I am confident that for the first time in our history we will begin to close the gap between the supply and the insistent demand.

The aforementioned legislation also includes $35 million over the next 3 years in support of research and demonstration projects designed to produce more effective methods of teaching and reeducating the handicapped, with a new proviso allowing Federal support for the construction of such experimental facilities.

We can therefore look forward in the coming years to a number of new approaches as fruitful in originality as the George Peabody College experiment in Tennessee and North Carolina.

There are so many who could help. For example, as the joint commission report notes, there are 6,000 pediatricians in this country but the great majority of them lack sufficient psychiatric orientation to capitalize on their professional potential.

We have just begun to scratch this great potential of people who can help people. In Washington, D.C., we are using mothers whose own children have completed their education. They are given a year's training in psychiatric concepts and then work on the psychiatric service at Children's Hospital.

In many cities in the country, trained youth workers are going into neighborhoods where trouble exists and applying their knowledge and affection to those children who are in revolt against the "norms" of modern society. As the noted psychiatrist Dr. Kenneth Appel has pointed out, there is a deep and tragic irony in the fact that millions of Americans, unemployed, retired, or otherwise rendered unproductive by society, seek a meaningful role in life, while millions of our children, our mental patients and others sunk in despair seek a helping hand. Dr. Appel pleads for a linkage between this great untapped human potential and the vast needs of the troubled and submerged in our democracy. Automation may eventually provide most of the material wants of our society, but it cannot ever replace the hand-to-hand and heart-to-heart relationship which is at the core of the helping services.

During this past summer's experience with Project Headstart—which reached more than 600,000 children under the age of 6—thousands of adults and children served as volunteers. As this program resumes this fall and winter, the goal is to reach down to children 3 years of age and to expand voluntary and community participation.

The first several thousand trainees of VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—are now serving in all regions of the country. A sizable percentage of these dedicated people have chosen to work in the mental health field and, having addressed several groups of VISTA trainees, I can assure you they will make wonderful workers in the vineyard of childhood mental illness.

There have been exciting developments in other areas of childhood mental illness which have highlighted the necessity for a comprehensive survey of existing needs and the selection of a set of priorities for the next decade and beyond.

The first incisive plea for such a national survey came in a resolution adopted by both the American Psychiatric Association and the American Academy of Child Psychiatry as a direct result of a 1963 conference on training needs in the field of child psychiatry. Noting that the survey of adult mental illness by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health had led to a long-needed overview of the problem which resulted in positive recommendations and subsequent legislation, the conference adopted the following resolution:

"In sum, it was the consensus of the conference that what the joint commission had done by way of presenting the Nation with a program to combat mental illness as a whole should now be done in comparable manner and style for the problem of childhood mental illness. The conference members recognized and accepted their obligation to inform the public of the needs of children and registered their opinion that a national survey should be conducted under the leadership of representatives of the entire spectrum of child-care professions in the fields of mental illness and health. They pledged to work for the launching of such a study, looking to the formulation of a national program to combat childhood mental illness and to secure the wherewithal to carry out such a plan."

At the March 1965 meeting of the National Mental Health Advisory Council, the membership of that council voted unanimously to request the National Institute of Mental Health to explore with all national organizations interested in the emotional health of children the possibility of a joint commission survey comparable in depth and scope to the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health study.

I am happy to report that several exploratory meetings have been held, and that a Joint Commission on Mental Health Services for Children has been incorporated.

Legislation to provide Federal support for this survey was passed in the last session of Congress, and it is hoped that the commission can get going with its very vital work within the next couple of months.

The quest for a national blueprint of mental health services for children is of vital importance, but it is no substitute for continued efforts at the State and local level to meet the immediate and pressing emotional problems of so many of our children.

I am not here today to pass judgment on how Michigan is doing in improving the lot of the emotionally ill child. However, I think you and I would agree that only a minimal start has been made in this State in providing services for the 300,000 children who need them.

I am aware of the fact that you have several excellent facilities for children. Hawthorn Center is known throughout the Nation for the variety and range of its programs, and there are additional high quality facilities for children at the Lafayette Clinic in Detroit and at the Children's Psychiatric Hospital in Ann Arbor.

I note that you are embarked on a program to build separate residential units for children in existing State hospitals. My comments on such a development are guarded: it is a vast improvement over housing children in with adults in these hospitals. However, you must be constantly on your guard to maintain and preserve a high level of care in these units. I have toured most of the well-known State hospital children's units—some of them founded in the 1920's and 1930's when it was the current fashion in psychiatric circles—and I am constantly brought up short by the inadequacy of staff, the overcrowding and the depersonalization.

I am much more impressed with your many efforts to create alternatives to 24-hour custody—day school programs, day care centers at your State hospitals and clinics, and half-way houses where children can achieve a successful transition back to school and the community.

Under your own Community Mental Health Services Act, and under the 1963 and 1965 legislation providing Federal aid in the construction and staffing of mental health centers, there is a real opportunity to press for expanded community services for children. I plead with you to insist upon the inclusion of children's services in any center plan which is forwarded to Washington for matching support.

You also have a law on your books providing reimbursement to school districts establishing classes for the emotionally disturbed child. It is my understanding that only 72 such classes were started in the 1964–65 school year. This is pitiably low for a State which has pioneered in training teachers of the handicapped at its colleges and universities. Dr. William Morse, of the University of Michigan, estimates that your present programs are reaching only 1 in every 20 disturbed children; with the impetus of the new national program for training teachers of the handicapped, you should be able to expand these school services many times over in the next few years.

I am reminded of the statement made several decades ago by Katharine F. Lenroot, one of the great architects of the U.S. Children's Bureau: "We are prodigal in our dreams for children, but often miserly in our deeds. And that, I suspect, traces back frequently to an elementary difficulty all of us have at times in knowing how to get from where we are to where we want to go."

We must now move boldly at the national level in identifying a broad set of objectives which will get us "from where we are to where we want to go."

I am confident that the Joint Commission on Mental Health Services for Children is the appropriate vehicle for this long delayed journey into the future, and I know that all of you here today will work with us in other parts of the country to see that it fulfills its terribly important mission.

In conclusion, just a few remarks about the situation here in Battle Creek and the surrounding areas.

First of all, I want to salute you for founding the Battle Creek Child Guidance Clinic 14 years ago and for keeping it functioning under what at times must have seemed somewhat discouraging circumstances, in the face of many tribulations, financial and otherwise. I think all of you good citizens can draw deep comfort from the fact that you have undoubtedly saved hundreds upon hundreds of children from a lifetime of hospitalization in a remote mental institution.

As an illustration, I received a letter a few weeks ago from Dr. Matthew J. Trippe, professor of educational psychology at the University of Michigan, who served for a time with the U.S. Office of Education as their specialist in programs for emotionally disturbed children. In the course of a survey in which he visited a great number of mental hospitals housing children, he was uniformly told by clinical directors of these hospitals that between 40 and 60 percent of the children did not belong there, but they were so hospitalized because local clinics and other mental health services were not available.

However, you are now being given additional responsibilities. Under the provisions of Public Act 54, you are expanding your services to cover the adult mentally ill. This expansion of services, in addition to the present heavy load of children you carry with an inadequate staff, necessitates a significant broadening of financial support for your activities.

As I have said elsewhere in Michigan over the past few years, I think the State must do

a great deal more financially in implementing the broad and progressive purposes of Public Act 54. The State limitation of $1 per capita in support of local services is totally unrealistic; most States are abandoning these rigid ceilings. For example, Governor Rockefeller in his budget presentation less than a month ago, proposed $32 million in State matching funds for community mental health services during 1966. This comes to about $2 per person, and many cities and counties in New York State exceed the matching amount required. On a per capita basis, Michigan is far behind most of its sister States in support of community mental health services.

On a local level, you have the task of convincing your fellow citizens that a modest increase in millage taxation is a small price to pay for preserving the mental health of hundreds upon hundreds of their own children. I was quite shocked to learn that in May 1965 the voters of this area defeated a proposal for additional mileage taxation for mental health services. In Michigan there seems to be plenty of money for new highways, automobiles, color television sets, and the like, but very little money to preserve the most precious of all resources—our children.

For those of you who vote to deny these services to children, the handwriting on the wall is very clear. I have just finished reviewing a report from Operation Headstart which points out that at least 10 percent of the 600,000 children in the program were in such deep emotional trouble that it had already crippled their development by the age of 4.

I know that you also face personnel shortages, and that you are finding it very difficult to recruit an adequate number of professional people to handle your expanding services. This is part of a psychiatric personnel shortage which plagues clinics and community mental health centers in all parts of the Nation. A recent survey by the American Psychiatric Association reported that less than 10 percent of all psychiatrists are working in the field of child psychiatry, and of these 1,346 who report their major specialty as child psychiatry, only 25 percent are certified by the appropriate professional body.

I am not discouraged by these figures; I don't think you should be either. At the national level, mainly through the programs of the National Institute of Mental Health, we are increasing the numbers of available psychiatric personnel at a remarkable rate. Furthermore, as I have indicated at several points in this talk, we have an unlimited horizon in using the talents and resources of people who do not fall into the current rigid professional structures.

We are not resting on our oars. In 1965, Congressman GIBBONS, of Florida, introduced a bill to provide several hundred million dollars in Federal assistance to train child development specialists to work in the schools with troubled children in kindergarten and in the first three grades. Hearings on the Gibbons bill, which also provides grants to elementary schools to employ these child development specialists, were completed in January of this year, and the chances of its passage in this session are quite good.

I know that you are constantly being told that State and local taxes have reached a confiscatory level and that mental health services are doing quite well financially. This is sheer hogwash. Last year, less than 3 percent of all State and local tax moneys were used to fight mental illness, which the American Medical Association has described as "America's most pressing and complex health problem."

In a nation which spends $20 billion for recreation, $11 billion for alcoholic beverages, $7 billion for tobacco products, and $1 billion for candy, there is room for the additional expenditure of a few hundred million dollars so that 4 million of our children who are emotionally troubled can be helped so that they may lead useful and productive lives.

FOUR AMENDMENTS WOULD STRENGTHEN PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S OMNIBUS CITY DEMONSTRATIONS, METROPOLITAN, AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], and I intend to propose four amendments designed to strengthen President Johnson's Omnibus City Demonstrations, Metropolitan, and Urban Development Act of 1966.

Hearings on the bill will begin before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee on February 28.

The amendments are aimed at:

First. Assuring greater coordination both in Washington and on the local level of Federal programs affecting urban areas;

Second. Applying the proposed demonstration cities program to the areas of greatest need, and

Third. Initiating a program leading to new and better systems of urban mass transit.

We have today issued a press release describing more fully and giving the texts of the amendments we shall propose. I include the press release hereafter:

FEBRUARY 23, 1966.

Representatives THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; and HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, today announced they would propose four amendments to President Johnson's 1966 Omnibus City Demonstrations, Metropolitan, and Urban Development Act, designed to strengthen the program. Hearings begin next Monday, February 28.

The amendments follow:

1. Centralized coordination of Federal activities in urban areas: The new Department of Housing and Urban Development must coordinate its activities with respect to urban programs conducted by other departments—such as the city portion of interstate highways, the poverty program, and health, education, and welfare programs. The proposed amendment will require the Secretary to act as a clearinghouse for urban affairs, and to coordinate all Federal programs affecting urban areas. "If any disagreement or dispute should arise in the coordination of Federal programs * * * and the officers in charge of any of these are unable to reach a solution thereto, the HUD Secretary shall refer the matter to the President for his decision or for such other action as may be appropriate."

2. Demonstration cities program: The administration's demonstration cities program, while excellent in its general purposes, is believed to need strengthening with respect to the method by which cities qualify for demonstration cities grants to rebuild or restore entire slum or blighted sections or neighborhoods. The administration bill merely sets forth general criteria for such qualification. The proposed amendment will supplement these criteria by requiring two additional criteria for eligibility:

First, that the sections or neighborhoods in question be "subject to high-priority economic and social pressures, such as population density, crime rate, public welfare participation, delinquency, poverty, unemployment, educational levels, health and disease characteristics, and substandard housing.

Second, that there be in effect for these sections or neighborhoods a "workable program" such as is currently a requirement for urban renewal funds.

3. Local urban coordinators: The administration bill sets up Federal "urban coordinators," to go into effect at some future time, and only for those cities qualifying for the demonstration cities program. The proposed amendment, instead of setting up new and special agencies, would utilize the 76 existing FHA regional directors, who between them have jurisdiction for all of the urban areas of the 50 States. To the extent that they need additional specialist help, for example in urban renewal and conservation practices, the Secretary is directed to provide such help. The amendment would have the advantage of cost saving through utilizing an existing decentralized Federal setup; it could be put into effect at once; and it would fit the needs of all urban areas rather than just the limited number participating in the demonstration cities program.

4. Expedited program for research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transport: The Mass Transit Act of 1964, while it has been of considerable assistance to localities in improving traditional modes of transportation such as buses and subways, has failed to bring about needed research, development, and demonstration of entirely "new systems of coordinated urban transport that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in such a way as to contribute to sound city planning and development."

The proposed amendment directs the Secretary of HUD to prepare for the Congress by January 1, 1967, a program, similar to our efforts in the Manhattan project for atomic energy, in the space program to put a man on the moon, in the program to develop a supersonic air transport, and in the Boston-Washington high-speed railway, which will "aim at breakthrough results within 5 years of its approval by the Congress."

The proposed program is to concern itself with all aspects of new systems for metropolitan areas of various sizes. It is to concern itself with the technical, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects of the problem. In this connection, experts from such universities as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and such aerospace companies as North American Aviation, have recently testified that a program of this sort has an excellent chance of bringing about the required breakthrough. The proposed program would "provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations."

The four proposed amendments are attached:

"AMENDMENT NO. 1: CENTRALIZED COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN URBAN AREAS

"(a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall be the coordinator of all programs and activities conducted by, or with assistance from, the departments, agen-

cies, and establishments of the Federal Government in metropolitan and other urban areas. The Secretary shall establish such procedures for the correlation of these programs and activities (including joint consultation and joint action to the maximum extent feasible), shall receive, disseminate, and act as a clearinghouse for such information relating to them, and shall take such other steps as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that the programs and activities conducted in any such area will supplement and support each other and will be fully coordinated in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

"(b) If any disagreement or dispute should arise in the coordination of Federal programs and activities under subsection (a), or any inconsistency between statutory provisions or objectives or administrative practices which hinders or obstructs the effective coordination of such programs and activities should be found to exist, and the officers or entities involved are unwilling or unable to reach an agreement or solution with respect thereto, the Secretary shall refer the matter to the President for his decision or for such other action as may be appropriate.

"AMENDMENT NO. 2: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CRITERIA

"A comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance under sections 6, 8, and 9 (of H.R. 12341) only if—

"(1) the Secretary determines that such program covers sections or neighborhoods which are subject to high-priority economic and social pressures, such as those involving or resulting from—

"(A) population density,

"(B) crime rate,

"(C) public welfare participation,

"(D) delinquency rate,

"(E) poverty levels,

"(F) unemployment rate,

"(G) racial strife,

"(H) educational levels,

"(I) health and disease characteristics, and

"(J) degree of substandard and dilapidated housing;

"(2) there is in effect with respect to such sections or neighborhoods a workable program certified under section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

"AMENDMENT NO. 3: LOCAL URBAN COORDINATORS

"(a) Each of the regional directors of the Federal Housing Administration, with such assistance as the Secretary shall make available to him, shall act and be known as the 'urban coordinator' for the metropolitan and other urban areas within the region subject to his jurisdiction.

"(b) It shall be the function of each urban coordinator to provide assistance and information to local authorities and private individuals and entities within his region in connection with all programs and activities conducted within such region by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and to provide current information and data to all relevant Federal departments and agencies with respect to the programs and activities being conducted within such region by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and with respect to other public and private activities within such region which relate to the programs and activities of the Department.

"(c) The head of each Federal department and agency shall keep each urban coordinator currently advised with respect to the programs and activities being conducted by such department or agency in the region subject to his jurisdiction.

"(d) To the extent provided by the Secretary, each urban coordinator shall assist the Secretary in the performance by him of his centralized coordinating functions.

"AMENDMENT NO. 4: EXPEDITED PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION OF NEW SYSTEMS OF URBAN TRANSPORT

"The Secretary shall prepare, and submit to the President and the Congress no later than January 1, 1967, a draft program for research, development, and demonstration of new systems of coordinated urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall aim at breakthrough results within 5 years of its approval by the Congress; it shall concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transport, for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; it shall provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations. The sum of $1 million is authorized to be appropriated for the preparation of this program."

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963.

Its primary purpose is to provide national funds to assist in staffing of community mental retardation facilities. It logically follows an amendment to the 1963 act, passed last year by Congress, which provides national funds to assist the staffing of community mental health centers.

It also would amend the 1963 act to provide national funds to pay the costs of acquiring the sites for both mental health centers and mental retardation facilities.

National funds to help staff the mental retardation centers, under the bill I am introducing, would total $30 million and would be appropriated through June 30, 1969 as follows: $8 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

The great majority of mentally retarded children can become useful citizens with proper training. Between 75 and 85 percent can become self-supporting. But the costs of training are high and few local communities can afford them.

This amendment would help pay the salaries of the skilled persons needed to train the mentally retarded.

DULUTH TO BE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CAPITAL FOR EIGHT STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I need not call to my colleagues' attention the many outstanding contributions made by one of Minnesota's greatest and most productive citizens. Of course, I speak of our fellow colleague, the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK. Our distinguished colleague has spawned, worked for, and been responsible for enactment of more legislation to help people and the country in general than almost any other House Member. It is with personal pleasure that I ask his remarks of February 21, 1966, be reproduced for the benefit of all concerned.

DULUTH TO BE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CAPITAL FOR EIGHT STATES

(Remarks of Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK at the opening ceremonies of the regional EDA office in Duluth, Feb. 21, 1966)

Mr. Foley and distinguished guests, today marks a proud moment in the history of northeastern Minnesota. We are singly honored to have the eight statewide headquarters for this most important program for economic development right here in Duluth. This concept of economic development on a regional basis recognizes that governmental borderlines are not the existing limits of the economic problems of an area. They exist beyond county lines and they exist beyond State lines as well. As Gene Foley can attest, it took lots of strong argument and many witnesses and many drafts of legislation before this regional concept became law. As I look back on the many Saturday and late hour sessions it took to pass this bill, it is a real refreshing and satisfying feeling for me to officially cut the ribbon on one of the first of eight regional centers throughout the United States.

This regional area office means a stimulating role for Duluth as a key point in a fresh and dramatic program to develop areas that lag behind the Nation's overall prosperity. This new act authorizes over $3 billion over a 5-year period for planning aid, research and technical assistance, and public works loans and grants for projects which will facilitate industrial expansion and open up stable employment on a much larger scale. The act also provides long-term, low-interest-rate business loans to firms for locating and expanding in designated areas.

Under this act we have incorporated the best features of ARA and APW. Both of these programs were highly successful in stimulating the economy right here in the eighth district. As you know, over a 2-year period we had over 170 APW projects that amounted to over $10 million. In the same amount of time under the ARA program, 20 new industries creating 900 new jobs and costing over $8 million brought a real lift to the economy of the eighth district. Part of this $8 million also went to retrain 1,200 workers and to bring technical assistance grants to our fishing, lumber, and iron ore industries. Good as these programs were, they were short-term solutions. With this new act, a 5-year regional approach sets its sights for long-range planning.

I am honored that Duluth will be the center for this long-range economic development. We could call it the economic development capital of a multistate area with approximately 14 million people.

This opening of the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration in Duluth will have many dividends. It will make the city a focal point of a great and historic region. From this region an increasing number of business, State, and community leaders will come to Duluth for decisions on wide-ranging programs to develop new economic vitality and create permanent jobs in their States. This influx will in itself have an impact on Duluth. New families, new requirements for housing, a new payroll of around $400,000 a year, approximately 50 new employees—all this means an uplift in the economy of the city.

I hope what we have started today is a chain of economic reaction—solid and lasting. I hope this bold, imaginative economic planning for maximum use of the resources which abound in this region will grow far beyond anything yet envisoned.

I hope in a few short years we can look with as much pride to the success of this Economic Development Act as we now look to the successful acts that produced the Duluth High Bridge and auditorium.

THE INCREASING IMPORTANCE OF URBAN SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we enter upon our duties of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, all of us can, I believe, look back with considerable satisfaction upon the accomplishments of the Congress during the previous session. Each of you may be proud of the part he played in helping bring to reality the Great Society envisioned by President Johnson.

One of the most important achievements was the creation of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development. President Johnson wisely recommended the passage of legislation creating this new agency, for as he pointed out:

> In the remainder of this century—in less than 40 years—urban population will double, city land will double, and we will have to build in our cities as much as all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States.

The appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development was confirmed by the Senate. The President is to be commended on this appointment. Dr. Weaver brings to this post over 30 years of experience in working with housing and other related urban problems. By training, by experience, and by strength of character and personality, he is well equipped to supply the leadership essential to the implementation of this vital new position. Secretary Weaver is, in brief, the best possible man for the job.

His task will be made easier by having available to him the outstanding talents of an individual sharing the same initials and, indeed, the same first name and middle initial, Dr. Robert C. Wood. Dr. Wood, at the time of his nomination a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, recently served as Chairman of the President's task force to study the organization and function of the new Department. My Small Business Subcommittee on Urban Small Business Problems was most fortunate in having Dr. Wood appear as a witness in one of our hearings last summer. Dr. Wood's acknowledged expertise in the field of urban problems will be of the greatest value to this new Department.

The cities of our Nation are in a time of increasingly rapid transition. A growing population, unprecedented general prosperity and business growth, the stubborn nature of pockets of poverty, the continuing shift of our population to urban centers, have all contributed to an increased tempo of change.

Such programs as urban renewal, our vast new Federal highway system, and the expansion of facilities by local units of government, coupled with an unprecedented building program by the private sector of the economy, have made it necessary for many thousands of small businesses to seek new locations. Estimates of the total number of dislocations suffered by small businesses during the present decade from urban renewal alone run as high as 200,000. Nor is this confined to our metropolitan areas; almost half of all urban renewal projects are in towns of less than 25,000 population.

As our Nation becomes increasingly urbanized, the quality of our cities and the lives of our people dwelling in them becomes of even greater importance. President Johnson has wisely made the revitalization of our cities a matter of the highest priority, calling for action at the Federal level and cooperation with all units of government in what he has termed a "creative federalism."

In many ways the city is the natural home of small business. Because of the demand for specialized goods and services urban areas have traditionally been the natural habitat of a broad variety of smaller firms which collectively offer the consumer a spectrum of choice unmatched in the history of man. Indeed, it could be said that just as the city offers much to the small businessman by way of supplies and potential market so too does the small business community within the city contribute a great deal to urban life.

At the present time, too little is known about the effect of urban change upon small business. Data showing the impact of Federal programs is only fragmentary; even less information is available concerning the effects of activity by local governmental units and the private sector of the economy. Nor is there agreement as to precisely which factors of change are causing small business difficulties. As an example—some observers see the growth of suburban areas as presenting great opportunities for small businessmen, others characterize the so-called flight to suburbia as a grave problem endangering the very existence of smaller merchants.

In recognition of the overwhelming importance of urban small business problems, Representative JOE L. EVINS, chairman of the House Small Business Committee created a new subcommittee to hold hearings on urban small business problems.

The purpose of these hearings is to identify the changes taking place in our cities today, and to assess their impact upon small businesses. The subcommittee is undertaking during this study to determine such matters as—

What will the city of tomorrow be like?

What will be the role of small business in it?

Are present federally financed programs such as urban renewal harming small business? What is being done to aid the small businessman in successfully meeting these forces of change? Is enough being done in this respect?

Beyond this, it is the goal of these hearings to find new ways in which the revitalization of our cities can create new opportunities for smaller firms, to seek methods by which small business can be assured of full opportunity to participate in the growth which lies ahead in our urban areas.

Last year, 10 days of hearings were held. Witnesses were heard in Washington, Chicago, Rochester, New York City, and Atlanta. Testimony was received from Federal officials, from ranking city officials and administrators; and at the grassroots level well over a hundred small businessmen told the committee of the problems and opportunities which urban renewal and other forms of urban change had presented to them.

During the course of our hearings, the staff of the Urban Renewal Administration has been most helpful to us.

Our hearings to date have been most useful. We have attempted to follow the guidelines set forth by the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman EVINS. In so doing, we have amassed a wealth of information on the problems actually being faced today by small businessmen in our Nation's cities. We have learned much, too, of the new opportunities being created for small business by the revitalization of our metropolitan areas. The five volumes of hearings which are being published contain case studies and individual testimony which will give us all new insight into these complex problems.

During the months ahead, it is the intention of the subcommittee to continue these hearings. Testimony will be received from the American Institute of Planners, the National Institute of Housing and Rehabilitation Officials, the League of Cities, the conference of mayors and other similar organizations. When this phase of the hearings is completed, we will proceed to call the Federal Highway Administrator, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We will explore with these officials the problems which we have uncovered during the course of our hearings and seek their counsel on these matters. We will then formulate our recommendations and report them to the full House Small Business Committee for its approval and submission to this body.

SUBSTANDARD CRUISE SHIPS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to drive substandard cruise ships out of the trade on cruises that start and end at an American port.

At the present time the U.S. Coast Guard can only hold foreign-flag vessels to standards set by the International Safety of Life at Sea Convention. The United States has the world's highest safety standards, but a substantial number of these ships in the coastal cruise trade are not subject to American safety standards.

These vessels have been aptly referred to as "floating junkyards." Not too long ago one of these cruise ships exploded, and to date the exact cause has not been determined. Most of the passengers on such vessels are Americans, and the false impression that they are being transported under adequate safety standards, when they are not, should be corrected.

Legislation barring these scavenger ships from the cruise trade between one American port and another is the quickest, safest, and best way to correct this situation, and I urge early consideration of my bill which will accomplish this.

BACK TO BLUE HEAVEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any Member of this House does not have nostalgic memories of "My Blue Heaven" and other heart songs made popular by Gene Austin. This warmhearted man, who loves people and to whom music was a way of expression, has touched the heartstrings of countless millions in America and throughout the world with his songs. Gene Austin was recently in Miami and I saw him stir with old and tender memories a great audience at a lovely social affair by playing and singing many of the songs he made famous.

Gene Austin today can still touch the heart with a piano and his voice, and above all by his charming friendly manner. I think my colleagues would enjoy an article about Gene Austin by Columnist Larry Thompson which appeared in the Miami Herald of February 22, 1966. I offer this article for the RECORD because I know so many will be pleased to know that Gene Austin is still going strong.

BACK TO BLUE HEAVEN

The other day I was sitting at my desk when that grandpappy of all press agents and promoters, George Maines, walked in with a sturdy redheaded gentleman and introduced Gene Austin.

"The Gene Austin?" I gulped as I floundered to my feet.

That evening when I got home I called the family around me.

"Guess who I met today," I said.

"President Johnson?"

"I will give you a hint. This is a very famous singer."

"Bobby Darin?"

"Johnny Mathis?"

"Joan Baez?"

"Roger Miller?"

"One of the Beatles?"

"One of the Rolling Stones?"

"Of course not," I said. "You aren't even warm. The one and only Gene Austin."

Silence.

Finally, from the boy: "Who's he?"

Who is Gene Austin? What a ridiculous question. Why when I was a boy, he was just the most, that's all he was. When I bought a Victor attachment to fit our old Edison so I could play thin records, Gene Austin was the hottest thing on platters.

Fame, as the poet once wrote, is fleeting.

I have read somewhere that Austin's classic, "My Blue Heaven," has enjoyed greater sales than any other recording. That shows there still are many people like me who remember him.

I will admit that I was surprised to hear that "My Blue Heaven" was such a big seller, after all these years. If I had made a guess, I would have said that Bing Crosby's "White Christmas" probably led the pack.

At least it seems to me that it is played more, year after year, than any other record.

In the days when Austin and Rudy Vallee were at the peak of their fame, it was harder to sell a million records than now.

Back in those days there weren't so many phonographs, and the adults did most of the buying. Now, if your daddy or mamma is rich and famous, success is practically rammed down your throat, and you can enjoy the same kind of instant success if you are shaggy and different.

This, presumably, is because the teenagers do most of the record buying.

Well, I have no argument with that. The young people have the money, they are entitled to their own tastes, and for all I know their idols have talent.

But I was mighty proud to meet that king of the olden times, the high tenor with the red hair, who made "My Blue Heaven" sound like a paradise enow.

FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AND AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leo S. Tonkin, former associate counsel of the House Select Committee on Government Research and now executive director of District of Columbia Council on Higher Education, recently made a highly informative address before the Society of the Sigma Si, a national society composed of scientists and engineers devoted to scientific research. The speech was made at the Rolla campus of the University of Missouri. Mr. Tonkin's remarks concerned the scope and impact of Federal research and development expenditures on American colleges and universities. This is a topic of first importance to this House and the entire Nation. I am pleased to include in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Tonkin's thought-provoking and timely remarks:

FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING AND AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Government research and development funds have become one of the largest sources of revenue to our Nation's colleges and universities. Educational institutions now receive about 12 percent of all Federal research and development funds. In fiscal year 1966, this percentage will equal approximately $1.938 billion of the total Federal research and development expenditure of $15.5 billion.

This $2 billion figure constitutes 15 percent of all expenditures in U.S. colleges and universities and fully 75 percent of the expenditures for research in those institutions.

Some 70 percent of educational funding will follow the route of project grant and contract research with the remaining 30 percent earmarked for research centers administered by the institutions under Government contract. These university research centers will receive an estimated $587,900,000 in Federal funds during the present fiscal year (1966).

Total research expenditures of the Government in fiscal year 1966 will equal an estimated $5.6 billion. Of this figure, basic research will account for $2 billion with 46 percent of that basic research budget—$952,265,000—slated for institutions of higher learning.

As with any large Federal expenditure, criticism and comment are raised. With respect to university research, a growing critical interest has brought acute awareness to the Congress that it has an important responsibility for supervision and incisive study of Federal research programs.

With such a vast and complex subject and in such a few short months, obviously, several committees have been unable to suggest fruitful solutions to all of the problems under consideration. But the hearings and reports have specified areas where better coordination and planning are recommended, and where further study of the larger and thornier issues is needed.

My remarks this evening will be addressed to an initial analysis of some of these issues, that bear directly on the Government-university relationship vis-a-vis the research dollar.

(*a*) Priorities and Federal involvement: As the breadth of Federal support of research has increased, it has become more and more difficult to establish criteria to define the limits of the Federal involvement.

The National Science Foundation, according to its Director, Leland J. Haworth, "decided that the cause of science could best be served by placing primary emphasis on merit and supporting competent scientists of demonstrated ability, or young scientists with a high degree of originality and potential."

Any scientific field qualifies; the projects chosen for support are those "that are most susceptible to a truly scientific approach and are fundamental in character."

Does this obligate the Federal Government to support all basic research of scientific merit? It seems to me that NSF—and indeed the whole Federal research program—is presently without useful guidelines for stopping

short of that total commitment. From their testimony, many scientists and educators would welcome total support.

Many Congressmen would not. When a Member of the House rose in 1962 to complain about an $89,000 National Institute of Health grant to support a study of "behavioral cocktail parties," he was not challenging the scientific validity of the study, but questioning the appropriateness of Federal support.

In the 19th century, liberal Congressmen were guided by the criterion that Federal support should go to research "within neither the province nor the capacity of the individual or of the universities." And if their support for such research was meager, it was largely because they deemed only a limited variety of research studies as advancing the "national interest."

Clearly, we have come a long way from those narrow criteria. Today, many spokesmen for Federal support of research would defend the "behavioral cocktail parties" study because for them, the concept of "national interest" embraces "science for the sake of science." The umbrella is big enough for everybody.

Perhaps Curt Stern had this all-inclusive support version in mind when he described the scientist-investigator in these words: 'He can incessantly find delight in the discoveries made by other men; those of the past and those of his own times. And he can learn the difficult lesson that the journey itself and not only the great conquest is fulfillment of human life."

However, Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, has succinctly said, "Society does not a priori owe the scientist, even the good scientist, support from society on grounds other than that the science is carried out competently and that it is ready for exploitation. Scientists cannot expect society to support science because scientists find it an enhancing diversion."

Two congressional committees have very recently addressed themselves to research priorities. In January, Congressman REUSS asked, "Are we matching research and development goals with national goals?" And Representative DADDARIO has recommended in strong terms that the National Science Foundation must hasten to set priorities and illuminate national science policy. I might note that streams of recent witnesses before both of these congressional committees, hardly addressed themselves to the salient issues of overall policy determination and budgetary direction. Rather, the comments reflected individual interests and academic orientation. Primarily because of limited availability of Federal research funds, more truly long-range thinking is needed from each of the major fields of scientific study. This objective overview-perusal from each of the academic disciplines must then act as the basis for cogent articulation of immediate as well as long-term goals for the Federal research and development program.

(b) Research effectiveness: Closely allied to a discussion of priorities and expenses is the matter of optimum productivity in the research program. It is vitally necessary to remember the striking limitations that work to counter the full effectiveness in the overall R. & D. commitment.

Funds are naturally limited. More important, however, highly qualified and competent scientific investigators are also in short supply as are physical facilities and technical backup personnel. The federally sponsored research program is calling forth the greatest array of talent in the history of our Nation. The future requirements for scientific manpower will be even more demanding.

Dr. Wallace Brode, a past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, summed up this possible "manpower shortage" when he wrote in the January 1964 issue of Science: "There is a crisis but it is one of approach to a limited supply ceiling and the need for better and more efficient education, rather than a need to produce more trained individuals. Production of more after the ceiling has been reached in the supply of qualified candidates merely means lowering the standards to create more poor scientists and engineers. Future leadership in science and technology is not to be based on numbers, but rather on improved quality of the graduate. This will require better teaching of only those who are qualified to receive instruction."

If highly competent research personnel really are in increasingly limited supply, then indeed the wisdom of funding research into "behavioral cocktail party" attitudes and "flavor of aroma components in roasted peanuts" must of necessity be challenged as meritorious of Federal support.

Dr. Weinberg also has voiced concern in this area with words seldom heard from the scientific community. "There is already evidence," he says, "that our ratios of money to men in science is too high, and that in some parts of science we have gone further more quickly than the number of really competent men can justify." Since 1950, he points out with allowances for inflation and the like, the number of Ph. D.'s in science and engineering has doubled, but expenditures for research have increased fivefold.

In the critical area of basic research, where Federal support might well be at an already dangerously low level comparatively speaking—the finest concentration of scientific talent is needed. But with the increasing talent demands from the applied sciences and development fields, coupled with a possible overall quality manpower shortage, this country might well be on the verge of short-changing itself in the quality of its basic research programs. I can say that this is a question that will occasion the continuing attention of the Congress in the months ahead.

TEACHING MAY SUFFER

A very wise Persian proverb says that "men exist for the sake of each other; thus teach them or be tolerant with them; for a person is better unborn than untaught."

At the graduate level, research is one of the best teachers. Most science graduate students are engaged in research and are thus in close contact with professors similarly engaged. The lab in great measure is the classroom of the graduate.

The story is quite different at the undergraduate level. With research demanding more of a faculty member's hours, he naturally has less time to devote to teaching. There are those who contend that academic distinction and productivity should not be measured by the number of hours a professor spends in the classroom, but rather by the quality of teaching. In the exceptional case, where the professor is indeed of a superlative stature and is often available to students outside the classroom, the paucity of teaching hours is of minimal significance. But it is a developing reality that research and publication have given too many in the undergraduate cadre an "exit with grace" from teaching, with no compensatory provisions, such as "better quality teaching in fewer hours," accompanying the trend.

This situation has assumed serious dimension in some colleges and universities. The loser has been the undergraduate student.

Dr. James A. Perkins, president of Cornell, notes, "The critical problem in the next 10 years is not so much one of research but one of students. The recent pattern of Federal aid is not generally directed toward instruction."

Dr. David Henry, the University of Illinois president has said, "The physical needs for education will somehow be met. It is not clear how the teaching task will get done."

Certainly research broadens the quality of any teacher. The danger lies in overemphasis. To safeguard against the teacher drain which already has afflicted too many faculties, university administrators must insist on a sensible balance of both teaching and research.

The Elliott committee was strong in its judgment: "* * * if there is a conflict that can be labeled 'teaching versus research,' it is a problem that must be resolved not by a triumph of one over the other, but by proper balance between the two."

The Reuss subcommittee, in its October 1965 report, also had pointed words for the "teacher drain."

"Undergraduate teaching is all too frequently a thankless chore left to those unable to get research money—whether senior professors or younger assistants. In this topsy-turvy situation, the undergraduate may find that the university established mainly for his sake has no real place for him in the new scheme of things."

"The committee finds that too many scientists and engineers have been diverted over a relatively short period into research work, and too few are available for teaching. It will be necessary both to limit the requirements for research manpower over the short term and through an appropriate system of incentives, to increase the flow of qualified personnel into teaching."

A Reuss committee table showed that, in the 12-year period 1953–64, inclusive, the number of teachers (on a full-time equivalent basis) increased from 177,000 to 324,000 or only 83 percent, while enrollment more than doubled, and full-time equivalent of research workers at the same institutions more than trebled (up from 23,000 in 1953 to 71,000 in 1964).

John Fischer, editor of Harper's, places the quandary in simple perspective by asking "Is there a teacher on the faculty?" He pessimistically feels that it is unlikely "* * * that we can hope for any drastic improvement in college teaching to come from either the administration or the faculties. It will come, if at all, only as the result of outside pressure—from parents, alumni, and the students themselves."

Mr. Fischer overlooks one very important "outside pressure"; namely, the Federal Government and the Congress in particular. The Government has justifiably refrained from exerting pressures and persuasions on academia via research grants. But in this instance, Government money at times is being used to aid and abet a disturbing academic trend. Let there be no mistake, the Congress is aware of the detrimental effect that Federal research money sometimes has on undergraduate teaching. If the school, acting in concert with such groups as the American Association of University Professors, or the splendid association gathered here this evening, fail to correct the widening valley between student and professor, then the Government can and surely will attach certain unwelcome provisions to Federal research contracts.

While a college or university might feel reticent to unilaterally impose sanctions and regulations, the Congress will not have cause for similar reluctance. We are now in a period in which the universities literally are being cajoled and petitioned to "amend their teaching ways." For the sake of academic autonomy and faculty administrative prerogatives, let us hope the institutions heed the recommendations. If not, for the sake of the students and higher education, the Congress and the agencies will do the heeding.

It is here that distinguished ladies and gentlemen like yourselves can be so effective. You can recognize the need for more teachers and maximum teacher accessibility as well as more research. You can note the tenor of congressional and agency comment. You can respond to this situation by articulating a forceful policy and following a program that offers positive guarantees for the

use of Federal research funds concomitant with adherence to realistic teaching schedules within your institutions. A positive and demonstrable policy in this regard, from within the academic community, would hardly go unnoticed in Washington, and most assuredly, after proper communication would aid in your efforts to secure new research grants, and Federal institutional support.

PANELS OF PEERS

In awarding Government research grants and contracts, many agencies rely on the advice of established experts and faculty scholars in selected academic disciplines. These groups have been of much benefit to the agencies in pinpointing quality research proposals and competent investigators. However, a concentration of membership on the panels has evidenced itself over the years, with the large research institutions having a most discernible head-count majority.

In citing the growth of a "panel establishment," the Elliott committee found that many agencies utilize the same panelists from the same universities time and time again A 5-year study of the National Institutes of Health indicated 49 percent of the names occurred repeatedly.

The research community, through this panel peer grouping is approaching a "closed community of excellence," patronized by the benevolent Government eye. Alvin Weinberg thus says, "The panel system is weak insofar as judge, plaintiff, and defendant are usually one and the same."

I have known of more than one instance where a very respected professor, having worked under large Government research funding for many years, has chosen to join the faculty of a smaller institution—not represented in the "panel establishment." Much faster than a spring thaw his Government research funding disappeared and his Washington receptiveness was a thing of the past.

This entire issue was cast in sharp focus when the Woolridge committee filed its 1965 report. There, a top group of experts were drawn together to report to the President on the National Institutes of Health. Of the 74 people comprising eight life science panels advising the Woolridge committee, eight were Government employees; of the remaining 66, 59 were 1963 NIH research grantees. From all 11 of the advisory panels, 38 members were listed in the 1963 edition of Roster of Members of Public Service Public Advisory Groups. These men were asked to make assessments of the output of a system of project approval in which they were intimately involved both as grantees and as member of peer review groups. Is it any wonder the Woolridge committee with the assistance of such panels, found that the best available method for awarding research grants is through procedures utilizing scientific peer judgment panels?

It is recognized that most panelists come from institutions rated excellent under established standards, such as number of doctorates awarded and faculty membership in the National Academy of Sciences. Still, even the Academy in a special report has recommended that panel membership be on a short-term, rotating basis and from a wide circle of academia. This sentiment has received strong endorsement from the Elliott and Reuss committees, and a limited change in panel membership might well be anticipated.

ACADEMIC CRITICISM AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIVENESS

Many say that the Congress does not have the scientific expertise or advice to accord meaningful scrutiny to the university research and development program. This is partially true. Too often a congressional committee accords perfunctory treatment to the issues involved. Occasionally, a committee is established to do a particular research study job (e.g., Elliott select committee), but with a one-time-around survey, many schools are justifiably reticent to mobilize their administration for a large effort at the expense of considerable time and money.

Or other times standing committees and subcommittees, whose mandate is a total research and development look-see, cannot but study the academic problems disjointedly and sporadically—holding hearings and issuing reports on a particular aspect of the program now, with little or no follow-through for many months or even years.

Further complaints of legislative research perusal are directed to "nitpicking." Congressman MINSHALL, of Ohio, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, commented on the research grants listed in the National Science Foundation's annual report filed in mid-February of 1965. He referred, somewhat sarcastically, among other things, to "fright substances and alarm reactions in mollusks, Cornell University, $11,200." And then he said, "Until I have had an opportunity to interrogate National Science Foundation witnesses, I offer no comment other than the fact that I am intrigued by the idea of taxpayers supporting studies of how mollusks react when frightened. I have always accepted 'cool as a clam' as a truism, and I question how many taxpayers appreciate having their money spent to perhaps learn otherwise."

Let it be noted, however, that this line item scrutiny—usually on "title of project" basis alone—keeps faculty investigators and agency people on their toes and alert to the sensitivities of Congress and their constituents relative to the sensible expenditures of public funds.

On the subject of committee testimony, admittedly, most of the commentary before congressional committees is from agency men—university people being extremely reticent to appear; and, if they do, are rarely critical in depth. Dr. Abelson, editor of Science has said, "The witness in questioning the wisdom of the establishment pays a price and incurs hazards. He is diverted from his professional activities. He stirs the enmity of powerful foes. He fears that reprisals may extend beyond him to his institutions. Perhaps he fears shadows, but in a day when almost all research institutions are highly dependent on Federal funds, prudence seems to dictate silence."

Institutional presidents sometimes seem the most reluctant to speak out—perhaps for fear of jeopardizing their relationships with the Federal agencies. (The same fear may muffle the criticism of federally subsidized scientists, thus stifling the efforts of the Congress to learn of inefficiencies and inadequacies that are present in the Federal research program.)

When invitations were extended by the Elliott committee to a number of influential university presidents to provide testimony on current problems in the Government-university relationship, a few gave careful study to the matter and provided helpful suggestions. But some refused the invitation outright or offered empty generalities and glowing platitudes, or gave the committee what it needed least; less than candid expressions of immediate self-interest, cloaked in the familiar altruistic rhetoric of science and education.

Subsequent requests by the committee to colleges and universities for facts and figures on Federal expenditures were in many instances ignored or given perfunctory attention—often, it must be admitted, because the institution did not keep adequate track of where the Federal funds were going.

Faced with these realities, strong attention should be focused on how to insure a steady flow of critical and knowledgeable commentary from the university campus. Constructive criticism is vital to a more productive Federal research program—particularly if offered by the investigators themselves. Don Price, dean of Harvard's Graduate School of Public Administration and the new president of the AAAS, in noting the need for more critical comment from the scientific community, says, "Even as dissenters, they must be established, and the future status of their estate must be developed with care if we are to adjust our constitutional system to modern technology without losing our freedom."

And Logan Wilson of the American Council on Education has well summarized the concurrent responsibilities of academicians and Government officers: "Each institution should have its own sense of public mission, of course, but my own conviction is that the educational community has a right and a responsibility to share with the Government in the determination of policies and directions, that will, as much as any other factor, shape our whole future.

FEDERAL CONTRACT RESEARCH CENTERS

Under a usual cloak of Washington-imposed secrecy, some 20 or so Federal contract research centers—university affiliated though usually physically distant from the campus proper—perform complex, mission-oriented research and development work for the Government. The atmosphere is devoid of more than a dozen or so student assistants (if that) and reflects open chagrin at the idea of visitations by the centers researchers to campus classrooms and labs.

One fact stands dominant; namely, the heavy concentration of Federal research funds at these installations. In fiscal year 1966, almost $6 billion will be spent by the Government at "captive labs." One result of this funding is that the academic institutions sponsoring the facilities are usually considered the recipients of the money in general. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the universities proper rarely see any of the money, or, too often even the research results. Where labs are found, a closer examination of university accounts will invariably show high laboratory funding, with the main campus receiving a much more balanced and proportional share of the total Federal research allocation. This fact should be well remembered in any "geographic dispersion of funds" discussion and the side issue of the haves versus the have-nots in university research.

For example, according to figures just released by the Reuss subcommittee on research, Johns Hopkins University was the third largest recipient of Federal funds for all university research conducted in fiscal year 1964. In that year, Hopkins received somewhat in excess of $70 million from the Federal agencies—but $55 million of that total was from the Department of Defense alone. And virtually all of that money was earmarked for the Hopkins Applied Physics Lab in Silver Spring, Md., many miles distant from the Homewood campus in Baltimore.

Not a few university presidents with captive labs located at their schools continually insist before congressional committees that the centers are indeed part of their institutions' educational missions and thus should be retained. But, the affiliation all too often appears as a tortured one, necessitating a good deal of stretch to the imagination. Nevertheless, the centers do perform a vital service at a splendid level of productivity. The labs undoubtedly assist their parent institution in such matters as prestige and drawing power on the academic professions and student interest.

Also remember that the labs perform a good deal of applied research, an area underfunded according to people such as Drs. Teller and Kantrowitz. It is clear that the contract research centers have a continuing mission for the future. It remains for the academic community to secure a better assimilation of the work of these labs into the educational mission of the universities.

SCIENCE VERSUS EDUCATION

Whenever possible, research money should be allocated in such a way that it also will do the greatest good educationally. If two institutions or two investigators have the same competence to perform a given piece of research then the choice ought to go to the one with the greater capacity and willingness to involve students in the research experience. But it is quite another thing to compromise the research investment in pursuit of an educational objective.

This research compromise now reaches beyond questionable investigator subsidization, and is transferring research funds into a catchall category of curriculums and institutional development grants. The expanding effort to build new academic centers, to improve departments, and to expand institutional capacity should be labeled properly as an academic development program—certainly not one of research. Thus, our national research program, as presently evolving in higher education, should in reality be two mutually sustaining programs—one, a constantly expanding research effort, conditioned on excellence and productivity; and the other, an institutional development program geared to future increases in graduate education and research operations.

The National Science Foundation Board in a 1958 statement—as pertinent today as then—wisely noted that, "Problems of Government-university relationships in the Federal support of research at colleges and universities should be explicitly and completely disassociated from the budgeting needs and cries of the institutions and from the general issue of Federal aid to higher education. In the consideration of these relationships there should be no implication that Federal sponsorship of research is a convenient subterfuge for Federal aid to institutions of higher learning."

In the field of academic development there are already excellent programs carried on by such agencies as the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration which embrace open ended, Federal assistance to expand, in quantity and quality, institutions and science departments within those schools. In addition, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 has just completed its first full year of operation. The results show almost $300 million expended in the 12 months of fiscal year 1965 on undergraduate and graduate facilities development. The great bulk of this amount was allocated for institutional science building construction—bricks and mortar assistance which will enable schools to command legitimate approbation of agency research distributors in the future.

Unfortunately, there is a growing diffusion of intent with reference to the dual mandate of the Federal Government in the areas of institutional development and of academic research. In a September 1965 statement to the Cabinet, President Johnson stated that, "Research supported to further agency missions should be administered not only with a view to producing specific results, but also with the view to strengthening academic institutions and increasing the number of institutions capable of performing research of the highest quality." Here the President is speaking of the research dollar doing two jobs—mission project study and academic development.

In a paper by NASA's Thomas Murphy and Thomas Adams, delivered to the 1965 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, the writers stated this resultant dilemma:

"Can a mission-oriented agency use geography as a criterion in awarding grants, recognizing full well that it concomitantly will sacrifice time, quality, and money in the process? When grants are given to one institution on grounds other than merit, there is little basis for denying similar grants to other universities which would not normally merit them."

I submit that the development activity referred to by Murphy and Adams, might well lodge in any of the agencies commissioned to perform research. However, development programs should be clearly labeled as such and submitted to the Congress for consideration and approval. The relevant congressional committee should have full information on proposals and recommendations in both important areas of academic research and institutional development. Only in this way can legitimate priorities be established together with a Government-wide program of expanding quality research, and an increase in institutions capable of performing that research.

We cannot permit a continuation of the current ambiguity of interest. The wisest expenditure of the important research dollar lies in the balance. Both research and academic development are necessary, and at usually the same time—but can one research fund do both jobs? Too often, when attention is directed to research programs, commentators are talking in terms of Federal construction, geographical dispersion of funds for academic development, or student assistance and traineeship programs for future research expertise. Admittedly, all these programs ultimately lead to more research, but the limited research dollar cannot be the elixir vitae for comprehensive higher education advancement.

It is certainly a laudatory objective to develop new academic centers of research and scholarly proficiency. More colleges and universities with the "superlative" label attached are certainly needed. But to build such schools with Federal project research dollars would not only jeopardize at least for the present, the overall research program, but would put second-rank universities on a dangerous "easy street" to institutional expansion. It might well be noted that schools such as Johns Hopkins and Harvard did not attain their present excellence by way of Federal dollars; rather they achieved a preeminent position in education which in turn prompted the flow of Federal funds for research.

As a case in point, we have here at the University of Missouri, an excellent institution of higher learning. The student body is large and growing, the proliferation of campuses is noteworthy, the array of talent and productivity is increasingly impressive. It is a school such as this that might well wish to increase its funded research, bearing in mind the existing caveats on too much research vis-a-vis the academic mission of the institution.

There is something of the "chicken or egg" dilemma here, however. Should the University of Missouri set priority sights on more research dollars or on academic improvement and development programs first, which in time would garner the desired increment in funded research? A marvelous program, ideally suited to the University of Missouri and one that I am sure is already known by this institution, is the science development grants program of the NSF. Under its provisions very large open-ended grants are annually awarded to academic institutions that are not now among the very foremost in science but that have substantial present strength and, in addition, have shown sound planning for future improvement.

Many in Washington speak of the need for new academic centers of excellence. This NSF program is one important way to meet that need. And yet, the President's new budget, while recommending a substantial increase in funds for the National Science Foundation, has only a $5 million increase to a $45 million total, over last year's budget figure. Unfortunately, for a program which commands such widely voiced support from all quarters, it is most discouraging that it fails to receive larger funding. I would suggest that budgeting for vital science development programs such as this might well command your close attention and comment over the months ahead to Washington.

This, then, is the state of Government support of university research today. The work of the Congress over the past year has been accompanied by a restrained and reasoned approach to the questions and problems that surround our national research program. The fear that Congress is about to curtail its support of research or stifle the efforts of the Nation's deserving scientists, or turn its back on the many problems of higher education is wholly without foundation.

Seemingly, the most obvious requirement on the part of the academic and scientific community would be an articulate form of response, recognizing research program modification as inevitable and healthy, and embracing constructive, specific suggestions for changes best serving the Nation's interest, and the institutions educational mandate. You might well disagree with some of my comments this evening, but do have a capacious and vocal interest in all of them.

Naturally, there are difficulties in the Federal research program and the situation promises continuing concern over the months ahead. During this time of reappraisal and program modification, one fact is clear—if institutions are to maintain the educational ideals and traditional autonomy in conjunction with strengthened research activity, then the major advances in this Government-university partnership must be premised on clearly defined educational philosophy and sound institutional organization.

In order to clearly articulate and define a campus research policy, those responsible for our institutions of higher learning must take a more active role in the decisionmaking processes involving Federal funds. They must be aware of the changing Washington spirit, and they must know how to plead their cause before the Congress. They, and indeed you, should be totally aware of the issues I have mentioned this evening. Know of their impact on the research programs, and participate in the dialog that swirls about these questions, particularly in Washington.

If solutions are to be found for many of the imbalances and inequities in the campus-Government research partnerships, the solutions most properly should be proffered from within the academic community. Welcome this responsibility. Develop your suggestions, suggestions for change, where warranted, and suggestions for maintenance of policy where desired.

Above all, take part in the discussions that call your opinions to Washington and take part not on a sporadic or disjointed basis but with firm, concerted effort on behalf of your particular disciplines and as spokesmen of the academic community.

Now you might well ask, How can you suggest we criticize the agency that supports us, or the programs under which we have applied for funds? But my friends, it is not a reliance on criticism that I am recommending, but rather positive and constructive commentary on your part. Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, the Congress will respond with alacrity to your challenge for excellence.

Certainly research continues to be the key to national growth and security. This vibrant, scientifically oriented era of the mid-20th century might well be termed the research years—a time when an evergrowing portion of our physical human resources is being diverted into the unknown and then turning raw discovery into great technological achievements for man's benefit. It has become a matter of common faith that much greater advancement is yet to come.

Indeed, no one has summarized the spirit and vibrance of the research years more eloquently than Ernest Hemingway, when he said, "We are living in the morning of an epoch, and in the fog of the early dawn men walk confused and see strange sights. But the fog will melt under the rays of the very sun which has created it, and the world of truth will be seen to be solid and lovely again. All the glory of life, all the romance of living, all the deep and true joys of the world, all the splendor and the mystery are within our reach."

NOTIFICATION OF NEXT-OF-KIN OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I had inserted in the RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara concerning the Defense Department's procedures for notifying next-of-kin of deceased servicemen.

I now would like to have printed in the RECORD the reply from the Department of the Army, which explains the very sensitive nature of notifying loved ones of the death of a serviceman.

Col. J. L. Blackwell, in response to my inquiry, points out many of the problems connected with casualty notification and outlines some of the complexities confronting the various services. He also mentions that the current system is now being studied. I am extremely hopeful that this study will result in a better, more compassionate way of notifying a mother that her son has been killed—instead of an impersonal taxi driver delivering the death message during the night.

At this point, I would like the RECORD to show Colonel Blackwell's letter to me, as well as my reply to him. The correspondence follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1966.

Hon. HORACE R. KORNEGAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KORNEGAY: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your inquiry addressed to the Secretary of Defense in behalf of Mr. Howard White concerning the current system of casualty notification.

One of the most sensitive functions the Army has to perform is the notification of families of military personnel who have been reported in a casualty status. We share your concern and realize the emotional trauma experienced by anyone at any time in receiving news of a loved one's death. All military actions involving U.S. personnel in oversea areas are newsworthy and closely covered by representatives of the news media, who furnish their reports by the speediest communication facilities available. Therefore, it is imperative that initial notification be made as promptly as possible since additional grief is caused the families should the information be received prematurely through news media releases.

Up to this time, commercial telegraph has proved to be the most expeditious and efficient means in making notification. Taxicab drivers must, of necessity, be employed at times by Western Union to assist in the delivery of casualty notifications depending on the time the message is received at a local branch office and the area in which the addressee resides. They are advised of the contents of the message and instructed to be on the alert for indications of shock reaction and to offer their services when necessary.

With the rising casualty rate among U.S. forces in Vietnam as the result of our more intensive role, the matter of casualty notification has been the subject of several news items and editorials, especially in areas from which major contingents have departed such as Fort Bragg, N.C. Many recent requests have been received from various civic, military, and veterans organizations and, although the suggestions may seem to be workable with present personalities and conditions at a given local level, these are not necessarily workable when extended to the complexities involved by the membership of the entire Army which currently exceeds 1 million. Additionally, the prevailing local factors are also always subject to change upon departure of enthusiastic personnel currently available.

We certainly do recognize notification of next of kin as one of our basic responsibilities in a most sensitive area. It must be accomplished and controlled by the military not only in order to provide prompt, factual, and reliable notification but also to assure prompt and efficient coordination of all other actions which include the appointment of the survivor assistance officer, return of remains and press releases.

Recent instructions have been issued restricting telegraphic notification actions for overseas casualties to the hours of 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. daily. Though the attention of the public is currently focused on the Vietnam situation, the loss of a son or husband is considered an equally shocking and distressing experience irrespective of the location of circumstances of occurrence. We cannot in good conscience establish separate, preferential procedures for any particular area without considering relatives of the entire army. However, a current study is being conducted to ascertain the feasibility of initiating a notification system using military resources rather than Western Union facilities. A decision on this matter is expected not later than May 1 at which time you will be further advised.

The Army is aware of the need for personal assistance to bereaved families confronted with many unfamiliar demands at this crucial time. An officer, well informed as to these needs, is appointed to visit the home and extend courteous, efficient, and sympathetic assistance for as long as the need exists.

Your thoughtfulness that the feelings of others might be spared as much as possible is most understandable and I am grateful for your interest in this matter.

It is noted that on February 9 you entered the substances of Mr. White's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, therefore, the Department of the Army solicits similar action on your part.

I hope the foregoing information gives you an appreciation of our active and continuing interest in this very real problem.

Sincerely,

J. L. BLACKWELL,
Colonel, GS Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1966.

Col. J. L. BLACKWELL,
Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLONEL BLACKWELL: I want to thank you for your courteous reply to my letter of February 9, addressed to Secretary McNamara concerning the Army's current system of casualty notification.

I can very readily appreciate the Defense Department's problems in this extremely sensitive area. I can easily understand also that the Army, as you point out, cannot establish separate, preferential procedures for any particular area and would not suggest that you even consider such a policy.

My concern is for every mother and father and every wife who must in the future face the terrible emotional strain of receiving the news that the son or husband has been killed—regardless of the circumstances of the death or wherever they may live.

After writing to Secretary McNamara about the instance of a mother receiving the shocking news that her son had been killed in action in Vietnam, I went to North Carolina and visited with the parents of the young man who gave his life for his country. The Hiram Stricklands are a proud family. They were proud that young "Butch" had alway wanted to be a soldier. They were, quite naturally, grieved that his Army career was only 19 months long. But, 19-year-old "Butch's" mother, in her grief, kept reiterating one point in her conversation with me. "Please," she asked, "do whatever you can to help the feelings of some other mother of some other boy killed in the service." As she mourned her son, she wanted to alleviate the unnecessary trauma that might come to another serviceman's loved one. She received the death notice at night from a commercial taxi driver who handed her a telegram and went off again into the night.

I repeat my earlier plea for a better way. I am extremely hopeful that the current study you are now conducting will produce a more desirable and compassionate procedure. I know that the Army will persist in its efforts until a better way is found and put into use.

I will be pleased to have your correspondence inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I know that many others will be interested also in your efforts to find a better way.

I am grateful for your assistance and for your most courteous reply.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HORACE R. KORNEGAY.

SENATOR PAT McNAMARA TO STEP DOWN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who once said of Michigan's senior Senator [Mr. MCNAMARA]:

> I believe it can be said of the Senator from Michigan, "Behold a Senator in whom there is no guile." Everyone always knows where he stands. He does not make any ambiguous statements. He does not cast any ambiguous votes.

That statement, in a nutshell, sums up very well one of the outstanding characteristics about the public life of PATRICK V. MCNAMARA. His colleagues in the Senate have always known where he stood, and we in Michigan have always

known where to find our Senator. Invariably, it has been on the side of the public interest.

I have just been notified of Senator McNamara's decision not to seek reelection this year. He will step down at the end of 1966 after 12 years of dedicated and effective service to his State and Nation in the Senate of the United States.

I know I echo the sentiments of thousands of my fellow Michiganders when I say that we had hoped Pat McNamara would seek election to a third term in the Senate. We accept his decision regretfully and wish him well as he serves out his final year in the Senate and in the years ahead.

As he leaves the Senate, Pat McNamara can point to an enviable record of public service. Americans for years to come will lead better lives because Michigan sent Pat McNamara to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press last fall carried an article by Mr. James Robinson calling attention to Senator McNamara's outstanding record of accomplishment, particularly during the first session of the 89th Congress.

I hope Members of both the House and Senate will take the time to read Mr. Robinson's article about Michigan's senior Senator and his record of public service. It is a record of which the people of Michigan and the Nation can be very proud.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the November 15, 1965, edition of the Free Press under the headline, "Going Like 60 at 71—That's Pat McNamara," be printed as part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

Going Like 60 at 71—That's Pat McNamara

(By James Robinson)

Pat McNamara, Michigan's senior Senator, has returned to Detroit to spend the 2-month recess between sessions of the 89th Congress.

For McNamara, who at 71 is nearing the end of his second term as Senator, the annual visit could be the start of a new campaign for reelection—or a final report to the people on his achievements in the U.S. Senate.

"This year has been most gratifying—the best of my 11 years in the Senate," McNamara said in a leisurely interview over lunch at the Whittier Hotel, where he and Mrs. McNamara have an apartment.

The Senator is giving no hints on the question uppermost in the minds of Michigan politicans: Will he run for a third term in 1966?

But, as he reviews this year's Congress, it soon becomes obvious that the facts belie McNamara's own statement to the Senate on October 4, his birthday anniversary.

"When a man reaches the age of 71 years," McNamara said on that occasion, "there is very little to celebrate."

McNamara, at 71, has much to celebrate. This has been, by far, his most productive year as a Senator.

Before leaving Washington, he counted the pens he received from President Johnson for legislation in which he had a major role in enacting. The total: 19 pens.

"I've been down to the White House so many times this year for bill-signing ceremonies, I'm thinking of going into the pen business," McNamara said. "I could stock a stationery store."

There are other reasons for McNamara to celebrate. Few men at 71 are more active or more interested in the world about them.

He looks healthier, and younger every time you see him. A bit overweight, certainly less "vigor" than Bobby Kennedy. But who says a senior Senator should play touch football?

The reasons for McNamara's high opinion of the 89th Congress are easy to understand.

"We passed 85 percent of the 1964 Democratic platform this year," McNamara explained.

"And next year—we are going to go back and get the other 15 percent."

McNamara takes special pleasure in two of the year's most important pieces of legislation—medical care for the aged and Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools.

Both were part of his first campaign in 1954. He labored on problems of the aged and on behalf of better education for many years prior to entering the Senate.

"Back in the 1920's I was concerned because Michigan had no old-age pension," he recalled. "So I took a job—one of those unpaid jobs—as executive secretary of the Michigan Old Age Pension League.

"We got the first pension law on the books in Michigan. Frank Murphy (former Governor) was cochairman."

In the Senate, McNamara invented the popular and politically potent Special Committee on Aging and was its first chairman. He still is the senior Democratic member, but gave up the chairmanship when he took charge of the Committee on Public Works a few years back.

Congress this year also passed the McNamara-Fogarty Act, creating a new administration on aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"It gets rid of the welfare stigma which has been so obnoxious to the senior citizens," McNamara said.

A former Detroit school board member, McNamara now serves as ranking majority member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, on his recent visit to Michigan, told a Detroit audience that "Pat McNamara has done more for the cause of education in this country than any Member of the Senate, except possibly Wayne Morse."

McNamara is proud of the tribute, and proud of the opportunity he has had to boost education.

"The horizons of education are limitless," he explained.

"We'll never have enough money to bring all the education they can absorb to everybody who wants it and needs it. But we must keep going. There are always new frontiers every day."

The list of legislation McNamara sponsored or managed in committees and during floor debate is almost endless.

In fact, the bulk of what the Nation identifies as President Johnson's Great Society moved during the last 2 years through McNamara's hands, either as chairman of the Public Works Committee or as the ranking Democrat on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, where he also is chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and the Special Subcommittee on Poverty.

He managed the war on poverty act last year and again this year. He cosponsored the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 which adopted the regional approach to aiding distressed areas such as the Upper Great Lakes.

The President's Appalachian Regional Development Act moved through McNamara's Public Works Committee, or rather, the Senator moved the bill with some not-too-gentle shoves. Mr. Johnson was most appreciative. He picked a Michigan lawyer, John Sweeney, to run the program. Sweeney got his start in Washington as an aid to McNamara.

Even Lady Bird Johnson's pet legislation—the Highway Beautification Act—was a McNamara measure. There was some tugging and pulling between the Senator and the White House before the President agreed to McNamara's requirement that the money come out of the general revenue rather than the highway trust fund, which is threatening to run a deficit before the interstate roads are completed in 1972.

McNamara considers the Beautification Act "a feeble first step in the right direction."

The time has come, he says, for more control over scenery along Federal highways, especially billboards and auto graveyards.

"But it is really a timid measure," he said. "We're going to pay for all the vested rights and give the billboard companies 4 or 5 years to comply. You know, the industry admits a billboard will pay for itself in 5 years."

On the subject of next year's election and whether he will run again, McNamara weeks ago made his position clear in typically blunt fashion.

"I'll make a decision when the time comes and then I'll let everyone know."

He added: "I feel great. I certainly feel well enough to run and there's no reason why I shouldn't, so far as the way I feel.

"But I don't want you to think that means I will be a candidate.

Age is much more likely than health to play a part in McNamara's decision, despite recurring reports of ill health that stem from an illness just prior to his 1960 campaign for reelection. That year he led the Democratic ticket in Michigan at a time when rumor had him on the verge of death.

If he decides to go for another term, as his friends are now urging him to do, McNamara would be 78 at the end of another 6 years in the Senate. That's not particularly old, by Senate standards; but it isn't young either, and the Senator is conscious of his advancing years.

In his first speech upon return to Michigan last week, at a birthday dinner honoring Representative James O'Hara, Democrat of Utica, the Senator told his audience:

"When my colleagues celebrated my birthday in the Senate last month I told them when a man gets 71 there is very little for him to celebrate.

"But that doesn't stop me from helping others celebrate. Especially, young fellows like Jim O'Hara."

Friends say it is possible McNamara may decide to step aside next year and give some younger Democrat a chance—a bright young fellow like G. Mennen Williams, perhaps, or Mayor Jerome Cavanagh.

But don't bet on it. The Senator smiled coyly last Saturday night when Congressman O'Hara produced a large button labeled "Reelect McNamara in 1966," and proceeded to tell 400 Macomb County Democrats: "Pat, you're the greatest. You're my only candidate."

ADULT HEALTH EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce H.R. 12976 the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966.

Some time today our colleagues in the Senate will hear Mr. Harrison Williams, Democrat of New Jersey, introduce a measure identical with the one I place before you at this time.

This bill would authorize the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make grants to medical schools, community hospitals, health departments, and other public nonprofit agencies to establish and operate adult health protection centers. It would authorize grants for the establishment and op-

eration of these centers for a period of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, the system envisioned here will do more for preventive medicine and health protection than anything yet proposed. In addition to many other features, it will bring modern instrumentation and computer use to bear on a recognized, growing health problem represented by chronic illness and the increasing scarcity of professional health personnel.

What this act does is to make way for a healthy mutation in our preventive health care practices in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have often been impressed by the fact that—when the time is ripe—innovations occur independently to a number of people. It is rather noteworthy that last fall, after the passage of the Medicare Act, both Senator WILLIAMS and I were concerned about the aged who were not going to be helped by the medicare system. And, independently, we addressed ourselves to the solution—or solutions—of the problem.

In September 1965 Mr. WILLIAMS reminded the Senate that the increasing numbers of our aged and aging population present a growing problem with special significance for chronic diseases. He pointed out that an estimated 74 million Americans are afflicted by one or more chronic disorders. He went on to cite pertinent statistics on the high incidence among the elderly of a host of cripplers—blindness, deafness, epilepsy, arthritis, rheumatism, glaucoma, and others.

Then Senator WILLIAMS said:

> The final answer to the health problems of the aging and aged is surely not limited to the provision of a broad range of care services to all who need them. We must also envisage a more comprehensive effort to identify and control, during our productive years, such chronic diseases which, if ignored, take such high toll in later life.

And he concluded with the thoughtful words:

> Let us not hesitate to add another milestone beyond medicare. Let us give medicare its next logical handmaiden, preventicare.

At about the same time last fall I had an opportunity to speak at the dedication of Hall Manor, Cranston's first low-rent housing development for the elderly, in my home State of Rhode Island.

I took the opportunity to remark before that audience:

> I wonder, for instance, how many Americans realize that there now exist more than 2,500,000 elderly people who will actually not benefit from most of our national programs for the aged.
>
> These elderly cannot secure low-rent housing, cannot participate in recreational programs or in vocational rehabilitation projects, will hardly, in fact, benefit at all from the new medicare provisions.

I said that there is, therefore, an urgent need for long-term comprehensive care for the elderly who cannot take care of themselves. I called then for an entire program of services to provide for all the needs of life—in short, for what I called living care.

Finally, I concluded that we need nothing less than full Federal responsibility for maintaining the neglected lives of our 18 million elderly population.

In the measure that Senator WILLIAMS and I are proposing today, this conviction is spelled out in unmistakable terms. We state that "the Congress hereby finds and declares that the Federal Government has a duty to assist the adult population of the United States, particularly the aged and the aging, in protecting, maintaining, and improving their health."

Mr. Speaker, from this premise we propose for the first time to provide Federal assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease; to provide assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers; and to provide assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation.

I do not propose to read this bill aloud to you here, but its purpose is to encourage and assist, through grants, in the planning, establishment, and operation of regional health and community protection centers, each of which will provide health appraisal and disease detection services, on a periodic basis, to any adult who requests such services, if he has attained age 50 and resides within the geographic area served by the centers.

These health protection centers would provide a series of basic tests for the detection of abnormalities in the cardiovascular, respiratory, gastrointestinal, genitourinary, and musculoskeletal systems as well as defects in metabolism and organs of special sense.

Specific diseases or conditions to be tested might include hypertension, various forms of cancer, rheumatoid arthritis, respiratory insufficiency, diabetes, kidney disease, obesity, and hearing and vision impairment.

The tests would be administered by technicians, nurses, and medical specialists using automated or semiautomated equipment which has already been proven to give swift, accurate, and reliable results. The results of these tests, along with data provided by the person undergoing the health appraisal, would be fed into a computer. It is estimated that the battery of tests could be administered within 2½ hours.

The results of the tests, summarized by the computer, would be referred to the private physician of the person taking them. In cases where the persons either did not have a private physician or was medically indigent, the tests would be referred to a physician in accordance with local practice.

The adult health protection centers are intended to provide an efficient means for the detection of abnormalities or indications of disease—but not to replace full examinations. Their purpose is to place in the hands of the examining physician a summary of basic data and to place promptly under a physician's care a person with indications of disease conditions.

The health protection centers would conduct training programs in the operation of technical disease detection procedures and would research and develop new disease detection tests and equipment. Additional grants to the centers would be authorized for operational research and for the establishment of internships to give on-the-job training to physicians, nurses, and technical personnel. The centers would also conduct community education programs on preventive health care.

Finally, a 12-man Advisory Council on Adult Health Protection would be established to advise the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in the administration of this program. This Council will include men who are leaders in the fields of medicine, public health, public welfare, or representatives of national organizations concerned with the interests of the aging. And it shall include one or more national leaders known for their dedication to the national interest and the welfare of the Nation's citizens.

The basic idea behind the act, put simply, is this: to launch a genuine, nationwide preventive medicine campaign. By making these testing services available to any person age 50 or above, on a voluntary basis, we will encourage men and women approaching retirement to take regular health examinations and we will facilitate the giving of full examinations by practicing physicians.

Mr. Speaker, the long-range answer to the health problems of the aging is in early identification and control of disease and prevention of illness and disability.

Now, ideally, we would achieve this goal by having periodic health examinations for everyone. Realistically, of course, we know that there are not enough physicians to accomplish a program of this scale.

Fortunately, a way has been found out of this dilemma.

What we are proposing in this act is to take the proven automated testing techniques from an unusual project in California—called Kaiser Permanente—and adapt them for demonstration on a communitywide basis in other areas of the country.

Assisted by a grant from the Division of Chronic Diseases, Public Health Service, the Kaiser Foundation health plan in Oakland has developed a multitest laboratory that is immensely accurate and remarkably economical.

Some 40,000 Kaiser-Permanente health plan beneficiaries are participating in this pilot health program. Their experience will now become the basis for this first nationwide preventive medicine effort, so far as the chronic diseases are concerned—just as, once upon a time, a preventive medicine effort had to be launched against the infectious diseases.

May this new effort be as successful as that campaign proved to be.

Once again I want to repeat what I said at Cranston last fall.

I know well that, hearing this proposal, many voices will cry out—cry out as they did against medicare, and as they did against the heart disease, cancer, and stroke program, and as they cried out against most of the other far-sighted public health bills passed by the 89th Congress.

But I say to them, as I said in this House last year, when asked where "this

kind of business" will end: that I, for one, intend to keep going and going until we take adequate care of as many people as we possibly can who so badly need better health services, no matter how long it takes.

I promised, in my "Living Care" speech, to introduce legislation to help the elderly. This bill I introduce today is the first piece of such legislation I intend to introduce in this 2d session of the 89th Congress. It is a vital piece of legislation, for only by preventive care can we hope to reduce the staggering load of suffering borne by the elderly in our midst.

As most of you know, I have concerned myself with the problems of the aged for the past decade. In 1956 I supported the President in establishing a Federal Council on Aging, and in 1959 I introduced legislation calling for the White House Conference on Aging that was held in 1961.

In 1963 I introduced the Older Americans Act which finally passed in 1965. I am happy to say that the Aging Administration that it created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is now a going concern.

I am proud of this record and of these successes. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that I believe that the Adult Health Protection Act of 1966 will be the most important single piece of legislation concerning the aging and the aged that I have ever introduced into this House.

LOUIS CARDELL GERRY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on February 5 the House of Representatives lost a constituent, a taxpayer, a business leader, a Republican, a gentleman, a friend of the people and, I am both proud and personally grieved to say, a fellow Rhode Islander and a friend.

Mr. Louis Cardell Gerry, of Providence, R.I., died on February 5 at the age of 81 after a career as business executive and financier, after nearly two decades as president of Rhode Island Hospital, after a lifetime of service to his fellow man.

He was a director of a score of corporations, a trustee of Brown University, a former chairman of the Providence chapter of the American Red Cross, a 33d degree Mason, a recipient of the first Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce annual Roger Williams Award for outstanding service to the community.

Over a long period of time he was associated with the Rhode Island Community Chests. He served the State without compensation as racing and athletics administrator under the former Gov. William H. Vanderbilt, during which time he was the author of a modernized set of racing rules for the State. During World War II he served with the United War Fund, was vice chairman of the Rhode Island Salvage Commission, a member of the committee of Veterans' Information Center, and both during the war and afterward was a member of the First Army Advisory Committee.

The man of whom I speak did not hold public office, though he was a devoted public servant; a private citizen who exemplified enlightened and perceptive support of sound legislation; a friend of Governors and Members of Congress. Particularly, to me, he was a source of inspiration in his chosen avocation as the president of one of the oldest and, by reason of his association with it, one of the leading hospitals of our country.

Blessed with the insight of leadership, he chose wisely in his selection of people of similar purpose, energy, and concern for others. He brought Rhode Island Hospital to the forefront of excellence in its avowed functions of quality patient care, education, and research to benefit the people of the Providence Plantations and the entire State.

He developed new concepts of care for an institution that has provided a century of service to the sick and injured. He and Rhode Island Hospital together have been in the vanguard of progress for meeting the health needs of our State.

Before Congress passed legislation to help stimulate local financing of facilities for student nurses, Rhode Island Hospital—recognizing the need to attract more qualified young women to this important profession—constructed a nursing arts building and a senior student nurses dormitory, appropriately named the Gerry House.

Before Congress undertook to support Mr. Johnson's present master plan for advancing the Nation's health, Rhode Island Hospital faced the problem of its responsibility to the people of Rhode Island and is at this moment in process of developing plans for a large, 12-story building solely dedicated to the care of the ambulatory patient. This ambulatory patient center will meet the increasing need for health care at the most economical levels of construction expense and cost to the patient.

Such are two examples of long-range planning which only the most progressive of our country's medical centers are providing. By reason of leadership such as Mr. Gerry's, such hospitals demonstrate an understanding of Mr. Johnson's theme, which he expressed recently in these words:

> It is imperative that we give first attention to our opportunities—and our obligations—for advancing the Nation's health. For the health of our people is, inescapably, the foundation for the fulfillment of all our aspirations.

Louis Cardell Gerry, in an annual report to his hospital's corporation a few years ago, voiced a similar concern:

> We have indeed come far. What a comfort it would be to be able to stop climbing, seat ourselves comfortably and view our accomplishments. Such, however, is not desirable; it is not even possible. We have come far, it is true, and although it sounds paradoxical we have even farther to go than ever. As we progress in one area, several more areas are opened up. We are, in the truest sense of the word, in an expanding universe.

McNAMARA'S CONTRADICTIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of Congress, I imagine, I am receiving an increasing number of letters from the district I represent concerning the war in Vietnam.

I am well aware that this is a theater of operations 8,000 miles from our shores in an area of the world where newly created nations abound and this, to some degree, contributes to the confusion that exists over the entire aspect of the war there.

But an even greater contribution to the confusion and, in my opinion, the single most significant factor causing the controversy over our policy and actions there, is the record of contradictory statements for which Secretary McNamara is responsible.

I believe as well that, because we have withheld the truth from the people and camouflaged what the situation was in Vietnam a year ago, that we cannot now show the people how much better the situation is today. To do so would prove beyond question that we did not tell the truth a year ago.

I am a great believer, Mr. Speaker, in "the record," that chronicle of events made famous by Al Smith when he first said, "Let's look at the record."

It is quite fashionable these days for officials of the Government to make one statement one day and then deny it the following day or else say something quite different and hope that no one will remember what they said the first time. This is a dangerous and deplorable habit; particularly deplorable when it is practiced by the Secretary of Defense.

Secretary McNamara's statements on the war in Vietnam make a fascinating collection of confusion and contradiction which would be amusing if the subject matter were not so grave. I think it will serve an enlightening purpose if all his statements are put together in one place in the RECORD so future historians can study it.

Let us begin with a statement he made on March 22, 1962. At that time, returning from a conference in the Pacific, McNamara told newsmen that South Vietnam had taken the offensive.

Less than 2 months later, while in Saigon, McNamara told newsmen "there is no plan for introducing American combat troops in South Vietnam." This was on May 9, 1962.

Two days later, on May 11, 1962, McNamara said he was "tremendously encouraged."

A White House policy statement dated October 2, 1963, contains this statement:

> Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965.

Secretary McNamara, in Honolulu on November 20, 1963, announced that American troops would start being withdrawn before the end of that year, 1963. The following month, Secretary McNamara changed his mind. He said in Saigon on December 21, 1963, that we would not go ahead with troop withdrawal plans.

Another month went by before the Secretary delivered another pronouncement that should be made a part of the

RECORD. After the fall of Diem, in which he, himself, undoubtedly had a part, McNamara said:

The new government * * * has considerably more support than its predecessor, and the military revolutionary committee is beginning to take action to intensify military operations and to improve civil administration.

Everything was coming up roses according to the Secretary when he testified here on the Hill a month later, on January 27, 1964. At that time he said that most of the 15,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam should be withdrawn before 1965 was over. He said he did not believe the United States "should assume the primary responsibility for the war in South Vietnam."

The Secretary continued to see the situation there through rose-colored glasses 2 months later. Back from his fourth trip to Saigon, he reported that the Khanh regime had "produced a sound central plan for the prosecution of the war" and that the situation "can be significantly improved in the coming months."

Nine days later, the Secretary's opinion had taken a turn of 180 degrees. On March 26, 1964, he said:

The situation in South Vietnam has unquestionably worsened, at least since last fall.

He said also that the situation was "not hopeless, but not particularly optimistic."

Three days later, however, things took another turn for the better. On March 29, 1964, McNamara said:

The training personnel we have assigned there will come back as their training mission is completed. Perhaps some can return this year; some next.

The truth of the matter came from his own statement a month later when, on April 24, 1964, he told newsmen that U.S. strength in the Vietnam area was on the rise. He said:

I don't want to predict what the totals will be at the end of this year or at the end of 1965.

On that same day, the Secretary came up with a real prize in this statement:

I don't object to its being called McNamara's war. I think it is a very important war and I am pleased to be identified with it.

Back in Saigon for another look-see, the Secretary was very pleased with what he saw. He said:

Excellent progress. The plans we laid out in March, if they are consistently followed up, will work effectively.

This was on May 13, 1964. Back in Washington the next day, May 14, 1964, he said that "certain additional U.S. personnel will be needed in Vietnam." Let us mercifully draw the curtains to denote the passage of 24 hours.

On May 15, testifying again here on the Hill, the Secretary was reported to have been "gloomy" and to have said that the anti-Vietcong efforts had deteriorated.

Oh, "what a difference a day makes," as the songwriter says.

On August 5, 1964, the Secretary reported U.S. bombing raids against North Vietnam and reported "energizing" additional Army, Marine, Air Force, and antisubmarine units.

If there is one point in this recount of a thoroughly shoddy situation when it can be said that the custard pie had hit the fan, it was on November 26, 1964, when Secretary McNamara told newsmen they should not interview General Taylor because in his words:

It would be impossible for Max to talk to these people without leaving the impression the situation is going to hell.

Bear with me, Mr. Speaker. I know that this recounting stretches the credibility to the snapping point, but there are three more "pronouncements" I would like to include.

On February 18, 1965, buoyed up by heaven knows what, the Secretary of Defense said:

The past year has also brought some encouraging developments.

Visiting in Saigon for the sixth time, the Secretary assayed the situation and delivered himself of this:

We are no longer losing. It will be a long war.

One more quotation, Mr. Speaker, and I will rest my case. In December of 1965, Mr. McNamara said, when he returned from his seventh trip, that he was "suprised" at the intensity of the war.

I wish I could, like Shakespeare, leave him to heaven, but I cannot. This man, this computerized genius, is at the helm of our ship of war and this dreary record of his faltering, misunderstanding of the situation and the foe we face in Vietnam is a cause for alarm.

If the Secretary had had confidence in the American people and had told them the truth about the situation in Vietnam each time I have recorded his statements, there would not now be the division, the controversy, and the confusion which exists in the minds of many.

I hope this recording serves a useful purpose in setting his record straight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows, to:

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for February 24 and 25, on account of official business.

Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. NATCHER), on account of death of close friend.

Mr. DYAL, for Thursday, Friday, and Monday; February 24, 25, and 28, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah), for 1 hour, on February 28; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 15 minutes, today, on two different subjects; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 20 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Utah) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. MCCLORY.
Mr. MATHIAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.
Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER in two instances.
Mr. GILLIGAN.
Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. VIVIAN.
Mr. MULTER in two instances.
Mr. IRWIN.
Mr. FRASER.
Mr. COOLEY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1904. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes.

DEATH OF REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP, CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREIGG] is recognized.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it was with a great deal of sadness that I am called upon today to announce to you the sudden death of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Braskamp was born in Alton, Iowa, a small farm community in my district of northwest Iowa.

Since coming to the Congress last year, I was most pleased and proud to have had a series of opportunities to reminisce with our Chaplain about the heritage we both shared. Through this association, I developed a strong sense of respect and admiration for Reverend Braskamp. He typified the personal elements so necessary to the stature of the honored position he held for 16 years. It is significant to recall that the position of Chaplain of the House of Representatives assures us that our daily deliberations begin with thoughts of our

Creator—and the burden of such a responsibility was fully carried by the man whose memory we honor today. The toll of time which placed him among my elders never suffered him to be anything but enthusiastically concerned with his duty to God and this honored body.

My predecessor, the Honorable Charles B. Hoeven, resides in the same community of the birthplace of Reverend Braskamp. There was a great friendship and affection between these gentlemen, and it has been a source of real pride over these many years to the citizens of Alton to have a native-born son serve in as high a position as Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I join with all of the Members of the House of Representatives extending to the immediate family our deepest sympathies.

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

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply grieved by the loss of our beloved Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp. Only a few days ago he walked with us and among us in this chamber, and tonight he walks with angels.

This man of God, this noble character, has been our spiritual adviser and mentor for 16 years.

His was the voice of the servant of the Lord, adjuring us to maintain the added dimension of spiritual values in all our earthly works. His prayers dimension of spiritual values in all our earthly works. His prayers often reflected the mood and tempo of the House—its crises, its defeats, its victories. In every case he reminded us that these things shall all pass away, but the Kingdom of the Lord shall endure forever. His messages were essentially messages of hope—as is the Christian philosophy itself.

Therefore, while we sorrow at his passing, we are comforted by the knowledge that our friend and spiritual shepherd, has gone to the just reward that surely awaits him.

This distinguished churchman served his Presbyterian congregation for 40 years and was the dean of Presbyterian ministers in Washington, D.C. He was moderator of the Synod of Baltimore, comprising Presbyterian Churches in Washington, Baltimore, and New Castle, Del. His outstanding leadership in sending church aid to the people of Holland during the war caused Queen Wilhelmina to knight him in the Order of Orange Nassau.

Dr. Braskamp's 16 years of service in the House were the capstone of a long and effective career. His interest in politics and government dated back to the days when he enrolled at Princeton specifically to have the opportunity to hear the lectures of its then President, Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Braskamp was originally an Iowan and earlier had attended Grinnell College.

As the House knows, Reverend Braskamp was a learned theologian and philosopher, notwithstanding his love of baseball and his boyhood desire to become a major league player. His scholarship did not prevent his enjoying simple, human things. His humanity was the quality which made him our friend and confidante, as well as our official pastor. We shall greatly miss him; we can never repay our debt to him.

Mrs. Albert and I extend his children and all his loved ones our deepest sympathy.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Dr. Braskamp, all of us in this Chamber have lost a good friend and wise counselor. We who have served during his chaplaincy have been strengthened spiritually and religiously by his daily prayer and by the messages which he gave at the opening of each session.

I was particularly fortunate to become well acquainted with him. We were both graduates of the University of Michigan, and would reminisce on many, many occasions about Ann Arbor and our attendance at the university.

Although Dr. Braskamp was a man of God, he was an individual who had a broad interest in all facets of life and a deep appreciation for all people. His daily prayers while we were in session reflected this interest in and concern for his fellow men.

I can speak for those of us on this side and say without hesitation or qualification that this Chamber and its Members were better, each and every day, because we had as the Chaplain of the House, Dr. Bernard Braskamp. We will miss him, and we all extend to his family our very deepest condolences. Dr. Braskamp has left an indelible impression on the House of Representatives.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to concur in the beautiful expressions made here this afternoon by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, by the distinguished majority leader, and by the distinguished minority leader in the tributes they have paid to our late Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp. It was my privilege to have been closely associated with Dr. Braskamp. I saw him almost every day. His office was very close to mine.

Invariably he was a man of good cheer and good spirit, optimistic by nature. He loved his fellowmen. He loved this House of Representatives. He loved our country, and he loved his church and his God. As those who have spoken previously to me have said, all of us in this body are better off because of his years of service here.

He lived a beautiful life. He was saddened with the passing of his wife a few years ago. We used to talk about that. But he was a man of great courage and great faith.

Mr. Speaker, the House has lost a dear friend in the passing of Dr. Braskamp, our Chaplain for more than 15 years. A kind and gentle man was Dr. Braskamp, and we in this House are finer men—we are of stronger faith—because he dwelt among us for so many years.

When I think of Dr. Braskamp, I think of those words which he lived by, from the Book of Joshua, chapter I, verse 9, when the Lord said to Joshua:

> Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord Thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

I think that describes the beautiful, inspiring mind of the man who served us so well and so faithfully for so many years.

Dr. Braskamp was born to humble beginnings, but through his own inspiration, intelligence, and hard work, he earned his first degree from the University of Michigan, while working at odd jobs on the campus. His academic record was so superior that he was awarded a scholarship to the Hartford Theological Seminary in Connecticut. From there, he transferred to the Princeton Theological Seminary where he earned both a bachelor's degree in theology and a master's degree in philosophy. He came to us, Mr. Speaker, as acting chaplain for 3 years, and then in 1950, he was elected Chaplain.

A man of wisdom, of kindness and of noble spirit was the Reverend Braskamp, and we shall all miss him. Mr. Speaker, it is the spirit a man leaves behind for which he is most remembered, and Dr. Braskamp was a noble servant of our Lord, who gave of himself unselfishly for his fellow man. His soul now lies with God, where he will receive eternal love. We thank our Lord that Dr. Braskamp ministered to us for so many years.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this House has suffered a deep loss in the death of its Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp. He brought into this Chamber daily a quiet radiance of certainty: that life is continuous; that what we do here is part and parcel of the long trek man is making out of unconscious perfection to perfected consciousness. To him the ancients expressed his deep belief that "never the spirit was born, the spirit shall cease to be never, end and beginning are dreams—birthless and changeless and deathless remains the spirit forever, dead though the house of it seems."

He exhorted us daily to be true to the best that is in us—true to the principle of integrity, honor, and loyalty upon which this great country that he loved so deeply was founded.

I am sure all who knew him rejoice that he has stepped across the threshold so quietly, so gently—may the Infinite bless and keep him now and always.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the very distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp has come as a painful shock to the membership of the House of Representatives. In his 16 years of ministering to the spiritual needs of the Members, of opening our daily sessions with a simple, earnest prayer, and of friendly talk with individual Members and informal groups, Dr. Braskamp had gathered to himself a host of warm friends. Characteristically, his daily opening prayer, by which Dr. Braskamp's name became familiar to many whose needs or inclinations lead them to consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was brief, to the point, and marked by both a strong religious feeling and a logical commonsense. Since 1958, he had prefaced his prayer of each day with a Scripture text, an admirable custom which I hope his successors may keep up. His strongly held Presbyterianism was not allowed to narrow the scope of his ministry in the House of Representatives, and both his prayers and his Scripture selections were always made in such a way as to hearten and encourage each Member of the House, whatever his particular faith or denomination might be. Those of no creed, or of faiths widely differing from his own, were alike responsive to Dr. Braskamp's human and spiritual warmth, to his evident sincerity, and to his moral force.

Dr. Braskamp came to the House of Representatives as Chaplain after a career of 40 years' service to Presbyterian congregations in Washington, D.C. He had first come to Washington as a young man, in 1911, immediately after his graduation, with degrees both in theology and in philosophy, from Princeton Theological Seminary and Princeton's Graduate School of Philosophy. At first he was assistant pastor of the Church of the Covenant, which is now the National Presbyterian Church, and then was called to the pastorate of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church. He took the lead in the merging of the Gurley congregation with that of the Gunton-Temple Church, and in building the present Gunton-Temple Church at 16th and Newton Streets. There he remained as pastor until his retirement in 1952. In 1950, when Dr. Braskamp was elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives, he was already well known to Members of Congress, as it was then remarked that he had, within the past 10 years, officiated as Acting Chaplain more than 175 times in the House of Representatives, and more than 75 times in the Senate. In 1952, upon his retirement from the active pastorate, Dr. Braskamp became the first full-time Chaplain in either House of Congress.

Dr. Braskamp wore his years and experience, like his learning, lightly. He was a humble and unassuming man, seasoning his earnest remarks with a deprecatory wit. One of his casual remarks has entered into the treasury of American humor, along with the much-quoted sayings of Abraham Lincoln, Mark Twain, and Will Rogers. When someone commented to him about his praying for the House of Representatives, he corrected the statement by saying: "I always look out over the House of Representatives and then I pray for the country."

As pastor of the Gunton-Temple Church, Dr. Braskamp served with distinction, directing his congregation in ways of expressing their faith through practical action. For his church's relief aid to Holland in the period of postwar reconstruction, and for his own personal leadership in that effort, Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands in 1947 made him a Knight of the Order of Orange Nassau, bestowing the decoration upon him personally at a ceremony in the Netherlands Embassy. In the last days of his pastorate, he was dean of the Washington Presbyterian ministers. At the time of his death, he was president of the Princeton Theological Seminary Alumni Association of Washington, and moderator of the synod of Baltimore.

In common with numerous other people, Members of Congress, former members of his congregation, or just friends and acquaintances, I feel a deep loss in the removal of Bernard Braskamp from our midst. He was justly admired and revered by Members of the House of Representatives for his good qualities, both as a straightforward and friendly human being, and as a devoted servant of God. His memory will long be treasured.

I might say, only a few days ago, within the past week, Dr. Braskamp called to see me in my office and to inform me that he intended to retire at the end of this session. I said to him, "Doctor, you may retire as chaplain, but you will always remain the chaplain emeritus of the House of Representatives as long as you live."

I wish to express my personal sense of loss, and my deep sympathy to the surviving members of Dr. Braskamp's family: to his son, Bernard, Jr.; to his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker; to his brother, Otto, and to his sister, Christina Braskamp. To all of these I offer, both a tribute of sorrow, and an assurance that the splendid record made by their father and brother will stand in honor and affection as long as those who knew him may live.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that now, as in the past, Bernard Braskamp may continue to look out over the House of Representatives, and that from his place in Heaven he will continue to pray for the country.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

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

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our esteemed Chaplain and my professional colleague, gives occasion for expressions of sorrow at his passing and condolences to his survivors. Eulogies to great men are, on rare occasion, best spoken when such men can no longer hear the testimonies to their greatness. The occasion of our Chaplain's translation into glory is an instance of this sort, for the Rev. Bernard Braskamp was such a humble man that tributes to him could embarrass him. In his heart and mind he felt that tributes belonged alone to the God whom he loved and the Lord whom he served. He believed that God had brought him to the position as Chaplain of the House of Representatives, so that he could perform the dual function of an ambassador for Christ, namely, to speak to us for God and to speak to God for us.

He never lost his sense of the prophetic role. His daily meditations were begun by citations from the Holy Scriptures, so that we might be reminded to listen first to the voice of God before we presumed to lift our hearts and voices to God. He was a profound theologian, as his prayers amply indicated.

He captured the tensions of our times, the fears of our hearts, and the struggles in our minds in his role as intercessor for us all. He knew our weakness, so he led us to lean on God's strength. He knew our need for wisdom, so he asked God to give us wise and understanding hearts. He knew the loneliness we feel in making crucial decisions, so he prayed to God to guide us with His unfailing presence.

His pastoral concern reached down into our private and family concerns. He sought us out when he sensed our need for personal encouragement, and he served as prophet and intercessor when affliction and sorrow touched members of our families.

On this Ash Wednesday, 1966, when Christians throughout the world meditate upon the suffering and death of our Lord Jesus Christ so that He might reconcile men to God and to one another, we pause to honor the memory of one who followed in the steps of Him "Who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." May the blessing of God now rest on that ministry to us as we comfort Chaplain Bernard Braskamp's loved ones and ourselves with the promise given those who walk in His steps: "Where I am, there shall also my servant be."

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my fellow Iowan, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague from Iowa, and the leadership of the House of Representatives in the comments and remarks that have been made here on this sad occasion.

All of us are deeply grieved by the loss sustained through the passing of this good servant of the Lord.

In Dr. Braskamp I found, as a native Iowan and a fellow Presbyterian, a welcome handclasp and a friendship that was stimulating.

During the 14 months I knew him I came to look forward to his incisive choices of Scripture that prefaced the opening prayer each day. Dr. Braskamp distinguished himself as a churchman in this area long before he came to serve as Chaplain of the House of Representatives. I am certain that his 16 years of service to this body will stand as an eloquent monument to a gifted and dedicated spirit.

Mr. GREIGG. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREIGG. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our Chaplain and friend, Reverend Braskamp, has saddened all of us here in the House of Representatives. I, like all of my colleagues, will miss Dr. Braskamp's thoughtful and inspiring message each day as the House opened, but even more, the very presence of this man was a comfort to all who knew him. We all felt the influence of his guardianship over our deliberations and his concern that we do what is right for the people of this country. I believe that I can find no better words to sum up Dr. Braskamp's life than the following words from one of his very own prayers for us:

> Endow us with that magnanimous and sacrificial spirit of our Saviour who never spared Himself in the great mission of giving to needy humanity the morning wonder and glory of a new day.

Mr. Speaker, we may all feel honored to have known and associated with Reverend Braskamp, and our days will be less full for his absence.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Chaplain, Reverend Braskamp, has gone to the Great Beyond.

I want to compliment the gentleman in the well of the House, the gentleman from Iowa, the distinguished Speaker, and the leadership of the House of Representatives for taking this time to recognize this great Chaplain. He opened each one of our sessions with an opening prayer, and I think we would all agree he was of great service to all the Members of this House for many, many years and served them well. Also he was a servant of God in the best meaning of that word. He was loved by all who knew him. I personally am stronger for having had the privilege of associating with him.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late and Reverend Dr. Braskamp, not because he was Chaplain of this House, but because he was a personal friend of mine. I had many friendly discussions with him, unknown to many of my colleagues. In one of our discussions we discussed the term "Aloha." When I gave him what we in Hawaii deem to be the meaning of "Aloha," he said, "That is what this world really needs—Aloha—the spirit of love. The love of man for God. The love of man for man."

Mr. Speaker, he gave me much counseling during the short time that I knew him. Because I found in him a man of great wisdom, I sought his counsel in many matters. As a friend I shed a tear for him upon his passing and to his loved ones I extend my sincere condolence and my deepest sympathy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of Chaplain Bernard Braskamp.

Born in Alton, Iowa, 79 years ago, he knew the rigors of life in those comparatively early pioneer days. He struggled for the education that eventually brought him to the Presbyterian ministry and thence, in 1950, to the duties of Chaplain of the House of Representatives and it has been my pleasure to know him since that time.

In 1961, Reverend Braskamp suffered the grievous loss of his beloved wife but his dedication to the House of Representatives and its Members was not diminished.

He will be greatly missed in the Chamber in which he officiated so long, and I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to the surviving members of his family.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the voice of this body's spiritual leader has been stilled and the Members stand bereft as we mourn the passing of a great Christian, our Chaplain.

It is not an easy task to invite divine intervention in the affairs of the Nation when so many of us approach God's throne by such devious paths. Our Chaplain, however, was unique in that while he respected the doctrinal sensibilities of each one of us, he was able to speak in tones of conviction and reverence that reflected our endless groping toward the true light.

Reverend Braskamp and I, as fellow Presbyterians, found much in common in our concern over some of the liberal tendencies espoused by too many of those of our persuasion. Beyond that, he was one of my most respected counselors and I often discussed with him some of those perplexities that beset the souls of all of us in our contemplation of the ascendancy of lawlessness as well as that philosophical preoccupation with the atheistic contention that "God is dead."

Our hearts go out to his family in this time of sorrow. We are joined with them in this moment of heartbreak. But in the contemplation of a glorious sunrise on that distant shore, we rejoice with them that our good friend, and their beloved, will be there to greet us when we, too, have crossed over.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the years in this body, we meet many outstanding individuals with whom we rub elbows day by day. Some of them are the type of men who leave their mark and who have a profound effect on the minds and souls of those with whom they come in contact. Now, we have lost one of the great ones in the passing of our beloved Chaplain, Dr. Bernard Braskamp. As we carry on without him, those of us who have known him will feel the presence and the guiding light of this strong man of God. He will continue to influence our lives as long as those lives shall last.

Dr. Braskamp was a kind and understanding person whose sole thought was to give of himself to others. His prayers were thoughtful and always gaged to the spiritual needs of each day. He was down-to-earth as Christ was down-to-earth, deeply spiritual, of course, as a great minister must be but still a simple and unassuming man among men.

When he first became our Chaplain, I asked him, just before a new Congress, whether he would think favorably of inviting the membership to join in the Lord's Prayer. He thought it was a good idea and from that time until this past January, Members will recall that at the opening of each new Congress we said the prayer together as the Lord taught us.

Dr. Braskamp always gave me credit for this procedure, and I have no doubt that in his mind this was deserved. However, as I always told him, I got the idea from his predecessor, Dr. Montgomery. Nevertheless, I am glad it was I who suggested it to Dr. Braskamp and I commend the practice to his successor. To me, there is nothing more stirring in the entire congressional year than the moment when we bow our heads and say the Lord's Prayer together.

And so our beloved Chaplain has been called to some work higher than mortal and we shall have to depend on memories to sustain us in our loss. My sympathy goes out to his bereaved family. They will take comfort from the knowledge that he is now with his beloved wife who preceded him to heavenly rest some years ago.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the account of the passing of Dr. Braskamp which appeared in the morning press revealed a full and useful life of dedication to the ministry.

I was deeply impressed reading of the determination this gentle, modest man showed as a youngster fighting against odds to get an education.

We all know how devoted Dr. Braskamp was to the House of Representatives as an institution and to each of us as individual Members.

His kindness and good will was reflected in every conversation I ever had with him, and I had many, because talking with him was always a warm and pleasant experience.

Dr. Braskamp brought to his assignment as Chaplain of the House of Representatives a distinguished background of church leadership.

But it was not his experience, but his qualities of character—his helpfulness, his humanity and his never-failing sense of humor—which so endeared him to all of us.

As he was devoted to us, we were devoted to him, and shall sorely miss having him walk among us from day to day.

To his bereaved children and to his brother and sister I offer my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has had the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives and hearing the daily inspirational messages of Dr. Bernard Braskamp, will never be quite the same sort of person.

His was a quiet voice, but a voice of power. It was a soothing influence in the often troubled din of congressional debate. His wise counsel helped many a troubled legislator over the rough spots which so often occur.

Dr. Braskamp will be missed, but his influence will never quite be forgotten in the House of Representatives and we are better human beings and America is a better place because he served here.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House of Representatives for

the past 16 years, is indeed a sad occasion for every Member of the House. His spiritual guidance and eloquent prayers have been an immeasurable source of inspiration and comfort to us all ever since he first assumed his duties in 1950. We have all lost a beloved pastor whose abiding interest was the spiritual welfare of this House and all who had the good fortune to know him.

Dr. Braskamp spent virtually his entire ministry in the city of Washington, D.C. In 1911, after receiving his bachelor of theology and master of arts in philosophy, he accepted a call to the famous Church of the Covenant, now known as the National Presbyterian Church. From that time on he was a leader in the spiritual affairs of the city and became an internationally recognized leader in religious circles.

However, we will all remember him as one of our own, leading us, praying for us, and counseling us in his gentle, convincing way. It was my privilege to be his friend, and it was a friendship from which I grew great sustenance. He was always willing to lend an ear, he was a kind and effective spiritual counselor. He was a man of profound convictions, a man whose life was moved by a deep faith in God. This faith and conviction was manifest in everything he did, and certainly we Members of the House were far richer because of his influence.

In a moving prayer offered in the House after the death of President John F. Kennedy, Dr. Braskamp prayed:

> We are not saying "farewell" but only "goodnight" for this is our faith that someday we shall dwell together in hallowed union and be forever with our blessed Lord in that fairer land whose language is music and where there is eternal joy.

In this spirit, I bid my dear friend a fond "goodnight."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the total amount of good in the world is measured by the quality of superior lives. So long as we have men in the character of our beloved Chaplain, evil can make no headway. We mourn his passing in the ripeness of years, but even more we treasure the memory of his days among us.

Dr. Braskamp has filled two careers with worthy deeds. First, he served his chosen church with distinction through a long period that would encompass an ordinary lifetime. Then he came to us in the House, where he has touched the life of each and every one of us, possibly at times when we were scarcely aware of his influence. The inner glow of security in his own personality shone through and warmed us when we were sick at heart and overwhelmed with doubt and uncertainty.

> Greatness and goodness are not means, but ends.
> Hath he not always treasures, always friends,
> The good, great man? Three treasures, love, and light,
> And calm thoughts, regular as infant's breath;
> And three firm friends, more sure than day and night,
> Himself, his Maker, and the angel Death.
> —COLERIDGE.

Dr. Braskamp's career calls to mind the ancient rabbinic legend of Sandalphon, the angel of prayer, as rehearsed for us by Longfellow. In the legend, Sandalphon stood at the outermost gates of the city celestial listening to the sounds that ascended from the earth beneath:

> From the spirits on earth that adore,
> From the souls that entreat and implore
> In the fervor and passion of prayer;
> From the hearts that are broken with losses,
> And weary with dragging the crosses
> Too heavy for mortals to bear.
> And he gathers the prayers as he stands,
> And they change into flowers in his hands,
> Into garlands of purple and red;
> And beneath the great arch of the portal,
> Through the streets of the City Immortal
> Is wafted the fragrance they shed.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late beloved friend and Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

Reverend Braskamp was a great and good man, Mr. Speaker, a man who devoted his life to the Christian ministry. As Chaplain of the House, Reverend Braskamp in his daily prayers—memorable, devout, searching prayers—recorded the stream of human events.

His memorial prayer for the late President John F. Kennedy was pure eloquence. His prayer of hope for his successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson, was an inspiring message of encouragement to our new leader.

From a small house in Alton, Iowa, Dr. Braskamp made his way ultimately to Washington and to this House. He was a wonderful man—a great American, a fine human being, a gentleman, and a living inspiration to us all. We shall miss him greatly.

I extend to his family an expression of deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement. A great and good man has gone to his reward.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this House has sustained a great loss this week with the passing of our beloved Chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

In his quiet way, Dr. Braskamp was a constant source of spiritual comfort to all Members of this House, both those who shared his denominational preference and those who were members of other faiths. All of us, in different ways, have profited by knowing this kindly and gracious man. His passing leaves a great void in this House, but he shall never be forgotten by those of us to whom he gave so generously of himself.

For more than a half century, Dr. Braskamp did God's work and the world is a better place for his presence. To all Members of the House his loss comes as a personal one. Each of us has lost a good friend.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in extending our condolences to his son, Bernard, Jr., and to his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker, and to the other members of his family.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington as a freshman Member of the House, one of the things I found most heartening was the high quality spiritual guidance given the Members of the House of Representatives by their Chaplain, the late Reverend Bernard Braskamp. Perhaps I responded more warmly to him because he was a fellow Iowan and because he also rose from modest beginnings and found, through education, a means to serve others. I only know that I found his daily message a source of wisdom and inspiration and one which helped me view the daily round of quorum calls, rollcalls, and speeches as part of the continuing march of our national history.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say how fortunate the House of Representatives has been in being served by so illustrious a Chaplain as Dr. Braskamp, and I join all Members, both old and new, in offering my sympathy to his family and to all who have lost his valued guidance. Dr. Braskamp, however, had lived life to the full and in a manner worthy of his calling. There can be no finer eulogy to him than to paraphrase a line from one of the last prayers he offered for us. Surely, for him, that prayer, uttered just a few weeks ago, was fully answered for he, indeed, had "removed from him everything that holds us back from a complete surrender to Thy ways and Thy will."

Mr. Speaker, there can be no higher praise than to acknowledge that in Dr. Braskamp, we knew a man who preached to us, not only with his words, but also with his life.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected death of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, was a great shock. He was a man of wisdom, and good counsel who daily reminded this House that everything we do here, no matter how vital and enduring it may seem at the moment, shall all pass away but that the Kingdom of the Lord shall endure forever.

For 16 years Chaplain Braskamp ministered to this House, invoking divine blessings on our efforts. Although he was a stanch Presbyterian, he served God; and his ministry applied alike to all who serve and have served in this House.

We will miss this good and wise man who so honorably served the Lord in this Hall of public servants. I join my colleagues in extending condolences to his family and assure them that their father and brother has won an enduring place in the annals of Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened with the passing of our beloved Chaplain. His voice is now silenced but he is still to be heard. He is saying to us now what he has many times said in his counsel to us, individually and collectively. Whatever the loss, whatever the problem, however dark and formidable things may appear, whatever our grief and whatever our hardship: "Be of good cheer."

In our grief of losing Dr. Braskamp we need but remind ourselves of his sustaining words of encouragement: "be of good cheer." "God's will be done."

The words he lived by come from Joshua:

> Be strong and of good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

In his prayers, as he opened each session for 16 years, he would inspire us and encourage us in the tasks before us. In more ways than we will ever know he gave us courage and renewed our strength.

To his bereaved family I offer my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the passing of our beloved Chaplain. Dr. Bernard Braskamp, who labored in the service of the Master for over half a century, climaxed his ministry with almost two decades of service to the House of Representatives.

For these many years he has opened our daily deliberations with appeals for divine guidance, inspired us to nobler efforts as we struggled with the problems of war and peace, and lightened our labors with spiritual comfort.

For some time Dr. Braskamp had prefaced his daily devotions with passages from the Bible. I believe that these recitations from the Scriptures have led the members of his congressional flock to read further from the Word of God.

Like Apollos, one of the fellow servants of the Apostle Paul, Dr. Braskamp was an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord.

Mrs. Collier and I extend our sympathies to the family. We know that they will be comforted and sustained with the knowledge that the ministry of their father and brother has borne much fruit.

In the words of the Master:

Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today this House is saddened by the loss of a great man, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

Our beloved Chaplain has been taken from us. God's vicar in the House of Representatives has been called to the side of his Maker.

What can I say? Words fail to adequately express the impact of this man upon all of us who serve today in this body, and those who preceded us during the 16 years Bernard Braskamp was the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

For nearly six decades, this good, this tender, this dedicated man unselfishly gave of himself in the service of others.

He came to us following four decades as pastor of one of the Nation's Capital's greatest churches.

This man was always available to comfort.

He was always available to counsel.

This man was always available to give hope where there seemed to be none. He was always ready with a smile and a humorous word to cheer, and somehow brighten even the darkest of days.

This House has had its giants. It does today. It will tomorrow.

But, somehow, a man like Bernard Braskamp is in a class all to himself.

He performed not a simple—not an easy task.

He tenderly, wisely led his flock. He was the good shepherd.

Both Mrs. Gibbons and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to Dr. Braskamp's family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp was pastor to us all. There was not a Member of this body who did not feel a personal closeness to him. Our grief at his passing is deep and it is universal. He served his God and his fellowman with humility and dedication. The influence of his spirituality, reflecting his simple but unquestioning faith, will remain with us forever.

He was devoted to his wife and children, and after the death of Mrs. Braskamp he seemed to be marking time, as it were, until the happy hour of his reunion with his beloved in the realms above.

To his daughter, Mrs. Norman E. Tucker, and his son, Bernard, Jr., and other members of the family I extend my sympathy.

It seems only yesterday, although actually a number of years ago, that Dr. Braskamp was telling me with pride of his son's marriage to a charming young woman of Chicago's South Side. After that marriage the Chicago delegation felt that we had a share in the proprietorship of the House Chaplain. We often reminded him that while he may have been born and brought up in Iowa, his daughter-in-law came from our State of Illinois. Dr. Braskamp was so beloved everyone sought some reason for claiming a special share in him.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that all of us here note the passing of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D. Dr. Braskamp has faithfully served the House of Representatives for 16 years and during all those years provided a needed and welcomed daily moment of reflection and rededication.

For more than 40 years Rev. Dr. Braskamp served his church and God well. His church in return recognized his service and godliness. At the time of his death he was moderator of the Synod of Baltimore, dean of the Presbyterian Ministers in Washington and president of the Princeton Theological Seminary Association in Washington.

It was the mark of the man, Mr. Speaker, that despite the many different religious beliefs held by the many Members of this body he was able to find a common, sincere ground for all. He daily was the means whereby each Member, in keeping with his own faith, could for a moment at least withdraw from the frenetic life and ponder the higher order of things. It is ironic and sad, Mr. Speaker, that this same privilege is denied many of our schoolchildren.

In the past 16 years that Dr. Braskamp was Chaplain of the House of Representatives, I came to know him quite well. It was a matter of some amusement between us, for instance, that Brooklyn could also claim him as a son since he was ordained there in 1911. The power, sincerity, and warmth of the man were such that I consider myself fortunate to have known him. To that I can only add that I have lost a true friend as was his lovely wife who passed away about 5 years ago.

I extend to his son and daughter and loved ones my deepest sympathy upon their great loss.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with profound sorrow I join my colleagues in expressing our grief over the loss of our Chaplain, Dr. Bernard Braskamp.

He was a great force for good in our midst and all of us are better for having known him. He was full of sympathetic and generous impulses toward us, and all mankind, and he will not be forgotten by any of us who served here with him.

We mourn his passing as a cherished member of our family circle, and I wish to join my friends and colleagues in expressing my great esteem for our friend and spiritual leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the House of Representatives, was a shock to all of us and countless others who knew and respected him.

Many of you knew of the warm friendship existing between the late Dr. Braskamp and Charles B. Hoeven, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, until his retirement in 1964.

The moving tribute to Dr. Braskamp by his longtime friend will be of deep interest to everyone.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BERNARD BRASKAMP

(By Hon. Charles B. Hoeven, former Member of Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa)

Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, was one of my dearest and devoted friends. I deeply regret his sudden passing and shall miss him very much in the days that lie ahead.

Dr. Braskamp became Chaplain of the House of Representatives in 1950 and served in that capacity with honor and distinction until the time of his death. Prior to becoming Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp had served as Assistant Chaplain for 3 years during the absence of the then Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery.

Dr. Braskamp was born in my hometown of Alton, Iowa, and I recall making a speech in the House of Representatives when he was first chosen to be the Chaplain of the House. In that speech, I tried to reflect the feeling of admiration and pride which the people of Alton had for one of their distinguished sons. Later on, when Dr. Braskamp's prayers in the House were first published as a House document, he asked me to write the foreword which he continued to use in subsequent publications until the time of his death. It also has been my rare privilege, as chairman of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, to nominate Dr. Braskamp for the position of Chaplain on the convening of three sessions of the Congress.

In introducing Dr. Braskamp to some of my friends, I often referred to him as one of my "shirttail relatives," in that his oldest brother married one of my father's sisters. In short, we had a close companionship throughout our joint service in the House of Representatives, and I have many happy recollections of our close association throughout the years.

Dr. Braskamp took great pride in the fact that for many years three Alton, Iowa, boys served together in official capacities in the House of Representatives; they being the late Claude S. Scheckel, one of the official reporters of debates, Dr. Braskamp as Chaplain, and myself as a Member of Congress from the

Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, in which the town of Alton, Iowa, is located. Practically every day when the House was in session, the three of us chatted together about people and events in our old hometown. Naturally, our friendship ripened throughout the years.

Dr. Braskamp was a great and a good man, whom I can best describe as a first-class Christian gentleman. Although an ordained minister of the Gospel, with deep religious convictions, he was also one who had the "common touch." He was a dedicated and loyal servant of his Lord and Master and served well his day and generation. Those in the House of Representatives, whom he served so well, have had their lives enriched through the daily prayers offered in their behalf. Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the surviving son and daughter and to all members of the family.

"Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years the U.S. House of Representatives was privileged to have as its Chaplain the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp. This servant of the Lord lived a life reflecting his profound belief in God and the principles He taught.

Reverend Braskamp's actions will long serve as an inspiration to each of us who knew him. His wise reflections and ministrations were sources of strength and courage to this House in many difficult times.

I would take this opportunity to express my sympathies to Dr. Braskamp's family. What a great sense of loss they must feel at this time. At the same time, they must also sense a feeling of pride and love knowing that God's work was furthered during Reverend Braskamp's lifetime.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of our Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, who so faithfully served the House of Representatives for 16 years. My association with Dr. Braskamp had been but a brief 3 years, but I had come to rely on his devotion to our spiritual needs, which was marked by a distinct capacity to raise our level of vision of the tasks and responsibilities thrust upon us and to broaden our outlook. His daily prayers inspired us to rely on balanced judgments, steady hands, and awakened conscience, and to pray and work for the good of our fellow men. He had given us courage and steadfastness to face our duties with new hope. He was an intimate, respected member of our family and will be sorely missed.

My deepest sympathy goes to the members of his family in their great loss.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, When Dr. Braskamp, our beloved Chaplain, died the House lost another one of its inspirations. It would be needless for me to say he was a devoted, able public servant because everybody knows that.

He had that happy facility, whether you were in bed ill or on your feet feeling fine, of making you feel better. He was truly one of God's great leaders. All of us will miss him much.

Our deepest sympathy goes to his loved ones in this, their hour of great loss.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it would be extremely disappointing if I were unable to add a few words to the volumes of appreciation and admiration which followed the passing on of our beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp.

All of us are familiar with the outstanding events of his life, from his birth in Alton, Iowa, to his quiet "moving on" here in Washington. None of this needs to be repeated here.

In the 16 years that he served as the first full-time Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, all of us became aware of his practice of reciting appropriate verses of Scripture, preliminary to his prayer for divine guidance and support for the deliberations of the Members of Congress.

This mild-mannered and devout man of the spirit was beloved by all. In my frequent contacts and informal visits with Reverend Braskamp, I always felt a warmth radiating from this man. He displayed a kindly consideration and respect for the serious nature of the work of the Congress as well as an appreciation of the Members' desire to acknowledge that the guidance of divine providence entered into the grave decision-making in the U.S. House of Representatives.

In going from us, it is comforting to believe that he has gone on—a little ahead of us, and that somewhere he is still repeating those verses which were a testimony to his and our faiths in the mercy and justice he sought to convey to us and to all mankind.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker the death of the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp means not only the loss of an inspiring spiritual leader, but the loss of a valued personal friend to each Member of the House of Representatives, as well as to vast numbers of his former parishioners in Washington, and to the many who had come to know him in other ways. It is difficult to imagine how so simple and unassuming a man could achieve so spectacular a success in his ministry.

Somehow, his earnest sincerity became all the more effective because it was combined with friendly humor, just as his learning and logic became the more effective because they were combined with wit. The words of praise and sorrow spoken on the floor of the House since his death, and entered in the RECORD, are no mere matter of courteous recognition of Dr. Braskamp's 16 years of devoted service as Chaplain, but a heartfelt tribute of affection from the numerous individuals who had felt the full impact of his personality.

Seeing what great numbers of individuals are deeply and personally affected by Dr. Braskamp's death, I am reminded of the story about the funeral service of another great minister of the Gospel, Father Francis P. Duffy, chaplain of the "Fighting 69th" in World War I. A man is said to have come to the door of New York's great St. Patrick's Cathedral, while the service was going on, and demanded to be admitted because, he said, he had been an intimate friend of Father Duffy. The policeman with whom he was expostulating waved one hand toward the full cathedral, and the other toward the overflow crowd massed on the sidewalk, and said: "So were all these."

It took little contact with Dr. Braskamp to establish a feeling of intimate friendship. He was one who cared deeply, for the fulfillment of his Christian ministry in the service of God, for his prayerful contribution to the welfare of the country and of the House of Representatives, and for the concerns of each individual who came in any way within the scope of his generous ministry. He was so effective as Chaplain of the House of Representatives because we knew that he was truly concerned, both about each of us as a human individual, and about our problems of political and moral judgment.

He was aware, and he made it his business to keep us aware, that every political problem has its moral aspect—that every proposed measure must be scrutinized from the viewpoint of two inseparable questions: "Will it work?" and "Is it right?" The pragmatist is satisfied with the answer to the first question. The starry-eyed idealist is satisfied with the answer to the second. The Christian politician, as Dr. Braskamp so often and so forcibly reminded us, must seek solutions both practical and just. The Reverend Bernard Braskamp has earned from us, his many sorrowing friends, the noblest epitaph any man could hope for: we feel that we are better men for having known him.

On Sunday, April 18, 1965, Dr. Braskamp was the guest on my special Easter Sunday television and radio broadcast. Because of the reflections of Dr. Braskamp's life and work given in the discussion we had on this occasion, I am particularly pleased to share with my colleagues excerpts from this interview:

Mr. HORTON. In keeping with the spirit of this Easter Sunday, I am pleased to have as my guest today the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives. Dr. Braskamp is the first man ever to serve the House of Representatives full time as its Chaplain and he has served the post longer than any other man in history for the past 16 years.

Our Chaplain is a native of Iowa; he graduated from the University of Michigan and received his master's degree from Princeton University. Before coming to the House of Representatives in 1950, Dr. Braskamp served 40 years as pastor of a number of churches in the Washington area. Of Dr. Braskamp, the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn from Texas, said, "To the entire membership of the House of Representatives he is a counselor, friend, and brother."

I am honored to endorse this sentiment and welcome Dr. Braskamp to this Easter Sunday "Report From Washington."

Dr. BRASKAMP. FRANK, that is a very complimentary introduction. I appreciate it.

Mr. HORTON. Thank you, Dr. Braskamp. I'm sure that my constituents would be very much interested in what special ministerial duties you find distinguish your work in Congress from the many years you served in individual churches.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I remember very distinctly when I first ascended the rostrum to offer the prayer 16 years ago. Mr. Taft's campaign manager from Ohio said, "Now, 'Barnie,'" (he always called me "Barnie") "I'll tell you what you want to do—you want

to take a good look at the Congressmen, then pray for the country."

I've been doing that ever since.

Mr. HORTON. Has the House always had a minister that serves as Chaplain?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Yes, I think so, from the very beginning of the Continental Congress.

Mr. HORTON. I always note that when there is some pressing national concern, some national crisis, you frequently reflect this in your prayers and ask for God's help.

Dr. BRASKAMP. Naturally, I try to make my prayers appropriate for the occasion and when there is some very pressing crisis, I refer to that.

Mr. HORTON. I try, of course, to get over for the opening of each session. Many of our citizens don't realize that we start at 12:00 noon when we are in session. Of course, we do open with a prayer. Do you usually perform that function?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Yes. According to the ruling made by the Speaker, I am privileged to have one guest Chaplain per week. For awhile, with 435 Members, we had so many requests the Speaker decided to limit the number. So, from that time on we have had only one per week.

Mr. HORTON. I notice also that you have the habit of prefacing your opening prayer with a verse of Scripture. Why do you do this and where did this custom come from?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Well, naturally one evening when I was in my study I picked from my bookshelves a copy of the "Book of Prayers," by Edward Everett Heel, who was Chaplain of the Senate in 1900, and I noticed that he prefaced all his prayers with a verse of Scripture. So, the next morning I told the Speaker that I had made this observation and he suggested I do the same thing. Ever since I have been prefacing all my prayers with a verse of Scripture—from both the Old and New Testaments.

Mr. HORTON. Do you find that you get many comments from the Members of the House or from spectators who are in the gallery about the prayer?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Oh yes, quite frequently at the close of the prayer someone comes to me and says it was a fine prayer or that they appreciate my remembering an event in my prayer.

Mr. HORTON. Of course, I realize that many people don't know this, but your work does include more than opening each session with prayer. Tell me a little about some of your other duties.

Dr. BRASKAMP. As you stated a moment ago, I happen to be the first Chaplain in the history of the Congress who is making it a full-time ministry. Years before all the Chaplains were men with parishes of their own. Naturally, they couldn't spend much time with the Congress after the prayer. But after my prayer I usually sit on both sides and make no distinction between the two parties, and I feel as much at home with the Democrats as I do with the Republicans—the Republicans as much as the Democrats.

Mr. HORTON. Do you have many opportunities for private counseling or any requests for private counseling?

Dr. BRASKAMP. Yes, quite frequently I have, in addition to my duties to offer the opening prayer, requests for counseling. I have an office in the Capitol—a very fine office; it's very beautiful. I frequently have time for counseling with Members of the Congress. They have their own problems, you know, as the folks did in my parish before during those 45 years that I was in the ministry.

Mr. HORTON. From my knowledge of the work you do, you really are not only a minister for all the Congressmen in the House of Representatives, but probably your congregation is the largest in the country.

Dr. BRASKAMP. Well, you take 435 Members and their families and clerks—or anyone who connects in any way with Congress—and all are perfectly free to call on me for any service I can render.

Mr. HORTON. I think it is important this Easter season to leave the impression with those who are watching this show and listening to it on the radio that there is a sense of faith in God and a reverence for God here in the Nation's Capital. And, in spite of all the inroads that have been made into prayer in school, the problems dealing with the Supreme Court decision, there is a strong reliance here in the Congress on God.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I believe, FRANK, that during the last 10 years there has been noted evidence on the part of the Members in spiritual things. The first subject of conversation when I visit with a Member of Congress is one of religion.

Mr. HORTON. Dr. Braskamp, are there any special events that you have noticed in the last 16 years that stand out in your mind in your duties as Chaplain?

Dr. BRASKAMP. The day when the Puerto Ricans opened fire, I happened to be on the floor and sat about 50 feet from Kenneth Roberts of Alabama. I called every day on those Members of Congress, especially when men they knew were seriously injured. I had a wonderful opportunity then to find out just what their thoughts were along the line of the spiritual.

Mr. HORTON. Another thing I'd like to point out, Dr. Braskamp, is that I hold in my hand a book of prayers that were offered by you. This was published as a public record and I understand that very shortly you are going to have a new book "Book of Prayers" which will set forth some of the prayer messages that you have given in the openings of Congress.

Dr. BRASKAMP. This one contains all of the prayers that I have offered, not any of the prayers of the guest chaplains. The Speaker thought we might as well include only the prayers of the Chaplain. Now these books are printed every 4 years by resolution of Congress.

Mr. HORTON. Dr. Braskamp, in the short time that we have left, perhaps you might say a word by way of an Easter message to my constituency.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I would be delighted, for after all, you and I, as church members and Christians, believe that the Easter Sunday is the greatest day on the calendar of the church year, emphasizing some of the things we often take for granted. First, it is the outstanding manifestation of the power of God—Son of God raised from the dead by the power of God. And then, the outstanding fact that we're thinking about the resurrection of the Christ. The atheist doesn't, of course, believe in anything of that kind and says it is all a record, this whole business of religion; then the agnostic says, "Who knows, Christ is not with us now." But those who believe in the Christian faith feel that Christ has risen from the dead and is now among us.

Mr. HORTON. I think it is appropriate as we close that we recognize that even here in Washington, where there is great bustle and great activity of a capital of a democracy where man is free under God, we pause here to pay honor of God and to recognize that the things we have, the gifts we have, the talents we have are gifts to us from God and that it is important for each of us to use those as best we can to make His kingdom here on earth a little bit better for those that we serve.

Dr. Braskamp, I want to thank you for being here today.

Dr. BRASKAMP. I'm grateful to you, FRANK, and send my greetings to your folks, will you?

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the Members of the House that funeral services for Reverend Braskamp will be held Friday, February 25, at 1 p.m. at Sixth Presbyterian Church, 16th and Kennedy Streets NW., with the interment at Rock Creek Cemetery. Those wishing to pay their respects may call at the Hines Funeral Home, 2901 14th Streets NW., until 10 p.m. today and between the hours of 8 a.m. and 10 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, February 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and public service of the late Reverend Braskamp.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE BERNARD BRASKAMP, D.D., CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 745

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Bernard Braskamp, D.D., Chaplain of the House.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to his memory the Speaker appoint a committee of seven Members to attend the funeral services.

Resolved, That the necessary expenses in connection with the funeral services be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints, as members of the committee to attend the funeral of our beloved Chaplain, the following Members of the House: Mr. GREIGG, Mr. GROSS, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. BANDSTRA, Mr. CULVER, Mr. HANSEN of of Iowa, and Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned in memory of our late beloved Chaplain.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 24, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2082. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report of review of approval of mortgage insurance on housing project for the elderly in Houston, Tex., Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2083. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings through direct procurement of components used in production of variable timing fuses, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2084. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a communication relative to the report on potential savings through direct procurement of components used in production of variable timing fuses, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2085. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DANIELS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5147. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Acts of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 741. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9963, a bill to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 742. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12169, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 743. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 12889, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 12973. A bill to require certain sanitation measures in laundries of federally operated or federally assisted hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 12974. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12975. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder based on increases in the cost of living and the gross national product; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12976. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to protect adult health by providing assistance in the establishment and operation of regional and community health protection centers for the detection of disease, by providing assistance for the training of personnel to operate such centers, and by providing assistance in the conduct of certain research related to such centers and their operation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 12977. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 12978. A bill to permit the city of Memphis, Tenn., to count expenditures in connection with the Beale Street interceptor sewer as local grants-in-aid to certain urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 12979. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12980. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat sintering or burning as a mining process in the case of shale, clay, and slate, used or sold for use as lightweight concrete aggregates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 12982. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12983. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 12984. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 12985. A bill to provide that the United States shall make no payments or contributions to the United Nations for furnishing assistance to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12986. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 12987. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 12988. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12989. A bill to provide that tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use on motor vehicles shall comply with certain safety and labeling regulations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12990. A bill to prescribe certain safety features for all motor vehicles manufactured for, sold, or shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12991. A bill to provide for research, design, development, and construction of fully operational passenger motor vehicles in prototype quantities embodying certain safety features; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12992. A bill to establish a National Highway Traffic Safety Center to promote research and development activities for highway traffic safety, to provide financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 12993. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the maximum rate of percentage depletion to a rate of 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 12994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 12995. A bill to amend the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 772), providing for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 12996. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1886, relating to the transportation in the coastwise trade of passengers on foreign vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennesee:

H.R. 12997. A bill to extend until July 15, 1968, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 12998. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental retardation facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 12999. A bill to declare the Illinois and Michigan Canal abandoned as a navigable waterway of the United States of America, to quitclaim any interest the United States of America may have therein to the State of Illinois to remove or prevent clouds upon land titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 13000. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13001. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States

aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 13002. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for a method of designating U.S. ports for export of commodities donated abroad; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 13003. A bill to amend Public Law 660, 86th Congress, to establish a National Traffic Safety Agency to provide national leadership to reduce traffic accident losses by means of intensive research and vigorous application of findings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 13004. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of California (by request):

H.R. 13005. A bill to provide recognition as veterans of the Indian wars for persons who took part in the capture of the Ute Indians in 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 13006. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 13007. A bill to amend section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 13008. A bill to amend section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13009. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 13010. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 13011. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Redwood National Park in the State of California, to provide economic assistance to local governmental bodies affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 13012. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 13013. A bill to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 by repealing section 209(g); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 13014. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 13015. A bill to authorize the construction of extensions of the American Canal at El Paso, Tex., operation and maintenance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 13016. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of periods of service performed as a commissioner of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13017. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 13018. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 13019. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13020. A bill providing for a study of serious interruptions of certain essential services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 13021. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist States and communities in meeting the initial cost of establishment and operation of programs for the care of patients with kidney diseases and to train professional personnel needed to conduct such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 13022. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on Federal property in Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.J. Res. 842. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.J. Res. 843. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually proclamations designating the Sunday of each year which occurs immediately preceding February 22, a Freedom Sunday and the calendar week of each year during which February 22 occurs as Freedom Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.J. Res. 844. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the fourth week in April of each year as "Youth Temperance Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 845. Joint resolution to require that reports on imports into the United States include the landed value of articles imported, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVE:

H.J. Res. 846. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Comimttee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.J. Res. 847. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution to provide that an aircraft carrier shall be named the *Nimitz;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 740. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the obligation of all member nations of the United Nations to resist acts of aggression like those of the Communists in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Res. 746. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to study the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 747. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 13023. A bill for the relief of Caterine and Giacomo Pescetto and their minor child, Enrico Pescetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 13024. A bill for the relief of Clifton R. Kindt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 13025. A bill for the relief of Peter Cayouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 13026. A bill for the relief of Rosa E. Llobell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 13027. A bill for the relief of Michele Barbieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13028. A bill for the relief of Abraham Nassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13029. A bill for the relief of Ruby H. Holder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13030. A bill for the relief of Oswald Ethelred Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13031. A bill for the relief of Arthur Othterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13032. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13033. A bill for the relief of Pietro D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13034. A bill for the relief of Nasser Shahoulian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 13035. A bill to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13036. A bill for the relief of Stephen H. Clarkson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

332. By Mr. MAHON: Petition of students of Big Spring, Tex., Senior High School; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

333. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Convention of the Diocese of Washington of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., relative to security under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1965 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Norman Abelson, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,062.50. E. (9) $479.92.

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $41. E. (9) $92.12.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $759.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E. C. 3, England, and Norwegian Shipowners Association, Post Office Box 1452, Oslo, Norway.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $626.05.

A. Allen & Murden, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Informal Committee of 16 European and Other Foreign Cruise Ship Lines, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $3,497.24.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,012.50. E. (9) $190.13.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,302.74.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $210. E. (9) $210.60.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,073.23. E. (9) $3,073.23.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,777.47. E. (9) $10,777.47.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $112.75. E. (9) $13,794.78.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,177.50. E. (9) $10,177.50.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $814.48 E. (9) $814.48.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,650.12.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $32.60.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $32.50.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $16,351.56.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corps., 180 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $104.67.

A. Roy A. Archibald, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class one railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $175.49. E. (9) $1,152.03.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $331.96.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Floor Covering Committee Affiliated with the National Council of American Importers, 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $203.08.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Brothers Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,359.49.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,676.

A. Automatic Car Wash Association-International, 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,500.

A. Robert C. Barnard.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Wm. J. Barnhard, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Italy-America Chamber of Commerce, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $69.84.

A. Lowell R. Beck, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Council for Photogrammetry, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,279.70.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,821.92.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.18.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,851.16.

A. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,938.85.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,275.60. E. (9) $731.67.

A. Blumberg, Singer, Ross & Gordon, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Melvin J. Boyle, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,328.52.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 122 Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.
E. (9) $274.95.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,432.73.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $700.

A. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,514.14. E. (9) $7,514.14.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,460. E. (9) $3,460.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,800.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Pacific Sugar Mills, Ltd., Suva, Fiji.
E. (9) $2,400.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $74.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $204. E. (9) $567.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,564.92

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) $8.15.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $155. E. (9) $155.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $249.49.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33,050. E. (9) $8,366.04.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $21.26.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 805 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $1,842. E. (9) $2,677.36.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. W. W. Carson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $24,968. E. (9) $36,455.19.

A. Donald E. Channell, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bar Association, 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $14.60.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $31,763.33. E. (9) $247.95.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,913. E. (9) $9,700.85.

A. Citizens Radiophone Association, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $6.35.

A. William F. Claire, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $1,279.39.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. Gross & Co., et al.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $94.02.

A. David Cohen, 1223 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1223 Connecticut Aevenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,391.56. E. (9) $276.45.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $9.53.

A. Paul G. Collins, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $16.10.

A. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $52.25.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,722.87. E. (9) $13,330.54.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $416.43. E. (9) $416.43.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Writing Instrument Manufacturers Association, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30,172.65.

A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $57.76.

A. Henry Ashton Crosby, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,982.24.

A. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $190.71.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $22.30.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward G. Sparrow, 1 East 66th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,432. E. (9) $454.67.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $27.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,535. E. (9) $2,618.23.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $122.63. E. (9) $41.74.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,600.44.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $41.08.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,500.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $607.37. E. (9) $35.

A. Emergency Committee To Protect Cotton Growers, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,246.33. E. (9) $4,191.29.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chinese Government Procurement and Services Mission, Division for Taiwan Sugar Corp., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $95.40.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $46.73.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $586.78. E. (9) $586.78.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $351.25.

A. Robert W. Frase, 1820 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 1 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $6,017.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $288.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,741.37. E. (9) $463.95.

A. Harry J. Gerrity, 907 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $150.63.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, Executive Office, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,288.90.

A. Royce L. Givens, 234 Seventh Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,230. E. (9) $1,725.

A. Robert Glicker, 1642 South 52d Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.

A. Jack Golodner, 286 N Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 4th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $21,000.45 E. (9) $20,957.59.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $408.75.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,200.

A. Milton S. Gwirtzman, 844 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. HRH Construction Co., 579 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $148.65.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $13.

A. Robert N. Hampton, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,874.98. E. (9) $354.95.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,749.98. E. (9) $50.48.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,812.50.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,141.11.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800.

A. Laurance G. Henderson, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mayer, Friedlich, Spiess, Tierney, Brown, & Platt, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and Simpson, Thatcher, & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $202.50. E. (9) $202.50.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $541.45. E. (9) $31.

A. Frank N. Hoffman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John W. Holton, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $39.50.

A. Roland S. Homet, Jr.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold A. Hosier, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
B. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $174.17.

A. David P. Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9.75.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $108.75.

A. Harold K. Howe, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, 400 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $660.94. E. (9) $47.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Meryle V. Hutchison, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,026.14.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,284.04.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $26,704.55.

A. International Mailers Union, 2240 Bell Court, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $2,017.35.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $43.08.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $71.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ken Kendrick, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers.
D. (6) $5,692.24. E. (9) $5,692.24.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Kenneth B. Keating, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Robert H. Kellen, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $262.50.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $264. E. (9) $6.81.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $746.76.

A. J. B. Kirklin, Pecos, Tex.
B. Emergency Committee To Protect Cotton Growers, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,055.04.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $348.77.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,960. E. (9) $424.01.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. T. J. Stevenson & Co., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $49.25.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $525.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $7.50.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $57.28.

A. Robert J. Leigh, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $118.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,015.19. E. (9) $3,015.19.

A. John Linnehan, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $706.60.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $1,537.24.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $197.

A. Donald C. Ludwig, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
B. Citizen's Radiophone Association, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $6.35.

A. Donald C. Ludwig, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Citizen Band Council, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $6.35.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $798.46. E. (9) $220.05.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $52.88.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh and L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,712.50. E. (9) $2,106.31.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. Alfred R. McCauley, 720 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $30.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. W. J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $864.08. E. (9) $158.67.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and its subcommittee, Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $73.12.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,594.70. E. (9) $549.80.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $340.75. E. (9) $12.83.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $675.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 924 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,242.02. E. (9) $142.97.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $479.37.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $340. E. (9) $37.44.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,900. E. (9) $410.

A. Henry Mayers, 2301 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,420. E. (9) $1,592.77.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $6,050.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,952. E. (9) $291.77.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Apparel Manufacturers Association, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,700.

A. William R. Merriam, 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 1707 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $3,425.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $1,468.20.

A. Michigan Citizen Band Council, 3306 Kanter, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $6.35.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,206.14. E. (9) $307.35.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association and Canadian Particleboard Association.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,253.35.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,737.50. E. (9) $21.60.

A. Graham T. T. Molitor, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Biscuit Co., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $462.33.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Clarence W. Moore, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, Eugene Continuation Center, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Curtis Morris, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $43,650.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Murphy, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bricklayers, Masons & Plasterers, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $262.30.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7264, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $118.29. E. (9) $168.49.

A. Kenneth D. Naden, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,174.98. E. (9) $160.34.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,564.92.

A. National Association of Building Owners and Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $755.96.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24,743.93. E. (9) $11,423.85.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $843,028.53. E. (9) $14,485.31.

A. National Association of Postal Transportation Contractors, Inc., 4201 31st Street South, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $100.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,627.79.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $450.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,692.24. E. (9) $5,692.24.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $1,853. E. (9) $2,762.37.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $545,341.05. E. (9) $11,644.42.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,547.89.

A. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,780. E. (9) $3,496.53.

A. National Committee for a New Patent Office Building, 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,665.71.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, care of Dr. A. B. Baker, Division of Neurology, University of Minnesota Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $2,000.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,716.88. E. (9) $5,327.04.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
E. (9) $16.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $85,687.48. E. (9) $14,992.55.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,265.09. E. (9) $20,265.09.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $57.98.

A. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,802.95. E. (9) $1,760.40.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,370.

A. National Livestock Feeders Association, 309 Livestock Exchange Building, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $2,600.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue, South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $906.33.

A. National Preservers Association, 25 East Chestnut Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,427.90. E. (9) $12,529.92.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $902.87. E. (9) $1,229.

A. National Rice Users Conference, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,100. E. (9) $29,039.54.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,321.30. E. (9) $11,617.29.

A. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,325.35. E. (9) $11,042.04.

A. National Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,846.21. E. (9) $7,229.23.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $480.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (9) $1,387.50.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,759.12. E. (9) $1,526.98.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $784.04.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Inc., Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $1,014.70.

A. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $2,745.66. E. (9) $649.44.

A. Richard T. O'Connell, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,050. E. (9) $50.48.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, Fourth Floor, Gonzaga Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, Davies Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,490.71.

A. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,928.79.

A. John A. Overholt, 10400 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md. and 1106 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,480.78.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $65.75.

A. Brig. Gen. John L. Person, U.S. Army, retired, La Salle Building, Washington D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,083.33.

A. Sandford Z. Persons, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $118.21.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $188.60.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Population Crisis Committee, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,618. E. (9) $28,292.03.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $31.42.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666. E. (9) $80.45.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bulk Food Carriers, Inc., 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,552.65.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. South Atlantic & Caribbean Line, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Edward M. Raymond, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $58.45.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $799.98. E. (9) $188.62.

A. Research to Prevent Blindness, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. James W. Respess, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $320.31. E. (9) $112.36.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 East Cortland Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association, Post Office Box 512, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $750.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $152.80.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $180.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $200.

A. John F. Rolph III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Rubenstein, Wolfson & Co., Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Independent Coal Operators Association, Pikeville, Ky.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $130.

A. J. T. Rutherford & Associates, Inc., 1555 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $544.51.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $254.03.

A. Oswald Ryan, 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $30.10.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Franscisco, Calif., et al.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,150. E. (9) $3.36.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,953.04.

A. James M. Schuette, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Beer Wholesalers' Association of America, Inc., 6310 North Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Dwight H. Scott, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Biscuit Co., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $591.93.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,592.23. E. (9) $339.47.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores De Azucar, Lima, Peru.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $644.93.

A. Arnold F. Shaw, 503 D Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industria Escobera Mexicana, S.A., Nuevo Laredo, Tamps., Mexico.
E. (9) $13.70.

A. Kenneth D. Shaw, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $474.99.

A. John E. Shea, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $1,128.79.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $300.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $575.

A. Single Persons Tax Reform Lobby, 1692A Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $411.40. E. (9) $390.57.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $24,675. E. (9) $6,967.55.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $47.65.

A. James E. Smith, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $327.26.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,249.99. E. (9) $1,520.56.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $228.35.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,038.90. E. (9) $10,779.93.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $29,263.26. E. (9) $4,887.36.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $150.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16,915.95.

A. Raymond E. Steele, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American and Canadian Importers of Green Olives, Inc., 70 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $53.50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFCO Credit Corp., 108 John Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $113.91.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa.
E. (9) $1,000.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fuji Iron & Steel Co., Ltd., 80 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hohenberg Co., Inc., 1431 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $215.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. ICI (New York), Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $595.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, No. 2, 3-Chome, Nihonbashi, Muromachi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, Inc., New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,450.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Steel Wire Products Exporters' Association, 36 Hisamatsucho, Nohonbashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $215.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Vinyl Goods Manufacturers' Association, 11, 3-Chome Akasaka-Denmacho, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $50.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. A. D. Sutton & Sons, 1 West 37th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Toyoshima & Co., Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $140.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $233.72.

A. Philip W. Stroupe, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $174.90.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $102.66.

A. Roger H. Sullivan.
B. American Sugar Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $40.24.

A. Monroe Sweetland, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, Calif.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $335. E. (9) $50.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,342.04.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bert Tollefson, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,730.10. E. (9) $695.26.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,112.99. E. (9) $1,625.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $68.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,900. E. (9) $43.50.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gladys Uhl, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,777.96. E. (9) $267.29.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,510.55.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $3,500.

A. United World Federalists, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,754.01. E. (9) $1,754.01.

A. F. Bourne Upham III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $580.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $125.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $110.35.

A. Volume Footwear Retailers Association, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11,300. E. (9) $4,784.12.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $261. E. (9) $11.44.

A. Franklin Wallick, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,466.33. E. (9) $933.96.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Clarence M. Weiner, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,375. E. (9) $151.65.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $30.90.

A. Western Cotton Growers Association, Post Office Box 512, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $10,296.08. E. (9) $2,025.

A. The Wheat Users Committee, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38,875. E. (9) $45,362.85.

A. Don White, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $768.77. E. (9) $1,237.68.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Douglas Whitlock II, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,475. E. (9) $115.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $135.86.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 1765 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $26.77.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

E. (9) $2.10.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Spokane Tribe of Indians, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Robert P. Will, 487 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $1,169.64.

A. Edmond L. Williams, 4201 31st Street South, Arlington, Va.

B. National Association of Postal Transportation Contractors, Inc., 4201 31st Street South, Arlington, Va.

D. (6) $60. E. (9) $5.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,744.61. E. (9) $378.04.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government of the Bahamas, Nassau, Bahamas.

D. (6) $6,264.50. E. (9) $418.69.

A. Nathan T. Wolkomir, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,307.73. E. (9) $1,111.82.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,998.

A. Lester L. Zosel, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1965:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ≺

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names 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≺

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Norman Abelson, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $515.60. E. (9) $48.25.

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $22.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Force Sergeants Association, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.
E. (9) $300.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 525 School Street SW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $759.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,038.97. E. (9) $3,038.97.

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee to Abolish House Un-American Activities Committee, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $960. E. (9) $1,437.47.

A. George Venable Allen, 4370 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,845. E. (9) $13.80.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,318.75.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.; 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $28,553. E. (9) $28,553.

A. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $37,450.76.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,430.20. E. (9) $3,978.73.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $324,642.52. E. (9) $5,853.94.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $2,180.52.

A. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,275.

A. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,807.50. E. (9) $6,807.50.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,188.93. E. (9) $3,070.13.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $229.48. E. (9) $28,056.45.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,782.77.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $409.13.

A. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selisgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $4,543.63. E. (9) $4,543.63.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $688.30. E. (9) $688.30.

A. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the Subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for public elementary and secondary education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,096.97. E. (9) $614.12.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,815. E. (9) $7,327.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,421.65.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,709.46.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,341.37. E. (9) $1,341.37.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $900.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Certain cement companies.

A. American Taxpayers Association, 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,574.03.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, Whitinsville, Mass.
D. (6) $5.57.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $12,751.78. E. (9) $12,751.78.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,947.14. E. (9) $1,947.14.

A. Cyrus T. Anderson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spiegel, Inc., 2511 West 23d Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $96. E. (9) $181.04.

A. George W. Apperson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Guild of Prescription Opticians of America, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW.,

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,944.06.

A. Arnold & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Margaret Lee Weil, 50 East 83d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. The Arthritis Foundation, 1212 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $670.12.

A. The Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,003.59. E. (9) $1,003.59.

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $170.71.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. A. V. Atkinson, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,834.03.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $300.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Averill, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $300.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $412.86.

A. Harry A. Barbour, 4925 Deal Drive SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Washington Parking Association, Jefferson Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.97.

A. Ernest L. Barcella, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Robert C. Barnard.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $11.07.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. William G. Barr, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes.
B. Insurance Co. of North America, Life Insurance Co. of North America.
D. (6) $335.30. E. (9) $120.50.

A. James P. Bass, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. John H. Beidler.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,725. E. (9) $471.89.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $18.

A. J. O. Bellenger, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $6.47.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $5,250.

A. Reed A. Benson, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The John Birch Society, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Mass.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,124.59.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Federation of Trades and Labor Unions.
D. (6) $5,670. E. (9) $386.80.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Robert J. Bird, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. John B. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $670.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,355.50. E. (9) $1,158.54.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,811.24.

A. Eugene P. Boardman, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,269.04. E. (9) $29.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $688.46.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $148.47.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $3.65.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 428 South Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Col. A. A. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue S.E., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry.

A. A. Marvin Braverman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East Ten Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,709.46.

A. Wayne L. Bromley, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,950.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $500.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $746.64.

A. J. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $51.85.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuban Electric Co., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co.'s, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $841.20.

A. Donald C. Bruce, 3219 Oliver Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Conservative Union, 1010 Vermont Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.03.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $68. E. (9) $214.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. America Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $3.32.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Mosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 22 Warren Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 22 Warren Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $245.82.

A. George S. Bullen.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $66.90.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Burger, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $562.50.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $18,861.49. E. (9) $429.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,447.92. E. (9) $6.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.
E. (9) $8.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $58.75.

A. Herbert H. Butler, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $100.

A. Monroe Butler, 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $11.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $60.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $252.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Marvin Caplan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,705. E. (9) $152.11.

A. Ronald A. Capone, 505 Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $295.81.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, DC.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $153.94.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $71.

A. Blue Allan Carstenson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,446.02. E. (9) $186.31.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $41,726.65. E. $37,609.83.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alaska Pipeline Co., Post Office Box 6554, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $74.46.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 420 South Milwaukee Avenue, Libertyville, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $196.29.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Asociacion de Comerciantes, en Licores de Nogales, Sonora, Obregon No. 102, Nogales Sonora, Mexico.
E. (9) $44.22.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,103.75. E. (9) $178.72.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S. A. de C. V., Bladeras 36, Primer Piso, Mexico D. F., Mexico.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $1,159.90.

A. James W. Chapman, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,708.50.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Mr. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $29.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,739.01. E. (9) $5,062.55.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Citizens Political Action Association of Prince Georges County, Md., 6302 Furness Avenue, Oxon Hill, Md.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $202.85.

A. James E. Clark, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger A. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Conference of America, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 13125, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $502.65.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., et al.
E. (9) $5.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $1.46.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris, Inc.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $124.99. E. (9) $217.49.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Superior Oil Co.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,350.90. E. (9) $400.83.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $42.71.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Cole & Groner, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Task Force of Small American Shipbuilders, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $216.27.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Navigation System, Inc., Box 7, Agana, Guam.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $212.49.

A. Collier and Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Footwear Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) 170.

A. Collier, Shannon & Rill, 1625 I Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, c/o Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $290.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $12.12.

A. Paul G. Collins, The American Bankers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,183.68.

A. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,970.

A. Committee for a Free Cotton Market, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,804.84.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $5,428.92.

A. R. T. Compton, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $43.15.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Conner, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $126. E. (9) $25.80.

A. Harry N. Cook, 1130 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Waterways Conference.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $2,004.97.

A. Joshua W. Cooper, 626 South Lee Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Portsmouth-Kittery Armed Services Committee, Inc., Post Office Box 239, Portsmouth, N.H.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,391.30.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 1477 West Penden Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division, Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,250. E. (9) $22.85.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,545. E. (9) $57.23.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Lightweight Aggregates Percentage Depletion Committee, care of John W. Roberts, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savings & Loan Bank of the State of New York, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. John T. Curran, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $2,090.38.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 3129 Brereton Court, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $895.83. E. (9) $14.64.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $674.32.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Louisville, Ky.

A. Clifford Davis, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shawnee Coal Co., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $160.40. E. (9) $160.40.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2401 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peoples Life Insurance Co., Equitable Life Insurance Co., and Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Responsive Environments Corp., 21 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 1003 Lancaster Drive, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Milton C. Denbo, 1341 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Car Wash Association, 4432 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $645.

A. John M. Dickerman, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber & Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $112.39.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $57.30.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Engineering Co., Inc., 74 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,267.15. E. (9) $67.15.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,082.40. E. (9) $32.40.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Thurman & Wright, 1203 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $6,375. E. (9) $2,971.25.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $337.50. E. (9) $4.75.

A. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $180.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38,529.50. E. (9) $44,184.49.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Transit Union, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James F. Doherty, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,696.00. E. (9) $461.30.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $12.94.

A. Paul E. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ronald D. Doremus, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $22.50.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $86.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,441.95. E. (9) $146.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. Michael Duncan.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Durand, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $225.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $110.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $69.01.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $24.98.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Management, Inc., Post Office Box 2065, Henderson, Nev.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 111 North Hope Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Las Vegas Valley Water District, 3700 West Charleston Boulevard, Las Vegas, Nev.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,947.50. E. (9) $217.17.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $404. E. (9) $50.40.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,171.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,050. E. (9) $33.40.

A. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. William J. Fannin, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $77,560.40. E. (9) $24,205.08.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $600.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League of the U.S.A., 414 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La., and Florida Sugar Cane League, Post Office Box 1207, Clewiston, Fla.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $23.25.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $125.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $104.28.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,266.66. E. (9) $28.34.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $537.50. E. (9) $70.73.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $57.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $171.36.

A. Morley E. Fox, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 1124 Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $129.18. E. (9) $136.20.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. R. Frank Frazier, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $46,754.55. E. (9) $10,531.99.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.

A. John Baxter Funderburk, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Gadsby, Hannah, Colson & Morin, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for International Housing Through Private Investment, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $182.90. E. (9) $567.31.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $14.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $848.30. E. (9) $374.86.

A. Harry J. Gerrity, 907 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Building Owners and Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $4.95.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1246 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, Executive Office, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,293.31.

A. Arthur P. Gildea, 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.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $78.09.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Plastic & Chemical Corp., Railroad Avenue, West Haverstraw, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $75.65.

A. Ginsburg & Feldman, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Ohio Valley Association, 902 Union Trust Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Glenn P. Glezen, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Philip M. Glick, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District of Columbia Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 710 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $65.

A. Jack Golodner, 286 H Street SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Transworld Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,086.23. E. (9) $3,420.29.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 15401 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,617.18. E. (9) $3,617.18.

A. James A. Gray, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8.75. E. (9) $205.75.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Dale Greenwood, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Washington Railroad Association, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association (Export Agency Division), Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Oceanic Properties, Inc., Post Office Box 2780, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,800.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, American Smelting & Refining Co., and American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Seymour S. Guthman, Executive Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Syndicat des Distillateurs et Producteurs de Sucre de Madagascar, 282 Boulevard, St. Germain, Paris, France.

A. Milton S. Gwirtzman, 844 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. HRH Construction Co., 579 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $14.30.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $692.31. E. (9) $144.56.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $141.91.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew G. Haley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $170.71.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,875.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision Nacional Para el Estudio de la Caña y el Azucar, La Paz, Bolivia.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $4,062.50. E. (9) $398.74.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $29.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1738 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $750.49. E. (9) $345.68.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,833.34. E. (9) $23.15.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,250.12.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $35.75.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $114.03.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $52.85.

A. Robert W. Healy, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bi-Partisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $121.80.

A. H. Struve Hensel, 1521 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. H. C. Stuelcken Sohn, Stuelckenwerft, Hamburg-Steinwerder, Germany.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $323.79.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $383.14.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms, Westfield, Mass., et al.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $12.79.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $65.43.

A. J. J. Hickey, 405 Majestic Building, Cheyenne, Wyo.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $1,290.51.

A. John W. Hight, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Norman Hill, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,188. E. (9) $21.65.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3.40.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $41.45.

A. Hogan & Hartson, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Kaiser Industries Corp., Kaiser Center, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $67.58.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apartment Association of America, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,925. E. (9) $252.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee on Transportation for Metropolitan Washington.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Specialty Contractors' Associations, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $632. E. (9) $128.14.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,475. E. (9) $425.89.

A. Lee B. Holmes, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $12.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Roland S. Homet, Jr.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $2,866.97.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, Jr., 331 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,087.50.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,290.38. E. (9) $15,290.38.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $6,247.20.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. International Armament Corp., 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $4,000.

A. International Association of Machinists, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,531.91.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21,373.40.

A. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975. E. (9) $2.25.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 19 Summit Court, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $14,674.33. E. (9) $22,007.09.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $196.90.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph K. James, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $21.73.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $100.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.51. E. (9) $38.16.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chas. B. Jennings, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1712 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.
E. (9) $100.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,607.74. E. (9) $151.36.

A. T. Richmond Johnson, Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, Arizona Title Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
E. (9) $47.65.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 3206 Ferndale Street, Kensington, Md.
B. Illinois Association of Consulting Engineers, Post Office Box 1202, Springfield, Ill.

A. Karelsen, Karelsen, Lawrence & Nathan, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $202.23.

A. William J. Keating, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Eugene A. Keeney, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas John Kehoe & Associates, 1904 Rockwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
E. (9) $1,733.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. Thomas A. Kelly, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,408.34.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $108.95

A. William J. Kerwin, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehouseman's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,409.26. E. (9) $2,363.66.

A. John L. Kilcullen, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Right to Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $50.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributors and Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $902.62.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 200 C Street SE, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,193. E. (9) $1,193.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $315. E. (9) $43.31.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. Robert M. Koch, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $4,977.09.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,462.50. E. (9) $1,787.71.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,990. E. (9) $5,352.97.

A. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,765.38.

A. Laborers' Political Action League, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,398.19.

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

A. Robert D. Larsen, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Swaziland Sugar Association, Mbabane, Swaziland.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $201.98.

A. Reed E. Larson, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $94.03.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $129.91.

A. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.25. E. (9) $108.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $42.30.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $118.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Nils A. Lennartson, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,749.98.

A. Donald Lerch & Co., Inc., 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shell Chemical Co., 110 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Gilbert B. Lessenco, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Mills, Inc., 9200 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,299.99.

A. Roy T. Lester, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $185. E. (9) $11.75.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $1,170.13.

A. Lightweight Aggregates Percentage Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 9138, Richmond, Va.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $820.65.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4.28.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,576.93. E. (9) $1,336.33.

A. Donald J. Lipsett, 1420 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Conservative Union, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,729.16.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $481.25. E. (9) $10.15.

A. Basil R. Littin, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Maj. Gen. George O. N. Lodoen, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen & Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $150.

A. Paul H. Long, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $40.85.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $20.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,331.27. E. (9) $382.76.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,531.25. E. (9) $4.25.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., Eleventh & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,712.50. E. (9) $607.43.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,442.40.

A. McCarty & Wheatley, 1200 Walker Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Semitropic Water Storage District, 2714 L Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
D. (6) $250.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, State and Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $100.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. Guy G. McConnell, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,230.98. E. (9) $220.28.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $878.20. E. (9) $160.66.

A. Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and the subcommittee Bipartisan Citizens Commission for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, 2107 Davenport Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Benny W. McGehee, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.
B. Air Force Sergeants Association, Post Office Box 908, San Antonio, Tex.
D. (6) $300.

A. F. Howard McGuigan, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
D. (6) $3,836. E. (9) $102.25.

A. E. Perkins McGuire, 800 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. H. C. Stuelcken Sohn, German Shipyard, Stuelckenwerft, Hamburg-Steinwerder, Germany.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $745.79.

A. William F. McKenna, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $34.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,316.67. E. (9) $28.30.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,835.02. E. (9) $41.03.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $208.15.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert D. McMillen, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $433.04.

A. Shane MacCarthy, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Printing Industries of America, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $750.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $627. E. (9) $116.85.

A. Jos. R. MacLaren, 4 Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $370.77.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $812.50. E. (9) $35.75.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,156.87.

A. Carter Manasco, 5932 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,400. E. (9) $102.69.

A. Rufus W. Manderson, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 924 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,242.02. E. (9) $147.75.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,802.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $7.35.

A. Michael Marsh, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $396.16.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $75.73. E. (9) $68.06.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $90.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $100.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,384.54. E. (9) $1,210.

A. J. M. Massey, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $393.34.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $292.10.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45. E. (9) $9.20.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. May, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $364. E. (9) $11.07.

A. Robert A. Means, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,135.72. E. (9) $7.30.

A. Carl J. Megel, 1343 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Teachers, 716 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $6,300.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,256. E. (9) $355.10.

A. Lawrence C. Merthan, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., 235 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $137.50.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,548.70.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Telephone Answering Exchanges, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $90.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $90.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas, Tex., Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,465.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $317.46.

A. Luman G. Miller, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 912 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $248.91.

A. Stephen A. Mitchell, Post Office Box 932, Taos, N. Mex.

A. J. R. Modrall, Post Office Box 466, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
B. Aetna Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Conn.

A. J. R. Modrall, Post Office Box 466, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
B. Travelers Insurance Co. and Travelers Indemnity Co., 1 Tower Square, Hartford, Conn.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13.84. E. (9) $78.28.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $177.67.

A. Morison, Clapp, Abrams & Haddock, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $1,252.39.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Murdoch, Jr., 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Water Co. Conference, 402 Barclay Building, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.

A. John J. Murphy, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113–D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,582.16. E. (9) $58.15.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Murtha, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Building Owners & Managers, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $306.76.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $6.75.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $495.71. E. (9) $7,411.46.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $350.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,627.32. E. (9) $1,627.32.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $23,371.64.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $829.87. E. (9) $485.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40,798.90. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,824.70. E. (9) $12,824.70.

A. National Broiler Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $200.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee To Abolish HUAC, No. 555 Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,437.47. E. (9) $1,437.47.

A. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,798.33.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $393.02.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $9,256.48. E. (9) $9,256.48.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 620 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $605.19. E. (9) $605.19.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $29.93. E. (9) $250.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Farmers Organization, Corning, Iowa.
E. (9) $755.95.

A. National Federation of Independent Business Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,748.64. E. (9) $21,748.64.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Forest Products Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,229.31. E. (9) $1,211.38.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,581.92. E. (9) $20,697.51.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $105.47.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 1200 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,353.81. E. (9) $384.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,446.50. E. (9) $1,446.50.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (7) $25,417.49.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $446.75.

A. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,999.98.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Right To Work Committee, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,777.16. E. (9) $3,105.44.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,572.69.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $865.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87,252. E. (9) $3,959.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $1,256.20. E. (9) $1,800.

A. Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,600. E. (9) $7,328.16.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $1,767.88.

A. George R. Nelson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,031.91.

A. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $423.25. E. (9) $423.35.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. George L. Nichols, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $35.11.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $511.18.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert W. Nolan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $527.63.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $455. E. (9) $5.66.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. North Carolina Cotton Promotion Association, Inc., Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.
E. (9) $346.43.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $469.25.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $250.

A. Seward P. Nyman, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $650.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper Institute, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Transit Association, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $796.26.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for Balanced Legislative Representation, 870 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,407.91.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. El Paso Natural Gas Co., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $397.55.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Amusement Business Association, Box 143, Southfield, Mich.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $12.23.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 1430 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,322.15.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 7703 Normandale Road, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $527.66.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,502.76.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Sugarcane Planters, Gonzaga Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 409 Davies Building, Manila, Philippines.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,030. E. (9) $418.41.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,659.12.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 702 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Harry D. Orr, Jr., 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Robert O. Anderson, Roswell, N. Mex.
E. (9) $50.95.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,650.14.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.
B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $89.63.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramac, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $405.99.

A. Lynn C. Paulson, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $27.99.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,437.48. E. (9) $125.

A. A. Harold Peterson, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. National R.E.A. Telephone Association, 500 Minnesota Federal Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,392.12.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation & Internal Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 6787, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $7.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John P. Philbin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $109.56.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $25.70.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $28.49.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,155.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $20,566.34. E. (9) $1,350.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John W. Pompelli, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $25.30.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $142.87.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $6.75.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.80.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marvin J. Powers, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., Arthritis Foundation, New York, N.Y., National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York, N.Y., and United Cerebral Palsy Associations, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,750.01. E. (9) $6,290.41.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $101.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

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.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.03. E. (9) $40.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,150. E. (9) $1,995.13.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Railroads.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1119 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. William M. Requa, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $131,129.17.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,189.90. E. (9) $8,010.87.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Continental Oil Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Company (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $12.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Insurance Co., Bloomington, Ill.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $238.90.

A. Siert F. Riepmax, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Austin L. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $812.50.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Furman-Wolfson Corp., 1440 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $106.40.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. I.O.S., Ltd. (S.A.), 119 rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.
D. (6) $9,700.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, c/o Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $500.

A. Kenneth A. Roberts, 423 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Animal Health Institute, c/o Mr. Robert Brouse, 1030 15th Street NW., Room 940, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, South 609 Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. John F. Rolph, III, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 90 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ad Hoc Committee of Publishing Companies, 60–62 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $27.18.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Insurance Association, 110 Williams Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.76.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pinkerton's, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $378. E. (9) $224.12.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,461.52.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Business Press, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,145.03.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $144.19.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association of America, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $2,976.55.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 1900 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $28.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $874.17. E. (9) $170.52.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $665. E. (9) $206.05.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $47.67.

A. David C. Sharman, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Melvin D. Wolfberg, 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $474.08.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $604.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge & Madden, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. League of Americans Residing Abroad, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,075. E. (9) $575.14.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 306 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $767.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,900.

A. Silver Users Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $245. E. (9) $1114.33.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $31,700. E. (9) $6,614.67.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $15.88.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $12.

A. W. A. Smallwood, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1925 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. E. Stratford Smith, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $22.40.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $50.50.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Bismarck, N. Dak.
E. (9) $489.85.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Robert B. Smith, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 200 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 829 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $30.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 815 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87.20. E. (9) $65.

A. Thaddeus S. Snell, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Particleboard Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1726 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $54.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,163.46.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainman.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, Post Office Box 3719, Georgetown Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,461.79. E. (9) $4,612.08.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $221.58.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $33,034.64. E. (9) $5,550.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $150.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $10.03.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. State and Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,416.10.

A. Raymond E. Steele, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American & Canadian Importers of Green Olives, Inc., 70 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $84.50.

A. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co. and Elgin National Watch Co.
D. (6) $200.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1250 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Box 907–X, Route 7, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tuscarora Nation of Indians, Tuscarora Reservation, Lewiston, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Herald E. Stringer, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $4,625. E. (9) $415.51.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 520 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $87.60.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $64.10.

A. Roger H. Sullivan.
B. American Sugar Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $48.60.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $2,772.66. E. (9) $842.15.

A. Ralph L. Tabor, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. M. Tarr, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1909 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,846.14. E. (9) $81.60.

A. Wm. B. Thompson, Jr., 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John N. Thurman, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 635 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $710.81.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. E. Linwood Tipton, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce of Vallejo.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,314.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $127.40.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $28.38.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,933.34. E (9) $24.95.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,107.50. E. (9) $18.75.

A. Joel B. True, 840 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Galen Douglas Trussell, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $100.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $80.70.

A. Gladys Uhl, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Immigration Reform, 1616 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,135.26. E. (9) $462.19.

A. David G. Unger, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $690.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $50,783.27.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $411.75.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $23,002.25.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $15.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNISEP, 20 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $121.90. E. (9) $7.

A. Veterans of World War I, USA, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $175.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
D. (6) $460.

A. John S. Walker, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hanna Mining Co., 100 Erieview Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $17.

A. William A. Walton, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 820 Quincy Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,607.50. E. (9) $3,598.15.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $300.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.89.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $25.18.

A. E. E. Webster, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $805.15.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Michael Ladney, Jr., 18125 East Ten Mile Road, East Detroit, Mich.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $601.30.

A. John C. White, 1317 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 1317 F Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Industrial Bankers Association, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $1.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 1765 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $2.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Tribe of Indians, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut, Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,916. E. (9) $74.17.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $465. E. (9) $275.35.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $213.66.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Automobile Excise Tax Repeal, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $81.62.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government of the Bahamas, Nassau, Bahamas.
E. (9) $26.62.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,392.31.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 121 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $90.

A. Morton M. Winston.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Everett T. Winter, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 225 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation-Communication Employees Union, 3960 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 1010 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 815 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Hal J. Wright, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.

A. Howard E. Young, 4622 Creek Shore Drive, Rockville, Md.
B. Best Universal Lock Co., Inc., Post Office Box 103, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $30.90.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $408.

A. Kenneth Young, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,836. E. (9) $316.80.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,006.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine, and Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Roger E. Zylstra, 1101 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Smith & Pepper, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1965:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1←

A. Ad Hoc Committee of the Construction Industry Advancement Funds, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth D. Allen, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Plywood Association, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.

A. American Transit Association, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Aris Gloves, Inc., 10 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Consulting Engineers Council, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Bergman, 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Employment Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown, Lund & Levin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuban Electric Co., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Lowell A. Burkett, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Caplin & Drysdale, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Village Green Corp., Charlottesville, Va.

A. George C. Cheek, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.
B. American Plywood Association, 1119 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Counihan, Casey & Loomis, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Wisconsin Corp., 500 Union Street, Seattle 1, Wash.

A. Francis J. Curry, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cummins-American Corp., 1825 Glenview Road, Glenview, Ill.

A. Jerome R. Gulan, National Federation of Independent Business.
B. National Federation of Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, 15th Street & New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Randolph M. Hale, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Humor Lobby, 4323 52d Road South, Arlington, Va.

A. James W. Hunt, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas John Kehoe and Associate, 1904 Rookwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Glenn T. Lashley, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. Edward Lashman, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

A. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Lynham, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles and Katrushka J. Parsons, 310 Park Avenue, Pasay City, Manila, Philippines.

A. McClure & Trotter, Suite 405, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Co., Post Office Drawer 1734, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Gordon L. McDonough, 3808 Warren Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. David S. Moir, 2244 Live Oak Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Henry J. Moreschi, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laborers' International Union of North America, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, 304 West 58th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Counsel Associates, 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Central Scientific Co., 1700 Irving Park Road, Chicago, Ill.

A. Olson & James, 809 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mr. Jack Baer, A-421 Park Drive Manor, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Earle W. Putnam, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. William Edwin Richardson, 2633 North Sycamore Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Stanley W. Schroeder, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Gerald A. Simmons, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. P. Sommer, 31 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.
B. National Columbus Day Committee.

A. Warren G. Taylor, 605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee, 605 Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

A. Craig L. Thomas, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph P. Tumulty, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Harry S. Leyman, care of Frost & Jacobs, 2310 Central Trust Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Weaver, Glassie & Molloy, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.

A. Weil, Gotshal & Manges, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aris Gloves, Inc., 10 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God of deliverance, we come to Thee on this Ash Wednesday asking Thee to deliver us from evil. As Jesus went into the wilderness to prepare himself for the cross, we find ourselves in a wilderness needing preparation.

Cleanse us from our sins and all unrighteousness. Open our hearts to Thy grace that in us and through us the evil of the world may be overcome with good.

We return unto Thee in sackcloth and ashes, as it were, that the world might be saved. In quietness and confidence may we renew our strength as a nation at this seat of government, in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 21, 1966, and Tuesday, February 22, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 387)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President which is at the desk be referred jointly to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Public Works. I have discussed this with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and it is agreeable to him. The message includes items relevant to the jurisdiction of both committees.

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

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Works, jointly, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Albert Schweitzer said:

Man has lost the capacity to foresee and to forestall. He will end by destroying the earth.