Seibert, Donald A., [redacted].
Shell, Claude O., Jr., [redacted].
Shriver, Rowland B., [redacted].
Shuffer, George M., Jr., [redacted].
Smith, Homer D., Jr., [redacted].
Smith, John A., [redacted].
Smith, Joseph H., [redacted].
Smith, Malcolm R., [redacted].
Smith, Paul T., [redacted].
Smith, Samuel C., [redacted].
Smith, Samuel L., [redacted].
Smith, Wilfred K., [redacted].
Smithey, Paul C., [redacted].
Snell, Dillon, [redacted].
Starry, Donn A., [redacted].
Stenger, John E., [redacted].
Sterling, William R., [redacted].
Stivers, Fred, Jr., [redacted].
Stone, Virgil M., [redacted].
Swanson, Paul A., [redacted].
Swenson, Richard W., [redacted].
Tackaberry, Thomas, [redacted].
Taylor, Charles H., [redacted].
Thompson, Lawrence, [redacted].
Tiller, Norman L., Sr., [redacted].
Todd, John A., [redacted].
Townes, James E., Jr., [redacted].
Trask, Norman E., [redacted].
Trost, Robert W., [redacted].
Tucker, William H., Jr., [redacted].
Tumlinson, Jack M., [redacted].
Tutwiler, Guy I., [redacted].
Tyson, Charles M., [redacted].
Ulatoski, Joseph R., [redacted].
Ungerleider, Alvin, [redacted].
Van Laethen, Fernand, [redacted].
Vaught, James B., [redacted].
Vessey, John W., Jr., [redacted].
Voseipka, John R., [redacted].
Waggener, John G., [redacted].
Wagoner, Fred E., Jr., [redacted].
Wagonhurst, Arland, [redacted].
Waldrop, Andrew J., [redacted].
Ward, Robert M., [redacted].
Ware, Thomas A., Jr., [redacted].
Waters, Ace L., Jr., [redacted].
Weaver, Wilburn C., [redacted].
Webber, Kenneth E., Jr., [redacted].
Weeks, Robert J., [redacted].
Weisinger, Sherman, [redacted].
Wellde, Raymond L., [redacted].
Westling, Frank S., [redacted].
Wetherill, Jerry G., [redacted].
Whitehead, Ennis C., [redacted].
Whitesel, William M., [redacted].
Williams, Robert W., [redacted].
Williams, Theodore, [redacted].
Williams, Virgil H., [redacted].
Williams, Walworth, [redacted].
Williamson, Wade H., [redacted].
Witko, Andrew B., [redacted].
Woods, John O., [redacted].
Woolard, Reginald W., [redacted].
Worthen, Robert D., [redacted].
Yarbrough, John D., [redacted].

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be colonel

Burgreen, Charles L., [redacted].
Carroll, James C., [redacted].
Gilbert, Bertram C., [redacted].
Johnson, Mitchell C., [redacted].
Ledebuhr, Albert F., [redacted].
Plocki, Robert J., [redacted].
Price, Ben S., [redacted].
Stewart, Duncan C., [redacted].
Wood, Robert J., [redacted].

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

To be colonel

Long, Alice A., [redacted].

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Bishop, Raymond H. J., [redacted].
Burt, Glenn B., Jr., [redacted].
Cawgill, Herbert F., [redacted].
Dalton, James B., [redacted].
Gomez, Alphonse C., [redacted].
Hanson, Thomas A., [redacted].
Jensen, Robert T., [redacted].
McCabe, Lloyd B., [redacted].
McClure, Claude Jr., [redacted].
Morss, Dwight F., Jr., [redacted].
Nitz, Robert E., [redacted].
Odom, Emwood, [redacted].
Parvin, Robert W., [redacted].
Plunket, Daniel C., [redacted].
Ransone, James W., [redacted].
Richardson, William, [redacted].
Stenberg, Edwin S. Jr., [redacted].
Thompson, James W., [redacted].
Uhrig, Henry T., [redacted].

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Crowe, Patrick D., [redacted].
Hare, Charles M., [redacted].
Horkowitz, Gabriel, [redacted].
Millard, Robert J., [redacted].
Mooney, Samuel C., [redacted].
Norlind, Gunnar, [redacted].
Osterholtz, Raymond, [redacted].
Schmitz, John F., [redacted].
Ward, Brente L., [redacted].

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Guy, Donald E., [redacted].
Kirk, Samuel K., [redacted].
McChesney, Thomas C., [redacted].

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

Bost, William L., [redacted].
Cohen, Milton, [redacted].
Downing, Jack W., [redacted].
Goldstein, Bernard, [redacted].
Greene, Billy C., [redacted].
Hind, Chester T., [redacted].
Hume, Joseph W., [redacted].
Kerrigan, Robert J., [redacted].
Nation, Marvin E., [redacted].
Nystrom, Rudolph Jr., [redacted].
Patrick, Darvin D., [redacted].
Porter, William R., [redacted].
Shafer, Keith O., [redacted].
Smith, Grayson, [redacted].
Thomas, Charles A. Jr., [redacted].

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be colonel

Williams, June E., [redacted].

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be colonel

Douglas, Maxine, [redacted].
Renegar, Velma F., [redacted].

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

Wallis, Charles R., [redacted].

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be major

Easley, Michael F., [redacted].
Grigg, Vernon C., Jr., [redacted].
Petesch, Gary L., [redacted].
Stamper, Walton B., [redacted].

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Merritt, Ezra A., [redacted].

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be captain

Allen, Gerald W., [redacted].
Amiot, Robert J., [redacted].
Baker, Richard L., [redacted].
Cook, John A., Jr., [redacted].
Farrar, John L., [redacted].
Francis, John R., [redacted].
Hess, Robert E., [redacted].
Newsham, Thomas D., [redacted].
Reichert, David E., [redacted].
Salyer, Howard C., Jr., [redacted].
Wicks, Bruce J., [redacted].
Zimmerman, Charles A., [redacted].

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captain

Cheney, David H., [redacted].

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

Comella, Martin C., [redacted].
Cressler, John W., [redacted].

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captain

De Bok, Phillip C., [redacted].
Zitek, Lyle E., [redacted].

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be captain

Fitz, Robert J., Jr., [redacted].

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be captain

Cox, Janice M., [redacted].
Darnold, Jana L., [redacted].
Hertel, Arthur J., [redacted].
Laur, Margaret H., [redacted].
Wondra, George E., [redacted].

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be captain

Jenkie, Ronald A., [redacted].

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 29, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Elliot L. Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Defense.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, January 29, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The eternal God is thy refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms.—Deuteronomy 33: 27.

Eternal God, strengthen us with Thy sustaining spirit as we enter the portal of another week. Thou art with us always. Help us to be aware of Thy presence that we may be instruments of Thine in ushering in a new era of peace, freedom, and justice.

We pray for our President, our Speaker, and these Representatives of our people upon whose shoulders rest heavy burdens and who face the responsibility of vital decisions which affect the future of our Nation and the life of our world. May Thy wisdom make them wise, Thy strength keep them strong, and Thy love fill them with an abounding good will.

Together may we march forward to meet the issues of these critical times with dynamic faith and dauntless courage, assured that underneath are Thine everlasting arms. In Thy name and for the sake of our land and the good of our world we set up our banners. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 498. An act to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, for 1 year; and

S.J. Res. 26. Joint resolution to amend section 1319 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to increase the limitation on the face amount of flood insurance coverage authorized to be outstanding.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. RES. 26

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Cannon of Nevada, Mr. Allen of Alabama, and Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Cannon of Nevada, Mr. Pell of Rhode Island, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Cook of Kentucky, and Mr. Hatfield of Oregon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO SIT DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE IN THE 93D CONGRESS

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House of Representatives in the 93d Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this mean a tax bill for 1973?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I would certainly hope so, but not one that would increase your taxes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman hopes so?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes, but not one that is going to increase your taxes.

Mr. GROSS. Not one that would increase my taxes?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Just for the information of the House, last week the President told a group of us who were at the White House in his Cabinet Room that if we would live within the budget he has submitted for 1973 and 1974, he would not ask for a tax increase. Certainly, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would agree not to ask for one myself.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the question is what the Committee on Ways and Means may do, not what the President will request. It is what the Committee on Ways and Means may do. I just wondered if the gentleman, in asking for this permission to sit during sessions of the House, and I understand that this has been routinely granted in the past——

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. It has.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman in his wisdom thought that a tax increase would be necessary?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Not if we live within the limits of the budget set by the President for 1973 and 1974.

Mr. GROSS. Will my friends across the aisle be amenable to cutting back to that extent; economizing to the extent that the tax increase will not be necessary?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I can only assure the gentleman from Iowa of the views of the gentleman from Arkansas, and the answer is "Yes."

Mr. GROSS. The answer is "Yes" as far as the gentleman from Arkansas is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tomorrow night to file privilege reports.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 26, 1973.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the authority granted by the House today, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate:

That the Senate passed without amendment H. J. Resolution 246 entitled "A Joint Resolution Providing for a moment of Prayer and Thanksgiving and a National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving."

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
U.S. House of Representatives.
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, January 26, 1973, he did, on that day, sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House: House Joint Resolution 246.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 3, 1973.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Rule III, Clause 4 (Section 647) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. W. Raymond Colley, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in cases of my temporary absence or disability.

If Mr. Colley should not be able to act in my behalf for any reason, then Mr. Benjamin Guthrie, another official in my office, shall similarly perform such duties under the same conditions as are authorized by this designation.

These designations shall remain in effect for the 93rd Congress or until revoked by me.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM U.S. ATTORNEY SEYMOUR IN RE SHARROW AGAINST ABZUG, ET AL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 19, 1973.

Re: Sharrow v. Abzug, et al., 72 Civ. 49811 KTD.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please be advised that the above-captioned matter, in which you were named as a defendant, was heard by Honorable Kevin T. Duffy, United States District Judge, on December 22, 1972. On January 2, 1973 Judge Duffy filed his opinion, in which he declined to convene a statutory three-judge court, and dismissed the action as against all defendants. Should plaintiff file an appeal, we shall so inform you upon its receipt.

Sincerely,

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR, Jr.,
U.S. Attorney.

JOSEPH D. DANAS,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.

OPERATION HOMECOMING

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I went to the Pentagon to gather information about the prisoners and missing in action from my district. Operation Homecoming, designed to handle the return of the prisoners, was well organized and was being conducted in a proper and dignified manner.

Because the North Vietnamese, Vietcong and Pathet Lao have never permitted an International Red Cross team to inspect the prison camps and America has never been given an official POW list prior to last Saturday, I had hoped that a large number of Americans listed as missing in action would show up as prisoners. This has not been the case.

However, there is some confusion about the pilots and crewmen shot down over Laos. The Defense Department shows 311 Americans listed as missing in action and six held as prisoners in Laos. As of yesterday, the prisoner list had the names of only two Americans shot down over Laos. So I am concerned over the fate of the 311 missing and the four other prisoners. Granted that of the 311 missing, all did not eject out of their planes safely, but the average survival rate is well over 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident our Government will press forward to obtain a full accounting of those lost in Laos, as well as the 1,000 other Americans missing in Southeast Asia.

NO HELP FOR HANOI

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, if the Communist world is to be believed, Hanoi has been led to expect reparations from the United States to help rebuild that country. Surely our Government does not seriously contemplate such a step.

What a travesty if the United States were to pay off the aggressors who have spread war and destruction and murdered indiscriminately throughout Indochina. They are the ones who should be paying reparations for the destruction and death they have brought upon innocent peoples.

It is ironic to contemplate that the rebuilding of North Vietnam with U.S. funds would be in progress at the same time that Russia and China were restocking North Vietnam arsenals for continued aggression against other countries in Indochina.

This proposal for reparations by the United States should be settled immediately and permanently with a flat "No."

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it was predictable, but once again President Nixon has handed the Congress a budget which permits as alternatives only the dire consequences of increased taxes or inflation. "Take this," he says, "or reap the consequences of your failure."

For some unexplained reason it is not possible for the Congress to substitute its priorities within the overall spending limitation of $268.7 billion. There is no hint by the President that deficits might be made up or lessened by tax reform; nor is there any explanation of why anything more than a $12.7 billion deficit is inflationary tomorrow. When (as we are told) the administration is halting inflation today and running a deficit of $25 billion.

I object to the budget presentation in such simplistic terms. I know of no one who wants inflation or higher taxes. I know many who have priorities differing from the President within the $268.7 billion. So lets all start from a different perspective. Let's all admit at the outset that neither the Congress nor the President want inflation or higher taxes. Then let's proceed to the allocation of the $268.7 billion according to our priorities. And thats the real issue. What are the priorities of the President and how might the Congress differ with him?

Let me suggest at the outset that the Congress may not take kindly to the President parceling out to the States and local governments in the form of more special revenue sharing of the Congress' power of the purse. These are Federal taxes and at least under the Constitution the Congress has the duty of raising them and bears the responsibility of seeing that they are expended wisely. The latter becomes difficult when the decisionmaking rests with officials other than Congress.

The Congress is also considering the possibility of tax reform. Hearings have already been announced. Some of us will doubtless have questions of a system that continues a $3 billion annual asset range depreciation windfall to business while revoking an emergency employment program for working people that cost $1 billion annually—hopefully, we in the Congress will be looking at such tax credits as oil depletion allowance, hobby farming, capital gains, and others. For some strange reason the President appears not to have considered tax reform as an alternative to cutting some programs which his priorities do not reach.

And speaking of cutting, hopefully, the Congress will disagree with the President's ideology which dictate his priorities. I would envision a Congress which is reluctant to increase military spending while reducing water pollution control efforts, community mental health centers, Hill-Burton hospital funds, unemployment compensation, and many other programs that aid people who for some reason are placed at a disadvantage.

PROPOSED ARMED FORCES LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I introduced—with some of my distinguished colleagues—a bill entitled:

A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war—or of a military attack upon the United States.

Briefly the bill provides that in such cases prior approval by the Congress is necessary in order to commit our Armed Forces to combat abroad: but it permits such action by the President without prior congressional approval in cases of emergency or necessity, followed by prompt report to the Congress with provision for congressional approval or disapproval of the action. This bill is a serious effort to provide long-range legislation which will leave the Executive necessary flexibility while assuring congressional participation.

I have asked for hearings, and I am today placing in the RECORD a copy of the bill and a digest of its provisions.

OUTLINE OF THE BILL

1. When there has been no declaration of war by the Congress, nor any attack on American territory, the President shall not commit the armed forces of the United States to combat or to situations abroad where combat is imminent or likely without prior congressional approval; except in cases of emergency or necessity—the existence of which emergency or necessity shall, however, be determined by the President.

2. If the President determines that an emergency exists in such situations which justifies and requires the commitment of our armed forces to combat or to combat situations abroad without prior congressional approval, he shall immediately make a report in writing to the Congress respecting his action.

3. The Congress shall within 90 days thereafter take legislative action to approve or to disapprove the action of the executive.

4. If the Congress approves the action taken, the President shall thereafter make reports on the situation to the Congress at intervals of not more than six months, and the Congress shall thereupon (and within 30 days from the receipt of such report) again approve or disapprove the action of the executive.

5. If, on receipt of the first Presidential report or at the time of any subsequent report—as above provided—the Congress acts to affirmatively disapprove the action of the executive, the President shall thereupon terminate the action taken and disengage the troops involved as expeditiously as it may be possible to do so "having regard to, and consistent with, the safety of the armed forces of the United States, the necessary defense and protection of the United States, its territories and possessions, the safety of citizens and nationals of the United States who may be involved, and the reasonable safety and necessities, after due and reasonable notice, of allied or friendly nationals and troops."

6. The bill does not apply to any hostilities which are in progress at the time of the passage of the bill.

7. The bill does not abrogate or alter existing treaty obligations of the United States.

H.R. 3046

A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States or of a military attack upon the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. In the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress or of a military attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, the armed forces of the United States shall not be committed to combat or introduced in to a situation where combat is imminent or likely at any place outside of the United States, its territories and possessions, without prior notice to and specific prior authorization by the Congress, except in case of emergency or necessity, the existence of which emergency or necessity is to be determined by the President of the United States.

SEC. 2. Whenever, in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress or of a military attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, the President of the United States nevertheless determines that

an emergency or necessity exists which justifies such action, and shall, by consequence, commit the armed forces of the United States to combat or shall introduce them in to a situation where combat is imminent or likely at any place outside of the United States, its territories or possessions, without prior notice to or authorization by the Congress, as is provided and authorized in such cases under and pursuant to the provisions of Sec. 1 of this act, the President shall report such action to the Congress in writing, as expeditiously as possible and, in all events within twenty-four hours from and after the taking of such action. Such report shall contain a full account of the circumstances under which such action was taken and shall set forth the facts and circumstances relied upon by the President as authorizing and justifying the same. In the event the Congress is not in session the President shall forthwith convene the Congress in an extraordinary session and shall make such report to the Congress as expeditiously as possible and, in all events, within forty-eight hours from and after the taking of such action.

SEC. 3. Not later than ninety days after the receipt of the report of the President provided for in Sec. 2. of this act, the Congress, by the enactment within such period of a bill or resolution appropriate to the purpose, shall either approve, ratify, confirm and authorize the continuation of the action taken by the President and reported to the Congress, or shall disapprove and require the discontinuance of the same.

SEC. 4. If the Congress, acting pursuant to and under the provisions of Sec. 3 shall approve, ratify, and confirm and shall authorize the continuation of the action taken by the President and so reported to the Congress, the President shall thereafter report periodically in writing to the Congress at intervals of not more than six months as to the progress of any hostilities involved and as to the status of the situation, and the Congress, shall, within a period of thirty days from and after the receipt of each such six-month report, again take action by the enactment of an appropriate bill or resolution, to either ratify, approve, confirm, and authorize the continuation of the action of the President, including any hostilities which may be involved, or to disapprove and require the discontinuance of the same.

SEC. 5. If the Congress shall at any time, acting under the provisions of Sec. 3 or Sec. 4, disapprove the action of the President and require the discontinuance of the same, then the President shall discontinue the action so taken by him and so reported to the Congress, and shall terminate any hostilities which may be in progress and shall withdraw, disengage, and re-deploy the armed forces of the United States which may be involved, just as expeditiously as may be possible having regard to, and consistent with, the safety of the armed forces of the United States, the necessary defense and protection of the United States, its territories and possessions, the safety of citizens and nationals of the United States who may be involved, and the reasonable safety and necessities, after due and reasonable notice, of allied or friendly nationals and troops.

SEC. 6. In the event that the Congress, despite the provisions of Sections 3, 4, and 5 of this act, shall, nevertheless, in any instance, fails to adopt legislation either approving or disapproving the action of the President, as provided and required by Sections 3, 4, and 5, such failure to act on the part of the Congress shall be taken and deemed to be an approval, ratification and confirmation of the action of the President, and an authorization of the continuation thereof; and disapproval of the President's action, with the consequences attendant thereupon as provided in Sec. 5, shall result only from action by the Congress affirmatively disapproving and requiring the discontinuance thereof, as in Sec. 5 provided. Any such failure to act on the part of the Congress shall in no wise relieve the President of the duty to make periodic reports to the Congress as provided in Sec. 4 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act the Panama Canal Zone will be taken and deemed to be a territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall alter or abrogate any obligation imposed on the United States by the provisions of any treaty to which the United States is presently a party.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any particular circumstance or situation is held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to any other circumstance or situation, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect on the date of its enactment but shall not apply to hostilities in which the armed forces of the United States are involved on the effective date of this act.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the President today sent up his budget, and those of us who have been previously briefed on this budget know it is a tight budget, and what we are going to have to do in this Congress is to face up to our responsibilities.

Over the past 4 years we have seen this Government run up a deficit of more than $75 billion.

In fiscal year 1973 the deficit is going to be about $25 billion, and in the next fiscal year it is estimated it will be reduced to $12.7 billion. This reduction is possible only because of the President's restraint.

The question, as I see it, as we face this coming budget is whether or not we in the House and the Senate are going to face up to our responsibility of living within, as much as possible, our means. We have a joint committee that is going to look at this question.

The President asked for a spending ceiling of $268.7 billion during fiscal year 1974. That is $18.9 billion more than will be spent this year. It appears to me that we in Congress have only two choices, and that is to assume the burden of fiscal responsibility or, if we fail to do that, to tell the American people that a tax increase is necessary. If we fail to assume either of these responsibilities we will be confronted with further increases in the debt limit and continued increases in deficits which can only fuel the fires of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a simple question of whether or not we in the Congress have the will to face up to this responsibility.

We hear about the reordering of priorities. I have no objection to that, but it must be done within the means available to us as far as our revenues are concerned.

Yes, we are going to enter into a time of testing. Are we going to meet that test? Only time will tell.

RURAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed by the Department of Agriculture's attempt to eliminate the rural environmental assistance program—REAP. It is an action which is aimed at the wrong time at the wrong people.

The official explanation of "economy" and "halting inflation" is designed to gather support for a policy which disregards the basic needs of the small American farmer and rural America generally. I understand the need for Federal cutbacks, I am aware of the unbridled inflation through which we are suffering, and what it is doing to the average man. Furthermore, I will be a vocal exponent for a scrupulous trimming of the Federal budget in those areas where the bureaucracy has grown fat and lazy. I will vigorously oppose programs that have failed.

I will not sit idly by, however, when the administration arbitrarily and suddenly decides that the REAP program, and the small farmer who has made the program work so well, are no longer important. This program is not a giveaway. It is not a reward for not working—or for not growing—or for not doing anything. It is one of the most positive programs that we have in the field of agriculture, or in all of government.

The small farmer who has needed to improve the state of his land—our land—could not afford to do it alone—he still cannot. Yet we are being told that in the interest of economy, this small farmer must suffer. I cannot agree.

I believe that we have a duty to those small farmers who have given so much of the little that they have. I believe that the duty we have extends even further. It extends to all the people in this country who have directly or indirectly shared in the beauty and recreational opportunities resulting from this program.

The Administration contends that farmers will undertake similar programs on their own now that they have seen the benefits of REAP, but this is hardly a reasonable assumption. The farmers who used REAP funds used them because they needed them. Since they have been the hardest hit victims of the very inflation the administration is trying to lessen, how can they do now that which they could not afford prior to the inflationary spiral—an inflationary spiral from which the small farmer has been suffering for decades? The answer is that they cannot. If we allow REAP to die, we will see the multifold benefits of that program die.

Finally, there is another reason why we must restore REAP. We are the Congress of the United States. We have been elected by and are closest to the inhabitants of this land. We have a responsibility to see that their wishes are carried out, and it is a responsibility that we do not take lightly. I do not believe we were elected to watch the administration spend money where it pleases, and withhold money where it pleases, regardless

of congressional authorization. We are compelled to react when a program like REAP, whose only beneficiaries are the nonpowerful, is arbitrarily and summarily killed. The people need a spokesman at this time—they need many spokesmen—they need us.

I want to lend my voice and support to this cause. We must reinstate this program and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to carry it out. The $225 million appropriation for it in the current fiscal year will do too much good to allow it to be withheld. Therefore, not only for my own district, and not only for the farmers of this country, but also for all the people in America who will continue to benefit from this program, I urge the members of this committee to demand that this program be reinstated immediately. I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 2107.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, after having been home over the weekend in my congressional district in northwest Indiana, I heard a great number of complaints pertaining to the President's message on his budget. The citizens in the Chicagoland area, which includes northwest Indiana, have suffered greatly in the last year due to the Presidential curtailment of Federal programs which are much needed in urban areas.

The President has curtailed programs passed by the Congress on education, housing, funds for antiwater and air pollution, mass transportation, child care, and is threatening to further curtail many necessary projects which are helping millions of Americans living in congested areas throughout the country. The executive department has always been extremely lax and indifferent toward enforcing Federal regulations on water and air pollution not only in the Calumet region of Indiana but throughout the Nation. I wish to incorporate with my remarks the headline and excerpts from this morning's Chicago Sun Times pertaining to the air pollution and also incorporate a newspaper article by Ed Zuckerman of the Gary, Ind., Post Tribune on the laxity of some of our major industries in aiding the Federal Government's environmental program:

[From the Chicago Sun Times, Jan. 29, 1973]

WORST AIR POLLUTION HERE IN OVER 2 YEARS

(By Bruce Ingersoll)

Chicago's air Friday was the filthiest it has been in more than two years, but quickening winds and a strong chance of precipitation on Saturday were expected to disperse the pollution.

Permeating the murk over the city was the stench of automotive fumes and the sulphurous emissions from chimneys and smokestacks. To the noses of many, it was acrid and powerful enough to penetrate some Loop buildings.

Hyde Park had the filthiest air measured in the city. For four hours Friday morning, the haze index at the city's air-sampling station at Kenwood High School, 5015 S. Kenwood, registered higher than 5 points on a scale of 10.

The haze index hasn't soared so high at the station since Dec. 28, 1970, said Jack Coblenz, manager of the state Environmental Protection Agency's air pollution episode section.

Over a 24-hour period ending at 2 p.m. this index of air "soiling" averaged 2.57—and "that's cause for concern," said Paul Harrison, technical director for the city Department of Environmental Control.

If the haze index hovers at 2.5 for 24 hours or longer, the federal government maintains that public health may be endangered.

Carbon monoxide levels were unusually high, too, particularly along the expressways during the morning rush, the city reported.

Carbon monoxide readings were also unusually high during the morning rush hour, the city Department of Environmental Control reported.

Carbon monoxide readings at the city's monitoring station near the junction of the Edens and Kennedy expressways averaged 17.5 parts per million (ppm) from 6 a.m. to 2 p.m. This eight-hour average is nearly twice the federal health limit of 9 ppm, which becomes enforceable in 1975.

Moreover, the citywide average for carbon monoxide, which comes primarily from vehicular traffic, was 13 ppm for the same period.

Because Chicago was nearly becalmed Friday, a blanket of warm air aloft, known as a temperature inversion, was able to keep most of the pollution trapped near the ground, pollution officials explained.

The state EPA would have declared an air-pollution watch, Coblenz said, if the National Weather Service had not predicted a 40 per cent chance of measurable precipitation for Saturday.

More important, said pollution forecaster Arthur Strong, is the forecast of northwesterly winds of 12 to 18 m.p.h. which should relieve the Chicago area of the pollution pall.

"From the 30th-floor window of his apartment on Michigan Ave., one of our weathermen could see the smoke layer below him this morning," Strong said.

It was this smokiness that dimmed the dawn and the mid-morning arrival of clouds guaranteed that Friday would be a gray, dingy day.

It was noteworthy, however, that the sulphur dioxide readings were not exceptionally high. The peak of .20 ppm. was measured at 10 a.m. at the Cermak Pumping station, 735 W. Harrison.

"We're beginning to see a payoff from all the regulations on the sulphur content of fuels," Coblenz said.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, December 1972]

AREA MILL SHOWER WATER A NATIONAL ISSUE

(By Ed Zuckerman)

WASHINGTON.—Grimy mill workers have been looking towards the days when purified water will be used in their shower rooms since 1971 when the Occupational Safety and Health Act was enacted.

But, if a proposed rule change now under consideration by a U.S. Labor Department official is approved, large industries will never be required to comply with the regulations.

The proposed rule, which is coming under sharp attack from health and environmental experts, would simply eliminate the provision.

Ostensibly the rule change is being advanced on behalf of industries which, for technical reasons, are unable to comply with the current standard. If approved, though, it would apply equally to all industries—including those where no technical problems exist.

Critics of the rule change view it as "a major retrenchment from the original standard . . . another instance whereby the Occupational Safety and Health Act is being eroded."

Those words were used by Dr. Sidney Wolfe, a physician with the Health Research Group in Washington, during a recent appearance before a Labor Department official.

Dr. Wolfe used the example of 50,000 steelworkers in Gary and North Township, to illustrate the need for keeping the current regulation.

"Shower water for U.S. Steel in Gary and Inland Steel in Hammond (actually East Chicago) comes from Lake Michigan at inlets quite close to the plants," he said.

"Aside from gross mechanical filtering to remove large objects, the water is untreated," he continued.

"The addition in this part of Lake Michigan of refuse from ore boats, untreated sewage from the Hammond area and industrial waste from the steel companies are merely local additions in a lake which is much more like a cesspool than a shower."

Dr. Wolfe emphasized that the blanket effect of the proposed rule change would "entrench the motion that the Department of Labor is more interested in corporate economic health than worker health."

For the two Indiana steel mills, at least, providing pure water for employe shower rooms may pose an economic—but certainly not a technical—problem.

"That these companies are aware of the amount of impurities and filth in the untreated lake water is clear from the fact that both Inland Steel and U.S. Steel have recently started using clean drinking water for several steel-making processes," Dr. Wolfe stated. "This was done because the amount of impurity in the lake water was so high that it interfered with making steel."

Recent surveys of Lake Michigan water by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) record unacceptable levels of bacteria and odor in the vicinity of the two large steel-making complexes.

Samples taken near U.S. Steel contained about 200 times the acceptable bacteria level and samples taken near Inland Steel contained nearly 3,500 times the acceptable level, he claimed.

Dr. Wolfe said it was difficult to describe the problem to people who are used to showering with clean water.

"In addition to complaints that the smell is intolerable, the showering often means coating one's self with grease, and the shower heads have to be occasionally removed to clean out pieces of decomposed fish," he said.

He added that showers "run clean" in the executive offices of U.S. Steel, Inland Steel and thousands of other companies and "to provide any less for the workers who run these industries is to confirm workers' suspicions that management looks on them as second class citizens."

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I listened to excerpts from the President's speech last night on the news about the budget, and I did not hear him say anything about foreign aid. I have not yet been able to find out how much is in there for that, but one thing you Republicans, instead of making speeches about it, had better be thinking about is, if you vote for foreign aid and vote to cut out Hill-Burton, what you are going to tell the people who are lying in hallways of hospitals. The President said there are

plenty of beds, but that is not exactly the way it is in Ohio. You had better be thinking of what you are going to tell those people lying in hallways of hospitals and who cannot get into those hospitals as to how you can vote for money for foreign aid but you cannot vote for money to help build hospitals in your districts. Think that one over before you vote too many times.

THE BUDGET OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 6]

Abzug	Fulton	Pickle
Addabbo	Giaimo	Pike
Anderson, Calif.	Gilman	Podell
Andrews, N.C.	Grasso	Preyer
Ashbrook	Gray	Quie
Aspin	Grover	Quillen
Badillo	Hanley	Railsback
Beard	Hanrahan	Rangel
Bell	Harrington	Reuss
Biaggi	Harsha	Robinson, Va.
Bingham	Harvey	Roe
Blatnik	Hastings	Rooney, N.Y.
Boland	Hébert	Rose
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Breaux	Helstoski	Rostenkowski
Brown, Calif.	Henderson	Roy
Brown, Ohio	Hillis	Ruppe
Broyhill, N.C.	Hogan	Ryan
Buchanan	Holifield	Saylor
Burke, Calif.	Holtzman	Sebelius
Burke, Fla.	Huber	Shipley
Chamberlain	Hudnut	Shriver
Chappell	Hutchinson	Skubitz
Chisholm	Jarman	Smith, Iowa
Clark	Jordan	Smith, N.Y.
Clay	Kastenmeier	Snyder
Cleveland	Keating	St Germain
Conyers	Kluczynski	Staggers
Corman	Koch	Steele
Cotter	Kyros	Steiger, Ariz.
Cronin	Latta	Stephens
de la Garza	Macdonald	Stokes
Dellums	Madigan	Symington
Derwinski	Mann	Taylor, Mo.
Diggs	Martin, Nebr.	Teague, Tex.
Dingell	Matsunaga	Thomson, Wis.
Donohue	McClory	Van Deerlin
Dorn	McCloskey	Vander Jagt
Downing	McKay	Wampler
Dulski	McKinney	Ware
Eckhardt	Melcher	Widnall
Edwards, Ala.	Milford	Williams
Edwards, Calif.	Mills, Md.	Wilson, Bob
Eilberg	Minish	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Eshleman	Morgan	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Fish	Mosher	Winn
Flowers	Murphy, Ill.	Wolff
Flynt	Murphy, N.Y.	Wydler
Foley	Nedzi	Wyman
Ford, Gerald R.	Nelsen	Yatron
Fountain	Nix	Young, S.C.
Fraser	O'Neill	Zion
Frey	Obey	
	Owens	
	Patten	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

THE BUDGET OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 93–15)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The following message from the President of the United States was read and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The 1974 budget fulfills my pledge to hold down Federal spending so that there will be no need for a tax increase.

This is a budget that will continue to move the Nation's economy toward a goal it has not achieved in nearly two decades; a high employment prosperity for American citizens without inflation and without war.

Rarely is a budget message perceived as a dramatic document. In a real sense, however, the 1974 budget is the clear evidence of the kind of change in direction demanded by the great majority of the American people. No longer will power flow inexorably to Washington. Instead, the power to make many major decisions and to help meet local needs will be returned to where it belongs—to State and local officials, men and women accountable to an alert citizenry and responsive to local conditions and opinions.

The 1974 budget proposes a leaner Federal bureaucracy, increased reliance on State and local governments to carry out what are primarily State and local responsibilities, and greater freedom for the American people to make for themselves fundamental choices about what is best for them.

This budget concerns itself not only with the needs of all the people, but with an idea that is central to the preservation of democracy: the "consent of the governed."

The American people as a whole—the "governed"—will give their consent to the spending of their dollars if they can be provided a greater say in how the money is spent and a greater assurance that their money is used wisely and efficiently by government. They will consent to the expenditure of their tax dollars as long as individual incentive is not sapped by an ever-increasing percentage of earnings taken for taxes.

Since the mid-1950's, the share of the Nation's output taken by all governments in the United States—Federal, State, and local—has increased from a quarter to a third. It need not and should not go higher.

The increase in government claims on taxpayers was not for defense programs. In fact, the defense share of the gross national product declined by one-quarter while the share for civilian activities of all governments grew by three-fourths, rising from 14% of the gross national product in 1955 to about 25% in 1972.

In no sense have Federal civilian programs been starved; their share of the gross national product will increase from 6½% in 1955 to 14% in 1972. Nor will they be starved by the budget that I am proposing. A generous increase in outlays is provided each year by the normal growth in revenues. Higher Federal tax rates are not needed now or in the years ahead to assure adequate resources for properly responsive government—*if* the business of government is managed well. And revenue sharing will help State and local governments avoid higher taxes.

During the past 2 years, with the economy operating below capacity and the threat of inflation receding, the Federal budget provided fiscal stimulus that moved the economy toward full employment. The 1974 budget recognizes the Federal Government's continuing obligation to help create and maintain—through sound monetary and fiscal policies—the conditions in which the national economy will prosper and new job opportunities will be developed. However, instead of operating primarily as a stimulus, the budget must now guard against inflation.

The surest way to avoid inflation or higher taxes or both is for the Congress to join me in a concerted effort to control Federal spending. I therefore propose that before the Congress approves *any* spending bill, it establish a rigid ceiling on spending, limiting total 1974 outlays to the $268.7 billion recommended in this budget.

I do not believe the American people want higher taxes any more than they want inflation. I am proposing to avoid both higher taxes and inflation by holding spending in 1974 and 1975 to no more than revenues would be at full employment.

1975 PROJECTIONS IN THE 1974 BUDGET

This year's budget presents, for the first time, a detailed preview of next year's. I have taken this step to demonstrate that if we stay within the 1974 and 1975 estimated outlays presented in this budget, we will prevent a tax increase—and that the 1974 budget is a sound program for the longer range future, not simply for today. This innovation in budget presentation is a blueprint for avoiding inflation and tax increases, while framing more responsive instruments of government and maintaining prosperity.

Our ability to carry out sound fiscal policy and to provide the resources needed to meet emerging problems has been limited by past decisions. In 1974, $202 billion in outlays, or 75% of the budget, is *virtually uncontrollable* due to existing law and prior-year commitments. But just as every budget is heavily influenced by those that have preceded it, so it strongly influences those that follow.

Control over the budget can be improved by projecting future available resources and the known claims on them, and then making current decisions within the constraints they impose. That is why, in my first budget, I began the practice of showing projections of future *total* revenues and outlays under current and proposed legislation. In the 1973 budget, 5-year projections of the cost of legislative proposals for major new and expanded programs were added.

This budget presents an even closer look at the implications of the 1974 proposals for the 1975 budget. It projects, in agency and functional detail, the outlays in 1975 that will result from the major program proposals in the 1974 budget, including the outlay savings that can be realized from program reductions in 1973 and 1974. In so doing, it takes into consideration the longer range effect of each of our fiscal actions.

Most importantly, this budget shows the narrow margin between projected outlays and full-employment revenues in 1975, despite the economy measures that are recommended. Program reductions and terminations of the scale proposed are clearly necessary if we are to keep control of fiscal policy in the future.

The 1974 budget program implies 1975 full-employment outlays of about $288 billion, $19 billion (7%) more than in 1974. This is within our estimate of full-employment revenues of $290 billion for 1975. There is, however, very little room for the creation of new programs requiring additional outlays in 1975 and *no room for the postponement of the reductions and terminations proposed in this budget.*

The program reductions and terminations I have proposed will result in more significant savings in 1975 and later years than in 1973 and 1974. It is for this reason, too, that I have included the 1975 projections in my budget this year. The Federal spending pipeline is a very long one in most cases, and the sooner we start reducing costs the better for the Nation.

The estimated 1975 outlays for the various Federal agencies are, of course, tentative. The outlay total, however, is the approximate amount that will represent appropriate Federal spending in 1975 if we are to avoid new taxes and inflation. As program priorities change and require increases in some areas, offsetting decreases must be found in others. As the projections indicate, this is necessary for both 1974 and 1975.

FISCAL POLICY AND THE BUDGET PROCESS

Fiscal policy.—In July 1970, I adopted the full-employment budget principle in order to make the budget a tool to promote orderly economic expansion.

Consistent with this principle, the budget that I submitted to the Congress last January proposed fiscal stimulus as part of a balanced economic program that included sound monetary policy and the new economic policy that I launched on August 15, 1971. My confidence that the American economy would respond to sensible stimulus in this context has been fully justified. During 1972, employment increased by 2.3 million persons, real output rose by 7½%, business fixed investment was 14% higher, and the rate of increase in consumer prices declined.

From 1971 through 1973, the full-employment budget principle permitted and called for substantial actual budget deficits. For this reason, some people have forgotten the crucial point that the full-employment principle requires that deficits be reduced as the economy approaches full employment—and that it establishes the essential discipline of an upper limit on spending at all times.

The full-employment budget principle permits fiscal stimulation when stimulation is appropriate and calls for restraint when restraint is appropriate. But it is not self-enforcing. It signals us what course to steer, but requires us to take the actions necessary to keep on course. These steps are not taken for us, and they are rarely easy.

As we look ahead, with the economy on the upswing, the full-employment budget principle—and commonsense—prescribe a shift away from fiscal stimulus and toward smaller budget deficits. We must do what is necessary to make this shift.

Holding 1973 spending to $250 billion and achieving full-employment balance in 1974 and 1975 will be difficult. Reduction of some activities and termination of others are necessary and are proposed in this budget. Nonetheless, the budget provides significant increases for many important programs.

If we did not budget with firm restraint, our expenditures in 1973 would be over $260 billion. The ballooning effect of one year's expenditures on the next would in turn have meant that 1974's expenditures would be about $288 billion, far beyond full-employment revenues, and 1975's expenditures would be approximately $312 billion, leading to a huge inflationary deficit.

If spending is to be controlled, the Congress must establish a spending ceiling promptly. Otherwise, the seeds sown in individual authorization and appropriation actions will produce ever-growing Federal spending not only in the coming fiscal year but in the years beyond.

Should the Congress cause the total budgeted outlays to be exceeded, it would inescapably face the alternatives of higher taxes, higher interest rates, renewed inflation, or all three. I oppose these alternatives; with a firm rein on spending, none of them is necessary.

Reforming congressional budget procedures.—Delay in congressional consideration of the budget is a major problem. Each time I have submitted a budget, the Congress has failed to enact major portions of it before the next budget was prepared. Instead, it has resorted to the device of continuing resolutions to carry on the activities for which it has not made appropriations. Such delay needlessly compounds the complexities of budget preparation, and frustrates the potential of the budget as an effective management and fiscal tool.

The complexity of the budgeting process is another problem. Because of modifications made to reflect the desires of the more than 300 congressional committees and subcommittees that influence it, the process has become more complicated and less comprehensible.

The fragmented nature of congressional action results in a still more serious problem. Rarely does the Congress concern itself with the budget totals or with the effect of its individual actions on those totals. Appropriations are enacted in at least 15 separate bills. In addition, "backdoor financing" in other bills provides permanent appropriations, authority to contract in advance of appropriations, authority to borrow and spend without an appropriation, and program authorizations that require mandatory spending whether or not it is desirable in the light of current priorities.

At the same time, a momentum of extravagance is speeded by requirements created initially by legislative committees sympathetic to particular and narrow causes. These committees are encouraged by special interest groups and by some executive branch officials who are more concerned with expansion of their own programs than with total Federal spending and the taxes required to support that spending. Since most programs have some attractive features, it is easy for the committees and the Congress itself to authorize large sums for them. These authorizations, however, create pressure on the appropriations committees to appropriate higher amounts than the Nation's fiscal situation permits.

Last October, the Congress enacted legislation establishing a joint committee to consider a spending ceiling and to recommend procedures for improving congressional control over budgetary outlay and receipt totals.

I welcome this effort and pledge the full cooperation of my Administration in working closely with the committee and in other efforts of the Congress toward this end.

Specific changes in congressional procedures are, of course, the business of the Congress. However, the manner in which the Congress reviews and modifies the budget impinges so heavily on the management of the executive branch that I am impelled to suggest a few subjects that deserve high priority in the committee's deliberations, including:

—adoption of a *rigid* spending ceiling to create restraint on the total at the beginning of each annual review;

—avoidance of new "backdoor financing" and review of existing legislation of this type;

—elimination of annual authorizations, especially annual authorizations in specific amounts; and

—prompt enactment of all necessary appropriation bills before the beginning of the fiscal year.

The Congress must accept responsibility for the budget *totals* and must develop a systematic procedure for maintaining fiscal discipline. To do otherwise in the light of the budget outlook is to accept the responsibility for increased taxes, higher interest rates, higher inflation, or all three. In practice, this means that should the Congress pass any legislation increasing outlays beyond the recommended total, it must find financing for the additional amount. Otherwise, such legislation will inevitably contribute to undue inflationary pressures and thus will not be in the public interest. And it will be subject to veto.

I will do everything in my power to avert the need for a tax increase, but I cannot do it alone. The cooperation of the Congress in controlling total spending is absolutely essential.

SUMMARY OF THE 1974 BUDGET

The 1974 budget proposes an approximate balance in full-employment terms and an actual deficit that is about one-half the 1973 deficit. The 1975 budget totals I propose here would also yield a balance in full-employment terms.

THE BUDGET TOTALS

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Description	1971 actual	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1975 estimate
Budget receipts		$208.6	$225.0	$256.0	(1)
Budget outlays		231.9	249.8	268.7	(1)
Deficit (−)		−23.2	−24.8	−12.7	(1)
Full-employment receipts		225.0	245.0	268.0	$290.0
Full-employment outlays [2]		228.9	247.3	267.7	288.0
Full-employment surplus or deficit (−)		−3.9	−2.3	.3	2.0
Budget authority		$248.1	$280.4	$288.0	$313.5
Outstanding debt, end of year:					
Gross Federal debt	$409.5	437.3	473.3	505.5	
Debt held by the public	304.3	323.8	348.8	365.3	
Outstanding Federal and federally assisted credit, end of year:					
Direct loans	53.1	50.1	50.1	51.0	
Guaranteed and insured loans [3]	118.1	133.1	150.3	164.1	
Government-sponsored agency loans [4]	38.8	48.9	59.6	71.8	

[1] Estimates of actual receipts and outlays have not been made at this time.
[2] In these estimates, outlays for unemployment insurance benefits and the Emergency Employment Act program are calculated as they would be under conditions of full employment.
[3] Excludes loans held by Government accounts and special credit agencies.
[4] Excludes Federal Reserve banks, but, starting in 1972, includes Export-Import Bank (previously reported as direct loans) and, starting in 1974, includes the newly authorized Environmental Financing Authority.

The full-employment budget balance in 1974 assures support for continuation of the economy's upward momentum without rekindling inflation. Greater stimulus in 1974 would be dangerous, and would put an unsupportable burden on future budgets.

Budget receipts in 1974 are estimated to be $256 billion. This is an increase of $31 billion over 1973, reflecting growing prosperity, higher personal income, and rising corporate profits. The receipts estimates also reflect the impact of tax cuts resulting from the Tax Reform Act of 1969, the new economic policy and the Revenue Act of 1971, as well as the payroll tax increases enacted to finance higher social security benefits.

Budget outlays in 1974 are expected to be $268.7 billion. The total would have been substantially greater—probably about $288 billion—had my Administration not made an extraordinary effort to hold to the fiscal guidelines of a $250 billion maximum in 1973, rather than the nearly $261 billion which otherwise would have occurred, and to full-employment balance in 1974.

Even so, this budget necessarily proposes an increase in outlays of $19 billion, or nearly 8% over the previous year. It provides amply for America's security and well-being in the year ahead.

The 1974 budget program projects full-employment outlays of $288 billion in 1975, which, together with the revenues that would be produced under existing law, will mean full-employment balance in that year.

About $288 bilion of *budget authority*—the new authority to make commitments to spend—is requested for 1974. Of the total, about $173 billion will require new action by the Congress.

IMPROVING GOVERNMENT

The role of government.—The last article of the Bill of Rights says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The philosophy of the Founding Fathers embodied in this amendment is also my philosophy. I believe that a larger share of our national resources must be retained by private citizens and State and local governments to enable them to meet their individual and community needs.

Our goal must not be bigger government, but better government—at all levels. Our progress must not be measured by the amount of money we put into programs, but by the accomplishments which result from them.

One of my first acts as President was to direct that an intensive review be made of our federal system of government. We found that:

—the executive branch was poorly organized to accomplish domestic program objectives;

—State and local governments often could not meet the basic needs of their citizens; and

—Federal programs to assist State and local governments had become a confusing maze understood only by members of a new, highly specialized occupation—the grantsmen.

My Administration has developed a comprehensive strategy for dealing with these problems through restructuring the executive departments and revitalizing the federal system.

A restructured Federal Government.—A thorough overhaul of the Federal bureaucracy is long overdue, and I am determined to accomplish it.

As the role of government has grown over the years, so has the number of departments and agencies which carry out its functions. Unfortunately, very little attention has been given to the ways in which each new unit would fit in with all the old units. The consequence has been a hodgepodge of independent, organizationally unrelated offices that pursue interrelated goals. As a result, able officials at all levels have been frustrated, public accountability has been obscured, and decentralization and coordination of Federal operations have been impeded. This overlapping of responsibilities has increased the costs of government. It has generated interagency conflict and rivalry and, most importantly, it has imposed inexcusable inconvenience on the public that is supposed to be served.

To help remedy this situation, I proposed to the Congress in 1971 that the executive branch be restructured by consolidating many functions now scattered among several departments and agencies into four new departments. These new departments would be organized around four major domestic purposes of government: community development, human resources, natural resources, and economic affairs—thus consolidating in a single chain of command programs that contribute to the achievement of a clearly stated mission. Under this arrangement, we will be able to formulate policy more responsibly and more responsively and carry out that policy more efficiently and more effectively. I welcome congressional cooperation in this important endeavor and will seek it in the weeks ahead. I plan now to streamline the executive branch along these lines as much as possible within existing law, and to propose similar legislation on departmental reorganization to the 93d Congress.

Meanwhile, I have already taken the first in a series of steps that will increase the management effectiveness of the Cabinet and the White House staff. I hope the smaller and more efficient Executive Office of the President will become a model for the entire executive branch.

Reorganization of the executive branch is a necessary beginning but reorganization alone is not enough.

Increased emphasis will also be placed on program performance. Programs will be evaluated to identify those that must be redirected, reduced, or eliminated because they do not justify the taxes required to pay for them. Federal programs must meet their objectives and costs must be related to achievements.

The Federal Assistance Review program, which I began in 1969, has made important progress in decentralizing and streamlining Federal grant programs. To speed the process of decentralization, improve program coordination, and eliminate unnecessary administrative complications, I have strengthened the Federal Regional Council system. These councils, working with State and local governments, have played an impressive and growing role in coordinating the delivery of Federal services.

A revitalized federal system.—Restructuring of the Federal Government is only one step in revitalizing our overall federal system. We must also make certain that State and local governments can fulfill their role as partners with the Federal Government. Our General Revenue Sharing and special revenue sharing programs can help considerably in achieving this goal. They provide our States and communities with the financial assistance they need—in a way that allows them the freedom and the responsibility ncessary to use those funds most effectively.

On October 20, 1972, I signed a program of General Revenue Sharing into law. This program provides State and local governments with more than $30 billion over a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1972. This historic shift of power away from Washington will help strengthen State and local governments and permit more local decisionmaking about local needs.

Although final congressional action was not taken on my special revenue sharing proposals, I remain convinced that the principle of special revenue sharing is essential to continued revitalization of the federal system. I am, therefore, proposing the creation of special revenue sharing programs in the 1974 budget.

These four programs consist of broad-purpose grants, which will provide State and local governments with $6.9 billion to use with considerable discretion in the areas of education, law enforcement and criminal justice, manpower training, and urban community development. They will replace 70 outmoded, narrower categorical grant programs and will, in most cases, eliminate matching requirements.

The funds for special revenue sharing will be disbursed according to formulas appropriate to each area. In the case of manpower revenue sharing, an extension of existing law will be proposed. Current administrative requirements will be removed so that State and local governments can group manpower services in ways that best meet their own needs.

The inefficiency of the present systems makes favorable action on special revenue sharing by the Congress an urgent priority.

Special revenue sharing, budget authority, first full year

Description:	*Billions*
Urban community development	2.3
Education	2.5
Manpower training	1.3
Law enforcement	.8
Total	6.9

As an important companion to returning responsibility to State and local governments, I proposed to the Congress in 1971 a program to provide funds to help State and local governments strengthen their management capabilities to carry out their expanded role. I am submitting this important proposal again this year.

The federal system is dynamic, not static. To maintain its vitality, we must constantly reform and refine it. The executive branch reorganization and special revenue sharing programs that I am proposing, along with continued decentralization of Federal agencies, are essential to that vitality.

BUILDING A LASTING STRUCTURE OF PEACE

Building a lasting peace requires much more than wishful thinking. It can be achieved and preserved only through patient diplomacy and negotiation supported by military strength. To be durable, peace must also rest upon a foundation of mutual interest and respect among nations. It must be so constructed that those who might otherwise be tempted to destroy it have an incentive to preserve it.

The 1974 budget supports America's efforts to establish such a peace in two important ways. First, it maintains the military strength we will need to support our negotiations and diplomacy. Second, it proposes a sound fiscal policy that, supported by a complementary monetary policy, will contribute to prosperity and economic stability here and abroad.

Our strength, together with our willingness to negotiate, already has enabled us to begin building a structure for lasting world peace and to contribute to a general relaxation of world tensions.

—We have made substantial progress toward ending our involvement in the difficult war in Southeast Asia.

—In the past 4 years, we have concluded more significant agreements with the Soviet Union than in all previous years since World War II, including the historic agreement for limiting strategic nuclear arms.

—We have ended nearly a quarter century of mutual isolation between the United States and the People's Republic of China and can look forward to the development of peaceful cooperation in areas of mutual interest.

In this atmosphere, other nations have also begun to move toward peaceful settlement of their differences.

One of the results of our negotiations, taken together with the success of the Nixon Doctrine, our substantial disengagement from Vietnam, and the increased effectiveness of newer weapons systems, has been a significant but prudent reduction in our military forces. Total manpower has been reduced by about one-third since 1968, and will be further reduced as we end the draft and achieve an All-Volunteer Force. At the same time, our allies are assuming an increasing share of the burden of providing for their defense.

As a result, defense outlays have been kept in line. In 1974, they will be substantially the same as in 1968. During the same period, the total budget has grown by 50%, and nondefense outlays have grown by 91%, or $90 billion. When adjusted for pay and price increases, defense spending in 1974 will be about the same as in 1973 and about one-third *below* 1968.

But, while this Administration has succeeded in eliminating unnecessary defense spending, it is equally determined to spend whatever is necessary for national security. Our 1974 budget achieves this goal. It assures us of sufficient strength to preserve our security and to continue as a major force for peace. Moreover, this strength will be supported, beginning this year, without reliance on a peacetime draft.

A framework for international economic progress is an important part of our efforts for peace. A solid beginning has been made on international monetary reform through our participation in the ongoing discussions of the Committee of Twenty. We will continue to press these efforts during the year ahead.

Our foreign assistant programs also reflect our intention to build a lasting structure of peace through a mutual sharing of burdens and benefits. America will remain firm in its support of friendly nations that seek economic advancement and a secure defense. But we also expect other nations to do their part, and the 1974 budget for foreign assistance is based upon this expectation.

Our goal is a durable peace that is sustained by the self-interest of all nations in preserving it. Our continuing military strength and our programs for international economic progress, as provided for in this budget, will bring us closer to that goal for ourselves and for posterity.

MEETING HUMAN NEEDS

The 1974 budget for human resources programs, like the three that have preceded it under this Administration, reflects my conviction that social compassion is demonstrated not just by the commitment of public funds in hope of meeting a need, but by the tangible betterments those funds produce in the lives of our people. My drive for basic reforms that will improve the Federal Government's performance will continue in the coming fiscal year.

Between 1969 and 1974, outlays for Federal human resources program have increased 97%, while total budget outlays have grown by only 46%. As a result, human resources spending now accounts for close to half the total budget dollar, compared with just over one-third of the total at the time I took office.

Many solid accomplishments have resulted. Higher social security benefits are bringing greater dignity for the aged and the disabled. Better health care and better education and training opportunities, especially for the disabled, the disadvantaged, and veterans, are helping to raise the social and economic status of millions of individuals and have improved the productive capacity of the Nation as a whole. Expanded food programs are helping to assure adequate nutrition for the needy.

However, disappointments and failures have accompanied these accomplishments. The seeds of those failures were sown in the 1960's when the "do something, do anything" pressure for Federal panaceas led to the establishment of scores of well-intentioned social programs too often poorly conceived and hastily put together. In many respects, these were classic cases of believing that by "throwing money at problems" we could automatically solve them. But with vaguely defined objectives, incomplete plans of operation, and no effective means of evaluation, most of these programs simply did not do the job.

We gave these programs the benefit of every doubt and continued them while we conducted a long-needed, thorough review of all Federal human resources programs. Based on this review, the 1974 budget proposes to reform those programs that can be made productive and to terminate those that were poorly conceived, as well as those that have served their purpose.

We can and will find better ways to make the most of our human resources—through the partnership of a restructured Federal Government and strong State and local governments, and with the help of a socially committed private sector that is bolstered by a revival of

individual initiative and self-reliance among our people. But only by halting the unproductive programs here and now can we assure ourselves of the money needed to pursue those programs that will get results.

Income security.—Federal income maintenance programs have expanded dramatically in the last 4 years. Cash benefits under the social security system alone will have grown from $30 billion in 1970 to $55 billion in 1974, an increase of 83%. These benefits will account for about one-fifth of *all* Federal budget outlays. Legislation enacted in calendar year 1972 alone increased these benefits by $10.5 billion, or almost 30% over 1971 benefits.

Beginning on January 1, 1974, under the terms of legislation passed last year, the Federal Government is scheduled to assume responsibility for providing a basic assistance payment for the aged, blind, and disabled. While this would require that we add a very large number of Federal employees to the Social Security Administration, I have ordered this increase held to an absolute minimum, and I will urge the Governors to seek ways of eliminating an equivalent number of positions in their States so that the overall size of government will not grow.

The 1974 budget for income maintenance programs will emphasize:

—intensified efforts to eliminate wasteful and inefficient management of welfare programs; and

—further improvement in the welfare of the aging.

The legislation that established General Revenue Sharing also set a long-needed ceiling on Federal outlays for social services. In 1969, Federal outlays for these services were less than $400 million. By 1972, States had discovered that this ill-defined program could be used to finance most public services and they were planning to make claim on about $5 billion in Federal funds.

This runaway, open-ended program was out of control. The $2.5 billion statutory limit imposed on the program, about seven times the 1969 level, will restore a measure of control. We are now emphasizing efforts to assure that this massive increase in funding is used effectively to meet the real needs of public assistance recipients for useful social services.

Education and manpower training.—Outlays in the 1974 budget for education and manpower, including those for veterans, will be $12 billion. The 1974 program is based upon a reevaluation of the Federal Government's role in these areas. The primary responsibility for most of these activities, other than those for veterans, rests with State and local governments. The proper Federal role is primarily that of helping State and local governments finance their own activities, while conducting directly those few programs than can be done efficiently and effectively only by the Federal Government.

The 1974 budget supports such a role for the Federal Government. It provides for:

—creation of education and manpower revenue sharing programs to give State and local governments greater power in allocating resources within these vital areas;

—proposed legislation that would provide an income tax credit for tuition paid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools;

—full funding for Basic Education Opportunity grants to provide assistance for college students.

—continued emphasis on training disadvantaged veterans;

—an increase in the work incentive program to help welfare recipients get jobs; and

—phasedown of the temporary Emergency Employment Assistance program consistent with the increase in new jobs in the private sector.

Health.—My strategy for health in the 1970's stresses a new Federal role and basic program reforms to assure that economical, medically appropriate health services are available when needed. As major elements in this strategy, the 1974 budget provides for:

—a proposal for national health insurance legislation;

—increased funding for cancer and heart disease research;

—initiation of a nationwide system of physician-sponsored Professional Standards Review Organizations to assure quality and appropriateness of care;

—reform of Medicaid and Medicare to reduce financial burdens for aged and disabled patients who experience long hospital stays and to improve program management and increase incentives for appropriate use of services; and

—increased special care units and continued improvement of outpatient and extended care benefits for veterans.

The impact of the 1974 budget will be significant. In 1974, nearly 5 million more poor, aged, and disabled persons will benefit through expanded financial support for health services. There will be continued emphasis on consumer safety. Finally, strengthened cost controls will give Americans greater protection against unreasonable medical cost increases.

Drug abuse control.—During my first term, in order to meet what had become both a crime problem and a health crisis of epidemic proportions, we launched an all-out war on drug abuse. With the 1974 budget, we will continue to press that attack aggressively. Budgeted expenditures of $719 million, an increase of $64 million over 1973, will permit continued strong support for interdiction of drug traffic and for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug users.

Civil rights.—The protection of each citizen's civil rights is one of the highest priorities of my Administration. No American should be denied equal justice and equal opportunity in our society because of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin. Toward this end, the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies will be able under the 1974 budget to increase their civil rights enforcement efforts aimed at upholding this fundamental principle as follows:

—The Department of Justice will expand its efforts to coordinate the enforcement of equal access to and equal benefit from Federal financial assistance programs.

—The Community Relations Service will expand its crisis resolution and State liaison activities.

—The civil rights performance of Federal agencies will be monitored and reviewed throughout the year.

—The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will receive additional resources to carry out its expanded responsibilities.

—The Civil Service Commission will expand its monitoring of Federal service equal opportunity.

—The Commission on Civil Rights will receive additional resources to carry out its newly granted jurisdiction over sex discrimination.

In addition, the Small Business Administration will expand its loan program for minority business by nearly one-third.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

The balanced development of our natural resources is essential to a healthy economy and an improved standard of living. Development inevitably brings change to our natural environment which, if not properly controlled, could impair the health and welfare of our citizens and the beauty of our surroundings. Balancing the need for development and growth with the need to preserve and enhance our environment has become a major challenge of our time.

Meeting this challenge is not solely the responsibility of the Federal Government. Heavy responsibilities fall on State and local governments, private industry, and the general public as well. This budget reflects my determination to seek a proper balance between development and preservation. It contemplates neither blind or insensitive exploitation of our natural resources nor acceptance of a no-growth philosophy. It avoids such a spurious choice and plots an orderly and reasoned course toward sensible development and environmental enhancement.

The forward thrust of our environmental programs has not been altered. We will continue vigorous enforcement of laws and Federal regulations. The Environmental Protection Agency has allotted to the States $5 billion of new authorizations to make grants for waste treatment construction. With $5.1 billion in additional funds already available for payment on new projects and projects for which the Federal Government had made prior commitments, a total of $10.1 billion has been set aside in a short period of time for waste treatment facilities. I believe that more funds would not speed our progress toward clean water, but merely inflate the cost while creating substantial fiscal problems.

Adequate supplies of clean energy are a vital concern. The resources devoted in this budget to energy research and development are one important element of the response to this problem. My initiative to demonstrate a large-scale fast breeder reactor by 1980 will be continued; and funds have been significantly increased to develop means of using other energy resources—particularly our abun-

dant coal resources. At the same time, this budget provides funds to carry out a program for regulation of strip mining activities to minimize their adverse environmental impact.

I have long been committed to sound, multiple-use management of public lands consistent with long-term environmental preservation. My 1974 program provides both for development of new outdoor recreation opportunities accessible to our large population centers and for new wilderness areas. In addition, the budget includes funds for a program providing incentives to States to undertake regulation of private land use. This program would encourage establishment at the State level of open decisionmaking processes to insure proper consideration of the long-term environmental implications of major land use decisions.

The role of agriculture.—The American farmer wants to raise high quality products in the most efficient manner, and to receive prices that provide him a fair return on his investment. He wants a minimum of Government regulation, and recognizes the need for some protection from events beyond his control. We are working to create conditions favorable to the American farmer by expanding our world markets, stabilizing the domestic economy, and tailoring farm programs to provide both freedom of choice and reasonable earnings for farmers.

We have made some impressive progress toward these objectives. Farm income has improved; more freedom to plant has been achieved; and the costs of price support are down. Americans and the entire world have benefited from the extraordinary productivity of American agriculture. In the period ahead, we seek to use this productivity in domestic and world marketplaces in order to maintain both high farm income and reasonable consumer prices.

REFORMING COMMUNITY AND AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

My deep commitment to providing change that works is, and must be, matched by a total determination to identify and reform or eliminate programs that have not worked. It would be irresponsible to continue spending taxpayers' money for programs that have long since served their purpose, are not working at all, or are not working sufficiently to justify their costs.

I began my efforts in community and area development with proposals for general and special revenue sharing. In 1971, I proposed a reorganization of the executive branch agencies responsible for community and area development programs—to consolidate related functions and thereby assure better management. Substantial progress in furthering community development was made last year when General Revenue Sharing became law.

The 1974 budget reflects my determination to accelerate major reforms of programs for urban development and housing, rural development, transportation, and crime prevention and criminal justice.

Urban development and housing.—During the past 4 years, the private housing industry reached, and has maintained, an unprecedented level of housing production. Early in this period the downward trend in housing production that existed in 1969 was reversed. New housing starts rose 60%, from 1.5 million in calendar year 1969 to nearly 2.4 million in calendar year 1972, a new record. While federally subsidized starts were 11% of the 1972 total, it is clear that our broad fiscal and monetary policies are the dominant factors that determined the overall level of housing production.

Throughout this period, federally assisted housing programs have been plagued with problems and their intended beneficiaries have thus been shortchanged. As a result, new commitments under those programs which have not worked well enough have been temporarily halted, pending a complete reevaluation of the Federal role in housing and of alternative ways to provide housing.

In addition, no new projects will be approved under several outmoded and narrowly focused community development programs which have not produced benefits that justify their costs to the taxpayer. Continuing to channel resources into these programs can only delay the initiation of more effective programs and policies.

The 1974 budget will:

—honor those commitments already made under housing and community development programs;

—continue the evaluation of alternative ways to help the private market satisfy the Nation's need for housing;

—continue to seek congressional approval of the Administration's Urban Community Development Revenue Sharing proposal so that new funds can begin to flow to State and local governments on July 1, 1974; and

—emphasize those programs that help State and local officials strengthen their decisionmaking and management processes, allowing responsibility to be shifted increasingly to these officials, while the Federal Government concentrates on those activities which cannot be accomplished more effectively by the private sector or other levels of government.

Despite the halt in new commitments, federally assisted activity will continue at a high level. Subsidized housing starts in calendar year 1973 will increase over the previous year, totaling 270,000. Approximately 1,800 urban renewal projects will still be active. Federal outlays on these uncompleted housing and community development projects will rise from $4.0 billion in 1973 to $4.9 billion in 1974.

Rural development.—The 1974 budget consolidates and reorients our rural development programs.

While I would have preferred that the Congress enact special revenue sharing for rural development, the Rural Development Act of 1972 provides a basis for beginning efforts consistent with the revenue sharing concept. In particular, State and local officials will have greater control in project decisions. Rural development programs as a whole will increase over last year, with loan programs growing particularly rapidly.

I intend to watch closely our experience with this new approach and then consider whether additional legislation may be needed to make it more effective.

The counterpart to proceeding with the new authorities is the consolidation, termination, or reorientation of older programs. Public works and related economic development programs of the Department of Commerce will be phased out in favor of programs established under the Rural Development Act and Small Business Administration authorities. Loans to improve rural electric and telephone service will be available on an even larger scale—but at reduced cost to taxpayers—through the loan authority of the Rural Development Act and through the new Rural Telephone Bank.

Transportation.—The Federal role in transportation is significant but limited. It must insure that national needs, such as the Interstate Highway System and airway control, are met. Otherwise, the primary responsibilities rest with the States, local governments, and the private sector, while the Federal Government provides financial support.

Last year, the Administration supported legislation that recognized this proper Federal role. It proposed providing flexibility at the State and local level in meeting mass transit and highway needs and avoiding narrow categorical grants. The legislation narrowly failed to be enacted.

I will propose legislation incorporating the same principles again this year. The legislation and this budget propose a broad $1 billion program to aid urban mass transit capital investment and sufficient funds for the Interstate Highway System to insure completion of the system in a reasonable time.

The safety of our transportation systems is a matter of paramount importance. I have directed that Federal safety efforts for all modes of transportation be intensified.

Crime prevention and criminal justice.—Helping State and local criminal justice agencies fight crime in our cities and towns continues to be a major commitment of my Administration.

Outlays for law enforcement activities will be $2.6 billion in 1974, a 7½% increase over 1973. This increase reflects my determination to enforce the laws of this country and protect the safety of all our citizens. We must make certain, however, that the programs which assist State and local criminal justice systems are not only expanded, but reformed, and that we do a better job of reducing crime and rehabilitating criminal offenders. To accomplish these goals, I propose in this budget that:

—the grants to State and local governments for law enforcement assistance be converted to a law enforcement revenue sharing program with additional funding;

—the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration continue and strengthen its national research, demonstration, and dissemination efforts to develop more effective ways of preventing crime; and

—Federal agencies intensify their efforts to fight organized crime.

Further, new and improved measures to prevent airplane hijacking will be put into effect in cooperation with the airlines and airport operators.

CONCLUSION

The respect given to the common sense of the common man is what has made America the most uncommon of nations.

Common sense tells us that government cannot make a habit of living beyond its means. If we are not willing to make some sacrifices in holding down spending, we will be forced to make a much greater sacrifice in higher taxes or renewed inflation.

Common sense tells us that a family budget cannot succeed if every member of the family plans his own spending individually—which is how the Congress operates today. We must set an overall ceiling and affix the responsibility for staying within that ceiling.

Common sense tells us that we must not abuse an economic system that already provides more income for more people than any other system by suffocating the productive members of the society with excessive tax rates.

Common sense tells us that it is more important to save tax dollars than to save bureaucratic reputations. By abandoning programs that have failed, we do not close our eyes to problems that exist; we shift resources to more productive use.

It is hard to argue with these common sense judgments; surprisingly, it is just as hard to put them into action. Lethargy, habit, pride, and politics combine to resist the necessary process of change, but I am confident that the expressed will of the people will not be denied.

Two years ago, I spoke of the need for a new American Revolution to return power to people and put the individual *self* back in the idea of *self*-government. The 1974 budget moves us firmly toward that goal.

RICHARD NIXON.

JANUARY 29, 1973.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1974

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message for fiscal year 1974 is a courageous, incisive statement which reflects two critical fundamentals: First, the common sense, sound-government thinking of the American people who so overwhelmingly reelected Richard Nixon; and, second, the no-nonsense, courageous determination of a President who knows the people, a President who knows why they reelected him, and a President who does not intend to let them down.

Our citizens grew irritated with an inflation which ran nearly rampant. President Nixon moved forthrightly to harness that inflation. He does not intend to let it mount. I applaud his determination—and so do the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Our citizens have become distressed with burdensome taxes. President Nixon—abundantly cognizant of the people's plight—promised not to increase taxes. He meant it. He means it now. I applaud his steadfastness—and so do the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Our citizens know that intent, however forthright, and promises, however steadfast, are not sufficient in and of themselves. Holding down inflation and preventing increased taxes demand effort—careful scrutiny, tough decisionmaking, and fortitude. President Nixon knows that too. He has proven for 4 years that he has the keen mind necessary to analyze complex situations, the guts necessary to make hard decisions, and the will necessary to handle the difficult chores. The President has acted with the wisdom and bravery demanded of him in preparing the Federal budget for fiscal year 1974—a budget calling for a firm rein on Federal spending. I applaud the President's courage—and let me repeat, so do the American people.

The President has called upon the Congress to join him in a concerted effort to control Federal spending. I, for one, will stand with those at the head of the ranks who intend to do all that is possible to see that the Congress responds to the President with affirmative action.

After all, we in the Congress are responsible—and I trust responsive—to not only the President, but to the people who elected us to represent them. That should most certainly be the case in this House—whose Members are closest to the people.

The President has analyzed the American people well, stating:

> I do not believe the American people want higher taxes any more than they want inflation.

I, for one, do not intend to ignore that wise and firmly held conviction of the American people. I concur with the President's judgment that, with a firm rein on spending, neither increased taxes nor renewed inflation nor higher interest rates will be necessary.

Furthermore, I do not believe that the Congress will shrink from its responsibility. We Members of Congress should be aware that the people have spoken. If we were to fail to do our part in heeding the people's wishes, the Congress would bear full responsibility for the increased taxes, the growing inflation, and the higher interest rates that would result. We in the Congress must not let the people down.

Curbing spending, as the President's budget message so clearly states, is not the only action needed. In the President's words:

> Our goal must not be bigger government, but better government—at all levels. Our progress must not be measured by the amount of money we put into programs, but by the accomplishments which result from them.

The President intends to match his philosophy with action. I quote:

> Increased emphasis will be placed on program performance. Programs will be evaluated to identify those that must be redirected, reduced, or eliminated because they do not justify the taxes required to pay for them. Federal programs must meet their objectives and costs must be related to achievements.

President Nixon talked common sense in his no-nonsense Federal budget for fiscal year 1974—more common sense that I have seen reflected in a Federal budget in some time. The four points of common sense which the President made in his budget message conclusion reflect a great appreciation for and a deep understanding of the real spirit of our people:

> Common sense tells us that government cannot make a habit of living beyond its means. If we are not willing to make some sacrifice in holding down spending, we will be forced to make a much greater sacrifice in higher taxes or renewed inflation.
>
> Common sense tells us that a family budget cannot succeed if every member of the family plans his own spending individually—which is how the Congress operates today. We must set an overall ceiling and affix the responsibility for staying within that ceiling.
>
> Common sense tells us that we must not abuse an economic system that already provides more income for more people than any other system by suffocating the productive members of the society with excessive tax rates.
>
> Common sense tells us that it is more important to save tax dollars than to save bureaucratic reputations. By abandoning programs that have failed, we do not close our eyes to problems that exist; we shift resources to more productive use.

The people of America have spoken. They have expressed their will—against inflation and increased taxes. The President in his budget message has, in a sense, said—Here is how we can do it.

I intend to do all I can to prove the wisdom of the President's confidence "that the expressed will of the people will not be denied." In simple terms, the President is saying: You have a choice—either slow down the spending or you get additional taxes and inflation.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the red carnations which are being worn on the lapels of Members of the House today give a sanguine atmosphere to the House of Representatives. This sanguine atmosphere is not supported by the President's budget which has just been submitted.

I should like to recite some of the harsh facts of life with respect to the fiscal situation.

ONE-QUARTER OF U.S. DEBT ACCUMULATED IN 4 YEARS

During the 4-year period ending with June 30, 1973, the national debt, subject to limit, will have increased by $106 billion, bringing it to a total of $463 bil-

lion. This 4-year increase represents nearly one-fourth of the total national debt.

PROPOSED DEBT INCREASE IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

The budget proposes a further debt increase of over $29 billion for the fiscal year which will begin on July 1.

EXPENDITURE INCREASE

During the current fiscal year, 1973, expenditures are estimated to increase about $18 billion over the previous fiscal year.

During the fiscal year which begins July 1—that is, during fiscal year 1974—spending is estimated to increase $19 billion over the current fiscal year 1973.

UNIFIED DEFICIT TENDS TO MASK FEDERAL BORROWING REQUIREMENTS

Newspaper headlines—and this budget—proclaim that the estimated budget deficit for fiscal year 1974 is only about $13 billion—and, of course, even that is a rather monumental sum—as contrasted with an estimated deficit of about $25 billion for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, on the surface these figures look somewhat encouraging, but a study of the fine print reveals that the improvement is nowhere near as dramatic as it may appear.

TRUST FUND SURPLUSES

The budget is submitted on the so-called unified basis. Under this system surpluses in the trust funds are used to partially offset the enormous deficits in Federal funds. These surpluses are borrowed and used for general Federal expenditures, and eventually, of course, are to be repaid with interest. Borrowings from the trust funds to finance the Government in fiscal year 1973 are estimated to be about $9 billion. Borrowings from the trust funds for fiscal year 1974, which will begin July 1, are estimated to be $15 billion.

FEDERAL FUNDS DEFICITS

Mr. Speaker, the unified budget system I have just described tends to hide the fact that in fiscal 1972 we experienced a $29.1 billion Federal funds deficit; that the Federal funds deficit for fiscal year 1973 is estimated to be $34 billion, and that the Federal funds deficit for fiscal year 1974, about which the budget treats, is estimated to be about $28 billion.

In other words, for this current fiscal year, 1973, it is estimated to be $34 billion, and next year it is estimated to be $28 billion.

FEDERAL BORROWING CONTINUES TO GROW

Mr. Speaker, there is little room for rejoicing about such an astronomical Federal funds deficit as is proposed for fiscal year 1974. The projected deficit represents a slight decrease from the current year but there is no marked or dramatic change in the constantly dangerous overall fiscal trend in this country.

Mr. Speaker, putting it another way, the national debt subject to limit will increase in 1973 by $34 billion and by over $29 billion in 1974. So the unified budget as submitted does not highlight the enormity of the real deficit; that is, the Federal funds deficit.

INCREASES IN FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, when we turn to the first sentence of the budget message, we have this line:

> The 1974 budget fulfills my pledge to hold down Federal spending so that there will be no need for a tax increase.

There is, of course, no likelihood of Federal spending being held down below the figures of the current year. What the President really means here is that he proposes to slow down the rate of Federal spending increases.

The debt continues to skyrocket.

The heavy Federal funds deficits continue.

That, Mr. Speaker, is where we find ourselves at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must applaud the President for facing up to some of the major aspects of the fiscal crisis which continues to confront the country. He is to be applauded for the goal of trying to reduce spending. But the fact that the budget message accepts a deficit this year of $34 billion in Federal funds and a deficit next year of $29 billion in Federal funds all the more reflects the enormous problem confronting the country.

FURTHER EXPANSION OF THE BUDGET

I am among those who do not profess to know precisely how we will meet the situation. I believe that this budget will have to be expanded further by the Executive. There are no massive sums in this budget for the rehabilitation of war-torn Southeast Asia. Under the cease-fire agreement this country is pledged to investment in the rehabilitation of southeast Asia, including South and North Vietnam. No doubt additional sums will be requested of the Congress to implement the cease-fire at a later date. So we are confronted with a very precarious situation.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON 1973 BUDGET

In the appropriation bills last year Congress reduced the President's estimated budget authority by over $5 billion. In spending, this reduction translated to about $1.5 billion. But Congress also increased spending for fiscal 1973 by about $7.5 billion in backdoor and other nonappropriation bills, resulting in a net congressional increase of about $6 billion in estimated spending.

IMPOUNDING

The President now states in the budget message—and he has stated it otherwise—that he is going to hold spending to $250 billion for the fiscal year which ends on June 30. He proposes not to spend funds which have been made available by the Congress for expenditure during this period of time. I believe myself that the administration has gone beyond the bounds of propriety and beyond the limit of Executive authority in impounding funds. I am not saying that we ought not to try to hold down spending. I am saying when Congress expressed its will and authorized programs and then provided for the funding of these programs, it is obligatory on the part of the Executive to carry out the will of the Congress, be it in his opinion wise or unwise.

ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT OF 1950

In 1950 the Anti-Deficiency Act was rewritten. This gives the Executive some limited latitude in withholding the expenditure of funds.

I think it would be well for me to read the basis of authority for withholding spending in that act, and for us to consider whether the President has the authority to make the massive reductions in programs he is now making:

> Section 3679. (c) In apportioning any appropriation, reserves may be established to provide for contingencies or to effect savings—

The President can provide for contingencies and can make reductions to effect savings whenever savings are made possible. For example, an estimate of too much to finance a program if it develops that the program can be carried out more efficiently—

> or to effect savings whenever savings are made possible by or through changes in requirements, greater efficiency of operations, or other developments subsequent to the date on which such appropriation was made available.

If there are sudden and dramatic changes in the situation in particular programs after spending authority is given the President, then he can make certain changes—

> Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required—

So, if the President or the administration feels these funds are not required, then that is the situation laid down in the law—

> Whenever it is determined by an officer designated in subsection (d) of this section to make apportionments and reapportionments that any amount so reserved will not be required to carry out the purposes of the appropriation concerned, he shall recommend the rescission of such amount in the manner provided in the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for estimates of appropriations.

So that the proper procedure if the administration is not going to use the funds is to propose rescission of those funds as required by law, and this would give Congress an opportunity to act affirmatively and specifically in regard to the problem.

Admittedly, the administration and the Congress must find a better way to cope with the situation which confronts us, and the Anti Deficiency Act suggests one avenue that might be worth exploring.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON BUDGET CONTROL

As all of you know, we have a 32-member joint committee created as a result of an act of Congress late in the last session, a committee which is designed to try to figure out ways to get better legislative control of the fiscal situation. That group, headed in the House by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), will be making a progress report on its deliberations sometime in February.

EXPENDITURE CEILINGS

The budget message says that we must have a rigid expenditure limitation. People are shouting from the housetops that we must have an expenditure limitation. They seem to think that an expenditure limitation is something that will give us a magical way to get the budget under control.

A mere expenditure limitation would be somewhat ridiculous unless Congress took action to reduce the ever-increasing authority of the administration to spend money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. It would make absolutely no sense whatever and it would be injurious to the legislative branch to have an expenditure limitation abdicating to the Executive what to do about the programs which we have funded. Expenditure limitations properly drafted could be fashioned as a useful part of an overall effort to control the budget, but a flat rigid spending ceiling ignores the logic of our present budget system.

If we want to control the Mississippi River we could not very well control it by building a huge dam at the mouth of the river. That would be an impractical approach to the problem. The way to control the Mississippi River would be to control it from upstream on the tributaries. That is the only way you could possibly control the Mississippi River.

CONTROLLING SPENDING

The only way to ultimately control spending is to do something about controlling the authorization of new programs, and to do something about controlling the funding of the programs through appropriation bills, back-door spending and other nonappropriation bills. The Executive could contribute greatly to budget control by submitting budgets that do not propose such gigantic deficits.

BUDGET OUT OF WHACK

It is clearly evident that this budget is out of whack. It is in many ways indefensible. This year we will go in debt by $34 billion, next year, over $29 billion. Those estimates could well increase by the close of the respective fiscal years.

There is no easy way to deal with the situation either. We are providing excessive spending authority or we are not providing enough revenue, or some combination of the two. So the question arises: Can we reduce spending authority? Can we find additional revenue? What course do we wish to follow?

To go in debt over a 4-year period by about $106 billion is indefensible. We simply cannot afford to continue at any such clip. I am not speaking derogatorily, because I think the President is doing the best he can under a difficult situation. This is a nonpartisan problem, but one that continues to get worse.

The average Federal funds deficit during the Eisenhower administration was $2.7 billion; during the Kennedy administration, $7.4 billion; during the Johnson administration, $11.6 billion; and during the Nixon administration, including that projected for fiscal 1974, $26.8 billion.

It is up to the U.S. Congress, working in cooperation between the House and the Senate, and with the administration, to try to find an answer to the problem which confronts us. Will it be more revenues? Will it be less spending? Or, what will it be?

A BAREBONES BUDGET

These remarks are made off the cuff. I have read the President's budget message, but I have not had an opportunity to read the entire budget thoroughly. I realize the President is confronted with a very serious situation. He has recommended that programs enacted by Congress be trimmed by $17 billion for the fiscal year which begins on July 1. I do not recall a more drastic budget submitted to Congress at any time in the past. It is a very difficult and serious situation that confronts us.

I see the "watch dog" of the Treasury, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, on his feet. He is wearing the sanguine color of the red carnation, but I am afraid he has some degree of concern about the President's budget.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for the information he has provided. I certainly share the concern he has expressed over the financial condition of the Government.

The gentleman mentioned the so-called settlement in Vietnam. I wonder if the gentleman was contacted, or if any Member in the House of Representatives, for that matter, was contacted. Certainly if anyone was contacted it ought to have been the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, with respect to that provision in the settlement in chapter 8, article 21 which provides that the United States will carry on in its "traditional role."

I do not know what that means. I did not know we had a "traditional role" of taking care of every Tom, Dick, and Harry around the world. But under the terms, article 21 is bound to help the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, which is North Vietnam, and it goes on to say "and throughout Indochina," which means every country in that area.

Was the gentleman contacted?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that on some occasions the President did mention suggested peace settlements at the White House conferences with the leadership.

He did state at that time that North Vietnam would be offered certain assistance as a part of the settlement, and in further fairness I must say that it is my offhand recollection that President Johnson upon one occasion made reference to helping in the rehabilitation of North Vietnam as one of the facets of a hoped for agreement to get a cease-fire.

But with respect to the recent agreement, I was not contacted. I was at the White House with the leadership at the time the President explained the cease-fire agreement, and reference was made in a very general way to some degree of rehabilitation of the wartorn areas of Indochina.

I have said in the past and I will repeat now that this aspect of the cease-fire will be, of course, very upsetting to the American public and to the American taxpayer, but I think Congress will of necessity have to look closely into the requirements and do whatever appears to be appropriate in the light of the agreements which this country through the Executive has made.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman that Congress should look closely into any request, and I do think it is incumbent that Congress pay especially close attention to the reparations that may be paid to Communist North Vietnam.

If the gentleman was present he will remember that I tried last week in the congressional meeting with Mr. Kissinger to elicit from him some indication of what this money handout might be with respect to Indochina including North Vietnam. I got exactly nowhere with my questions.

Mr. MAHON. That is a pretty touchy and difficult and upsetting subject at this time. It will come later.

Mr. GROSS. It will be just as upsetting later, as far as I am concerned, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I understand fully.

Mr. Speaker, here today I have not attempted to probe in depth the many characteristics of the complex budget document presented to us today. In the days and weeks immediately ahead of us, the Committee on Appropriations will be examining the many facets of the budget and we will be reporting to the House.

On Monday and Tuesday of next week we will have before us Secretary of the Treasury Shultz, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors for the purposes of examining the budget. After these sessions and as we have further opportunity to study what has been presented today, I will report to House in more detail.

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

BUDGET MESSAGE FOR THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, today the President has presented his budget for fiscal year 1974.

It will be a difficult budget for those of us in the Congress to handle, but it is a responsibility that has to be faced.

We in the Congress, whether we like to hear it or not, have not assumed our fiscal responsibility. We constantly hear

complaints about the spending policies of the President and the Office of Management and Budget but Congress has the tools to control Federal spending if we are willing to use them.

How did we get into this problem and how do we get out? I think this is worthy of a little analysis.

In the first place we cannot blame the House or the Senate Appropriations Committees. If we will look at the record over the past number of years we will find that the Appropriations Committees of the Congress have continually reduced the new obligational authority that has been requested in the budget. I sometimes think that what we need here in the Congress is a little instruction as to just exactly what spending is approved by the Appropriations Committee, and what spending is approved by legislating committees.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee said, during the last session of Congress the Appropriations Committee reduced the fiscal year 1973 budget authority by $6.6 billion and spending by $1.6 billion. Unfortunately, when the simple facts are considered the Congress did not reduce anything. After taking account of spending approved outside of the appropriations process, the net result of congressional action was that the budget authority was increased by $9.1 billion and outlays by $6.3 billion.

I think it is time that we in the Congress be honest with the American people and tell them very frankly that if we are going to go ahead with the spending programs, whether through the appropriation procedure or outside it, the time has come that we face the fact that we have to either raise the revenue by increased taxes or our deficits will increase, carrying with it the very dangerous seed of increased inflation that none of us want.

We are all concerned about the President impounding funds. I do not like the impoundment of funds any more than anyone else, but the simple facts are that if spending is not held to $250 billion as proposed by the President for this current fiscal year the expenditures will probably be over $260 billion. Without this restraint the 1974 budget, which now comes in at $268.7 billion, would have to come in at $288 billion and the fiscal year 1975 budget would balloon up to $312 billion.

Now, these are facts which we in the House had better consider. I can understand the President's position. We met with him the other day, and he understood our position. But, what are you going to do when you are trying to hold inflation down; when you are trying to keep our economy on an upward keel? Let it get it out of hand? If I were the President, I would do the same thing. The only way to prevent it is for us to be responsible.

We talk about a budget ceiling. Well, the President is requesting a budget ceiling. I have no objections to a budget ceiling. I will support a ceiling, but I have no illusions about a budget ceiling. We went through that in the past, and what did we do? We broke the ceiling.

We now have these choices. We are either going to stand up and be counted on some of these very tough issues that affect us in our districts, or we are going to have to face up to the fact that we are responsible for a tax increase.

I listened with interest yesterday when our distinguished Speaker appeared on one of the national programs, and he said this: If the Congress in its wisdom decides that we are going to increase spending, he would be for a tax increase. That is the statesmanlike position.

Now, I sit on the Joint Committee on Budget Review which is going to meet at 2 o'clock today to go into some discussions regarding how we in the Congress can get hold of the spending mechanism in order to be effective. There are discussions about a ceiling; discussions about an overall budget in which things are going to be assigned here and there. We may, and I hope we do, although frankly I am not too optimistic, come in with this kind of machinery that will hopefully bring some sense of balance out of the chaos that we have and which we have created ourselves.

But, the question is, can we get 218 Members to walk down the line to sustain those positions?

Mr. Speaker, the Federal budget for 1974 submitted to the Congress today by the President shows the way to better government and continued economic progress. At the same time, that budget keeps Federal spending within the limits required if we are to avoid higher taxes or renewed inflation. Of particular interest in this new budget is the President's call for the Congress to pass a rigid $268.7 billion ceiling on outlays in 1974 before any spending bills are considered.

I believe that an appropriate way for us in the Congress to begin our consideration of the President's proposals is to look at the goals, directions, and objectives which have shaped it.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS

In his budget message, the President stresses the need to "move the Nation's economy toward a goal it has not achieved in nearly two decades: a high-employment prosperity for America's citizens without inflation and without war."

Central to the achievement of this goal is maintenance of the full-employment budget principle. In brief, this principle holds that except in emergency conditions, expenditures should not exceed the level at which the budget would be balanced under conditions of full employment.

One of the hallmarks of the full-employment budget concept is its flexibility—there are times when stimulus is appropriate and there are times when restraint is called for. In the two previous budgets, adherence to this principle meant providing fiscal stimulus to an economy which was then operating below capacity. The efficacy of these and other monetary and economic actions was seen in the calendar year 1972; employment increased by 2.3 million persons, real output was up 7½ percent, business investment climbed 14 percent and the rate of increase in the consumer price level declined.

Now that the economy is on the upswing toward full employment, the full-employment budget concept requires that less stimulus be given to the economy in the form of budgetary deficits, hence the deficit for 1974 is estimated to be approximately half of the deficits for 1972 and 1973. On a full employment basis, the budget is in balance.

The President has said many times that Federal spending can and should be held down so that there will be no need for a tax increase. The 1974 budget shows how this can be done. The President recommends continued and increased support of many effective and needed programs; however, he also plans on reducing or terminating many programs which are ineffective, obsolete, or can be better carried on outside the Federal Government.

In many respects, the course the President outlines is a difficult one, but the necessity for making the kind of choices represented in the budget is convincingly illustrated by what will happen without this kind of restraint. The 1974 budget estimates outlays of $250 billion in 1973, and $269 billion in 1974. Without the alternatives proposed by this budget, 1973 spending would be over $10 billion more and 1974 spending would be almost $20 billion more. Most important of all, these higher spending levels together with a full employment balance would have required an across-the-board personal income tax surcharge of at least 15 percent or its equivalent in other tax increases.

THE CALL TO THE CONGRESS TO CONTROL SPENDING

The President asks that the Congress support his efforts to control spending by establishing a rigid ceiling on outlays for 1974 before we consider any individual authorization or appropriation bills. He also calls upon the Congress to accept responsibility for the budget totals and to develop a systematic procedure for maintaining fiscal discipline. To this end, he pledges the full cooperation of the administration with the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control chaired by Representatives WHITTEN and ULLMAN on which I am pleased to serve. These requests by the President will, I am sure, receive serious consideration by the Congress.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENT AT ALL LEVELS

A goal of the budget second only to continued economic progress is the improvement of Government at all levels in the United States.

As the President notes, since the mid-1950's, the share of GNP devoted to governmental activity has risen from a quarter to a third. He believes, and I agree, that it should not go higher. By restructuring the Federal Government and by revitalizing the division of responsibilities and the cooperation among the Federal, State, and local governments, not only can we avoid further encroachments into the private sector, but we can improve the service each citizen gets from each level of government.

Of all the President's proposals to achieve these goals, the one of the most interest to the Congress is, I believe, his call for enactment of special revenue sharing programs which will provide funds for specific purposes, with greater flexibility by the States and localities.

THE PROGRAM PRIORITIES OF THE 1974 BUDGET

Within the spending limits necessary to continue economic progress and avoid a tax increase or renewed inflation, the 1974 budget sets forth the President's program priorities.

The first of these priorities—the one closest to the President and the one toward which the country has made such dramatic progress during the past year and particularly in the past week—is building a lasting structure of peace in the world.

Securing this goal requires maintaining the military strength we need to support our negotiations and diplomacy, to preserve our security, and to continue our role as a major force for peace. The budget demonstrates that this can be done in 1974 with no greater defense outlays over 1973 than those required by pay and price rises. The effort to eliminate unnecessary defense spending has succeeded in the years of the Nixon administration: the war in Vietnam has been halted, our allies have assumed increased responsibilities for mutual defense, our own military forces have been reduced, and we are well on our way to ending the draft and achieving an All-Volunteer Force. As a result, defense expenditures in 1974 will be very close to those in 1969.

The other major way in which this budget reflects the objective of peace in the world is the sound fiscal policy it proposes which, when supported by a complementary monetary policy, will contribute to the prosperity and economic stability which is so essential for calm and productive international relations. The budget provides for continuing U.S. participation in international monetary reform. The foreign assistance proposals for 1974 are based on the expectation that other nations' efforts as well as our own are necessary for both security and economic progress.

Budgets of the past 4 years have all shown a trend which is continued in the 1974 budget: an increasing percentage of total budget outlays are for human resources programs. Between 1969 and 1974, outlays for these programs will double, while total budget outlays will grow by less than one-half.

The program proposals designed to make wise use of our natural resources, another area of importance, seek to strike a balance between development and preservation. Energy research and development programs which can lead to providing adequate supplies of clean energy are given emphasis in this budget, as are proposals for public and private land use. The agriculture programs outlined in the budget seek to expand world markets, and stabilize the domestic economy.

Reforming community and area development programs is another priority which is reflected in the 1974 budget proposals. Private housing production in the past 4 years has improved dramatically while many of the Federal housing programs have been plagued with problems. Consequently, the 1974 budget proposes a complete reevaluation of alternative ways to provide housing and of the Federal Government's proper role. Commitments already made under the programs to be reviewed will be honored and, consequently, federally assisted activity will continue at a high level; however, no new projects will be approved in those programs which have not demonstrated their worth.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this budget will receive careful consideration by the Congress.

Surely; it is bitter medicine, but the more serious the disease, the more traumatic the accident, the more difficult the treatment is.

We must face up to the fact that the treatment to cure this fiscal ill is going to require that we all participate in a dose of very bitter medicine.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have waited many long years for the opportunity to get on with solving our own problems here at home. Now that we have ended our tragic involvement in Vietnam, our waiting can finally end and our building can begin.

The President's new budget proposal fails completely to provide the outline for a peacetime society. Indeed, it has a very austere wartime tone which is totally out of place in today's world.

Military spending is increased more than $5.6 billion and that increase is not all for pay raises as we have been told. There is over a billion dollar increase for the operation of our numerous military bases around the world, another billion dollar increase for weapons procurement, and a third billion dollar increase for research and construction.

In practically every area of our daily life, however, the Nixon budget seeks to drastically reduce a wide array of Government services.

The education of our children is a prime target of the Nixon budget. Office of Eduction funds are to be reduced by $276 million and the popular Headstart program for disadvantaged children is to be eliminated.

The rebuilding of our cities and the development of our communities have a very low priority with the Nixon administration. The Economic Development Administration for areas of severe unemployment and low-family income is to be discontinued. HUD community development funds are cut by 90 percent. Urban renewal funds are cut over 90 percent. The model cities program is terminated. Funds for neighborhood community centers, open space lands, housing rehabilitation, and water and sewer grants are all eliminated.

In the field of health, the medical facilities construction program is eliminated. The regional medical health program is abolished. Health manpower aid is cut by $346 million. Funds for the National Institutes of Health are reduced by $33 million. And international health research programs are cut by 90 percent.

The war on poverty has been called off with the termination of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Its community action programs are reduced by two-thirds and its legal service programs by one-half.

Instead of a peacetime budget, we are seeing crucial peacetime programs being completely wiped out. This budget in no way reflects strong priorities which seek to improve our lives while reducing our excessive military spending.

We shall hear that these cuts in domestic programs are necessary to prevent a tax rise, but it is clearly the rise in military spending which causes the greatest pressure on our economy.

Because we are provided with such misguided priorities in the President's new budget, it is clear that this year the Congress must set our national priorities in a way which reflects the real needs of our citizens. We must create a true peactime budget which puts our military strength in its proper perspective and which offers our people the widest range of opportunities to improve the quality of all of our lives.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the President's budget.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK T. BOW OF OHIO

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that we pay tribute today to our late and much beloved colleague, Frank T. Bow. January 29 was always an occasion marked by Frank himself to honor a fellow Stark County, Ohio, native, President William McKinley. Frank was proud that this great American came from Canton, like himself, and particularly proud of the fact that McKinley served six terms in this House as Representative of the same area Frank served with such high distinction for so many years.

Frank Townsend Bow was born February 20, 1901, just a scant 7 months before President McKinley succumbed on September 14 to an assassin's bullet. Frank was reared in the tradition of McKinley's greatness, integrity, and absolute devotion to country and duty. Like McKinley he grew into a statesman of great stature and national prestige, rec-

ognized for his ability to ignore petty controversies, to foresee the trend of public thought, dedicated to the highest principles in both his personal and public lives.

Our late friend grew up in Stark County, attending public schools in Canton and Plain Township, as well as Culver Military Academy. After law school at Ohio Northern University at Ada, he completed his postgraduate work at Columbia University and was admitted to the bar in 1923. He practiced law in Canton and in 1929 became Assistant Attorney General of Ohio, a position he filled until 1932.

During World War II, Frank was news editor of WHBC in Canton. In 1945, he was selected to serve as war correspondent with Ohio's 37th Division in the Philippines. His concern over Government took him, when war ended, to Washington, where he became general counsel to the Subcommittee on Expenditures and to the Select Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission during the 80th Congress. He served as legislative assistant to Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel of Kansas in the 81st Congress.

Recognizing a man of unique intelligence, ability, and integrity, the 16th District of Ohio elected Frank to the 82d Congress on November 7, 1950. His proud constituents never stopped reelecting him, to 10 succeeding Congresses in all, until he himself announced plans for retirement at the end of the last Congress, completing 22 years of unselfish dedication to his district and his Nation. Frank Bow did as much for the taxpayers of America as any man who ever served in this House. The Bow amendment became a famous synonym for economy in Government.

Knowing him as well as I did, I can add with assurance that Frank would have been pleased to know that his day of tributes in the Chamber is the same day that Capitol Hill has received a budget message from President Nixon, whom he served so loyally, saying, "It is time to get big Government off your back and out of your pocket." Frank would have liked that. He said it himself many times over the years, and he backed up his words with action.

To me, Frank Bow was always more than a mentor, more than a leader and wise counselor during our years together in the Ohio delegation and on the great House Committee on Appropriations. He was all those, to be sure, but, in addition, he was one of the closest friends I have had in Washington. His companionship was without equal, his sense, of humor and sharp wit unmatchable. I shall always miss him, and I shall always regret that his untimely death last November 13 prevented him from fulfilling his last dream of filling his appointment by President Nixon to Ambassador to Panama.

It was just about a year ago that Frank announced his retirement to be effective at the end of the 92d Congress. At that time I read into the RECORD editorials from newspapers in his district, one of which said, in part:

Mr. Bow has been a Republican watchdog in the U.S. House of Representatives for more than two decades. He has kept an eye on federal matters as well as always being sensitive to the best interest of his constituents . . . In return for this type of concerned service, his constituents returned Rep. Bow to office every time he asked them to do so. That fact, in itself, says more about Rep. Frank T. Bow than could a mountain of words.

To which I added that to the richly deserved titles of Mr. Republican, Mr. Invincible, and friend of the people, we must add Mr. Sincerity, Mr. Integrity and, as the President refers to him, Mr. Responsibility.

Yes, it is true that a mountain of words could be spoken about Frank Bow, for he was a mountain of a man in ability, intelligence, and breadth of soul.

Fanny joins me in extending our love and sympathy to Frank's wonderful wife Caroline and their two fine sons, Bob and Joe.

I yield to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my friend from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) in his words of tribute to a former great Member of this House.

Frank Bow was a courageous, contributing, and active Member of this House, bringing absolute dedication to the principles he espoused. He had immeasurable influence on the appropriation process of the House of Representatives, and his expertise on matters pertaining to the budget was unequaled. Frank's name will always be synonymous with economy and responsibility in Government.

Frank was a skilled debater, a great orator, and an outstanding parliamentarian. Few from the House have attained his stature and effectiveness.

He was a wonderful man, a gentle person, who loved his friends and whose friends loved him.

I join the gentleman from Ohio in mourning his passing. The country has lost a very distinguished and a very great statesman.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Camden, my good friend, Frank Bow's successor, RALPH REGULA.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my first speech on the floor of the House can be in eulogy to a great American, Frank T. Bow, and also to mention, as I discuss my predecessor, his relation to our martyred President, President William McKinley.

Both of these men came from Canton in Stark County, Ohio, and at one time represented the 16th Congressional District. Today we have the red or scarlet carnations symbolic of these two men. The scarlet carnation was named the official flower of the State of Ohio during William McKinley's term in the governorship. It was adopted then because of his great love for the red carnation.

Today we have a delegation with us from Alliance, which has been designated by the Ohio General Assembly as Carnation City. It is through their courtesy and the effort of the Lamborn Floral Co., of Alliance, that each Member has a red carnation. Carnations have also been placed in the House dining room.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of Ohio, I am pleased by the attention accorded the late President William McKinley on this occasion, the anniversary of his birth. I would like at this moment to join in the general chorus of respect for his name and his performance in the world of politics and statesmanship. He was truly one of the finest of Ohio's sons—a credit to the Nation and a credit to his State.

At the same time, I would call to the attention of the House the record of another outstanding citizen of Ohio, only recently deceased—the Honorable Frank T. Bow, my predecessor on this floor as Representative of the Ohio 16th District; a veteran of 22 years of service to the people of the 16th District of Ohio.

There was a tie between these men—William McKinley and Frank T. Bow, a tie transcending the fact of their mere association as Ohioans. Although Frank Bow was not around to witness the performance of President McKinley, he was to live in the tradition of the martyred President's great record throughout the full extent of his lifetime. For, in the manner of McKinley, Frank Bow had a talent for serving the interests of the people with progressive intent, within the confines of the spirit and the letter of the Constitution, and in so doing held the confidence of his constituents through 11 terms of congressional service.

Despite a brief and fleeting period in an out-of-State military school and post graduate work in New York City, Frank Bow was largely a product of the Ohio education system, in which he flourished. His legal training was acquired in part at Ohio Northern University, which he entered at the close of World War I, graduating in 1923. He also attended Columbia University, and upon his return home entered quickly into politics and government, serving from 1929 to 1932 as assistant attorney general of Ohio.

His initial contact with national politics came as counsel for two congressional investigating committees during the challenging days of the first Truman administration.

It has often been observed that President McKinley acquired his qualities of leadership as a participant in military conflict, having served both as an enlisted man and as an officer in the Civil War, concluding his services as an aide to Gen. Rutherford B. Hayes. Upon returning to private life he was involved in the furious election campaigns of the Reconstruction period, winning recognition as a man of high intelligence and deep conviction.

The year 1876 was a turning point for McKinley. When the miners struck at the Warmington Mine west of Massillon, Ohio, there was violence, bloodshed, and the destruction of property. Public opinion ran high against them, and it was difficult to find an attorney who would defend them. McKinley volunteered to do so, won a favorable verdict by his heart-stirring appeal, and charged nothing for his service. This won him strong labor support for the rest of his political career. Incidentally, Mark

Hanna was present at the trial, and was greatly impressed, though the case went against his company.

McKinley won the Republican nomination for Congress for the 17th district now the 16th in 1876, and won the election.

Much the same sort of experience was in store for Frank Bow, who served in World War II as a war correspondent with Ohio's 37th Division, fighting in the Philippines. When the shooting stopped, he did not return directly to politics, in the manner of McKinley. He was, however, vitally involved in the national political process as early as 1947, only 2 years following the close of military hostilities, as General Counsel to the House Subcommittee on Expenditures of the 80th Congress, and the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission. As McKinley had become famous on a national scale, opposing waste and extravagance in government, so Frank Bow became famous on a smaller sphere, seeking through his influence to limit the expenditures of the Federal bureaucracy and to provide responsible government.

An outstanding feature of the Republican controlled 80th Congress was the intense endeavor on the part of the majority party to break the extravagant overspending traditions of the minority party, which had controlled for so long the purse strings of the country. Frank Bow's performance as majority counsel on the staffs of two House committees was wholly in keeping with the Republican Party purposes in this regard. Deeply impressed, Senator Andrew F. Shoepel of Kansas offered Frank Bow a position as his administrative assistant, in which capacity he was to come to the attention of many Republican leaders in Washington.

In the 1950 off-year elections Frank Bow returned to Stark County to seek the Republican congressional nomination for the 16th Ohio District, and carried the day with the blessings of many profesional political leaders and a large share of the Republican rank and file. In the great Republican upsurge of that year, he was returned to Washington, as a Member of the 82d Congress, and was to represent the 16th District from that moment until the day of his recent demise. Coming as he did from the land of President McKinley, and belonging as he did to the party of President McKinley, Frank Bow was in many ways similar to that most remarkable man. Primarily, he was opposed to execessive Federal spending and as ranking minority member of the Approprations Committee and second ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, he made his presence felt whenever the so-called giveaway programs became the issue of the day.

As my colleague stated, I am sure Frank would have enjoyed the debate on this day.

In many instances, of course, he was overwhelmed by the united opposition intent on over spending, yet in many other cases, he was able to keep the lid on the Treasury, in the national behalf.

It is ironic that Frank Bow's idol, President McKinley, died at the hands of the anarchist assassin in the year 1901, in which year Frank Bow was born. Even in death, McKinley lived in spirit for many years thereafter, molding the policies of a thousand thoughtful political leaders—and Frank Bow was one of these.

The ageless wisdom of President McKinley was shown in the quote from his last speech delivered at the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo in 1901. He said to the assembled representatives from many nations, along with thousands of people, and I quote:

> Gentlemen, let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict, and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. We hope that all who are represented here may be moved to higher and nobler efforts for their own and the world's good, and that out of this city may come not only greater commerce and trade for us all, but, more essential than these, relations of mutual respect, confidence, and friendship which will deepen and endure.
>
> Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness, and peace to all our neighbors, and like blessings to all the peoples and powers of the earth.

The anarchist terror, extending from McKinley's murder to that of Archduke Ferdinand, and the resulting chaos of World War I, was the outgrowth of mass unemployment, poverty, hunger, and homelessness among the poor people of the Western world.

Then it was that revolutionary proposals and glorious panaceas were offered on every hand by self-styled political magicians. But the people of America went for McKinley and his practical solutions, which carried the day, killed the depression, ended the riots and the strikes, and satisfied the people. Such was McKinley's brand of politics. Such was Frank Bow's brand of politics.

"Frank T. Bow—the man you know" became not only a campaign slogan, but because of Frank's years of devoted service to his people in the 16th district, a fact that endeared him to countless thousands of citizens from all walks of life.

His record of helping people with their problems stands as a monument equaling his great legislative contributions to the Nation.

In the 82d Congress Frank Bow served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee where he coauthored the first law authorizing research in the conversion of saline water, gained recognition as a leader of the successful opposition to authorization of the Hell's Canyon Federal power project, and sponsored a comprehensive study of the conditions of American Indians which was the basis for subsequent legislation.

Frank Bow served since 1959 as a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution and secretary of the committee in charge of new construction at the Institution.

In addition, he has been particularly active in legislation on foreign trade policy and the status of U.S. Armed Forces abroad.

He was the author of a text on labor-management relations and of many periodical articles.

In 1961 he was awarded the honorary doctor of laws degree by Ohio Northern University, and in 1963 he received the honorary doctor of laws degree from Mount Union College.

Frank T. Bow, family man, dedicated Representative and patriot, will be long remembered in the hearts of those he served so well.

The final tribute to Frank Bow's distinguished record was the confidence accorded him by President Richard Nixon in naming him Ambassador to Panama, with responsibility for handling the delicate negotiations for a new treaty with Panama.

The 16th District is proud of two great Americans, President William McKinley, who also served as Governor of Ohio and Congressman from the 16th District area, and Frank T. Bow, a worthy successor to this mantle of responsibility.

On a personal note, my wife Mary and I felt a great personal loss on learning of Frank's death. He was a friend whose memory we shall always cherish.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. MAHON, of Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak at great length. A speech of whatever length could not be an adequate tribute to the memory of that distinguished gentleman from Ohio, my friend, Frank T. Bow.

Last year when he announced that he would not seek reelection, many of us in the House made some remarks about this distinguished legislator.

We worked together on appropriation matters so well for many years. I have never met a more cooperative Member. He was a man who was broad of vision and understanding, a man who worked with Democrats as well as with Republicans, a man who worked in behalf of the country. He was a man intensely interested in the welfare of his country.

Frank Bow became ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations about 6 months after I succeeded to the chairmanship in 1964.

We had, of course, been friends and colleagues on the committee for many years prior. But with the beginning of the 1965 session of Congress a new relationship developed between us—one of working closely together in pursuit of a common goal; namely, that of fiscal responsibility in the appropriations process and in Government spending.

Frank Bow earned the reputation he had established throughout the country for understanding and leadership in Federal fiscal policy.

Beyond that, however, and less known outside of the Congress, Frank Bow had an unusual ability to get to the heart of an issue and to find solutions when it appeared that opposing sides of an issue had reached an impasse. Time after time, he was able to provide the basis for agreement when it appeared that disagreements were irreconcilable. He was a legislator of unusual skill and capacity, possessing the talent to reconcile opposing forces and differing approach-

es—the basic requirement if a legislative body is to function.

All of us were aware of the respect with which Frank Bow's views and opinions were received by Presidents and the leaders in the Government departments and agencies during Frank Bow's period of service.

In a large measure, Frank Bow was the originator of congressionally imposed expenditure limitations proposals. Five years ago, he developed what became known as the Bow expenditure limitation, an amendment he offered to several appropriation bills establishing a ceiling on spending. He made a major contribution in insisting upon a policy of restraint by Congress in authorizing and funding legislative programs. Beyond that, he insisted upon expenditure limitations to impose restraints upon departments and agencies, a matter which promises to be very much to the fore in the session this year.

I think of Frank Bow in terms of personal friendship. He was my warm and understanding friend. I shall always cherish the memory of my association with this great American, and my association with his family. My sympathy and the sympathy of my wife go to Mrs. Bow and other dear ones left behind.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join my colleagues in commemoration and in respectful memory of our departed colleague Frank T. Bow of Ohio.

I had more than a passing interest in Mr. Bow because I not only served with him as a colleague in the Congress for 14 years, but if the Members will pardon a personal reference, it takes me back to my high school days when I was playing football at Arlington High School in Columbus where there was a young fellow named Robert Bow, the son of Frank T. Bow, so I knew the son before I knew his dad.

When I first met Frank Bow on the floor of this Congress he took me under his experienced wing and gave me guidance, help and direction, which has been useful during the intervening years.

I think it is altogether fitting that on this day when the President sends his budget, we find it is the day when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) has so kindly taken time to pay tribute to the memory of Frank Bow. As the Members know, Frank Bow was almost known as "Mr. Budget." I think we might do well in the Chamber just to make that blanket 5-percent cut in the budget in memory of Frank Bow, because that is what he offered every year. He was not always successful but he was always sincere. This Congress and the Nation might well pay tribute to him for that.

He was a very human individual. I know one instance where one of our very loyal employees in this House had a very serious family tragedy, one of the worst kinds that can happen to a family, which involved the losing of a loved one. Frank Bow, a man of great importance and influence in this House, nevertheless had the time to sit down and talk to this family and render them sympathy and solace and help them through this very trying time.

Frank Bow was a man whose name will go down in the annals of history as one of the great Members of this House of Representatives.

In conclusion may I also add a couple of other commendatory notes. First I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) on his maiden speech commemorating not only the memory of Frank Bow but also the birthday of another son of Canton, Ohio, Mr. REGULA's district, Mr. William McKinley, for whom we all wear the red carnation, the flower of Ohio, in his memory today.

Also I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), who is from Cleveland, who has taken this time, and who also succeeded the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow, on the Committee on Committees. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) has also done a great job in that particular position and was a worthy successor for Mr. Bow in what has been done for Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

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

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, during recent months America has suffered the loss of many of its great and respected leaders. Our only two surviving former Presidents were taken from us. Three Members of the House died in airplane accidents.

Also lost to the people of the United States during this tragic period was a man who commanded the respect of all who knew him during his long and outstanding career in the Congress. Frank T. Bow, a distinguished son of Ohio, had announced his retirement from Congress and was preparing to accept a new responsibility on behalf of our country, the post of Ambassador to the Republic of Panama. In his passing we suffer a double loss. He was a patriot, a friend to many, faithful to his beliefs, and a dynamic leader. He placed country above party and truth above all else.

It has been stated many times that Frank Bow's public service closely followed in the McKinley tradition of courage and devotion to America. There are many areas of similarity in their careers and in their contributions. Perhaps it is particularly appropriate that on McKinley's birthday anniversary we now honor our late colleague Frank Bow.

Frank Bow was a strong voice for fiscal responsibility. I knew this better than most because I served with him on the House Committee on Appropriations where his services were so well appreciated and so highly applauded. As the ranking minority member he had one of the most important and responsible positions in the House. His accomplishments there and elsewhere in his congressional career will remain a part of American history for the benefit of future generations.

I am proud to have been Frank Bow's friend, and I join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his wife and family and to the thousands of friends who knew and admired a great American—Frank T. Bow of Ohio.

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

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join my distinguished colleagues from Ohio, Mr. MINSHALL and Mr. REGULA, in eulogizing our former outstanding colleague, Frank T. Bow.

Shortly after I was elected to Congress in 1966, my wife, Marjorie, received a letter from Caroline Bow, Frank's widow, stating that she was to be Marjorie's big sister among congressional wives. Marjorie and I came to Washington soon after to see the Bows. No one could have been received more cordially than we were.

Frank went out of his way to give me advice and help during the next few weeks. He was always ready, willing, and able to make things a little easier. Would that I had listened to him more.

Once I had a problem regarding a misunderstanding on funds which we thought had been set aside for a new mental health center at Ohio State University. I called Frank Bow. Frank in his very understanding and sympathetic way set up a meeting with the then Congressman Melvin Laird of Wisconsin and other members of the Appropriations Committee along with officials from Ohio State University. I doubt that without that meeting and without Frank Bow's help, we would have that facility which has been termed one of the finest of its kind in the world.

If it had not been for Frank Bow, Alum Creek Dam and Reservoir, which is actually located in Congressman DEVINE's district, would not have been funded. I say it is located in Congressman DEVINE's district, but it will supply Columbus, Ohio, with much needed water, most of which is located in the district I represent. Of course, Alum Creek Dam was very, very important to both Congressman DEVINE and me. I appreciated very much his personal help and want to remember these two important instances for the record.

Frank Bow will be missed by all of us. His 20 years in the House of Representatives enabled him to rise to be ranking minority member on the important and powerful Committee on Appropriations. There he assumed his responsibility and exercised his position in an attempt to insure fiscal responsibility.

Beyond that Frank Bow was a sensitive public servant, a great American who will be missed especially by those of us from Ohio. When he stood up and it was said, "The gentleman from Ohio" he helped Ohio's image.

Marjorie joins me in wishing for Caroline and Frank Bow's family our deepest sympathy and our affectionate desire that you be sustained during this time of great loss, to you and to all of us by his extraordinary contributions while he lived.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MINSHALL.

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

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a profound sense of sorrow and personal loss when I learned of the death of my good friend and our distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable Frank Bow.

For 22 years, Frank Bow served the people of Ohio's 16th Congressional District with the kind of dedication that ultimately made him one of the most respected men on Capitol Hill. His sense of loyalty to the needs of his district in general or the wishes of one individual residing in the district earned him the respect he certainly deserved.

For more than two decades, he was the watchdog of Federal spending. As the ranking minority member on the House Appropriations Committee, he was a stanch opponent of excessive Federal spending and frivolous giveaways. He consistently applied his vast knowledge of fiscal matters to both domestic and foreign affairs. Simply put, he believed that the taxpayers should get a dollar's worth of services for every dollar spent. That alone was a personal objective he pursued—and the people of Ohio appreciated—for 22 rewarding years in Congress. It was appropriate then, that one of Frank Bow's last official acts was to introduce the legislative proposal to put a ceiling on Federal spending in this fiscal year.

In addition to his continual concern for fiscal responsibility, Frank Bow had an unparalled interest in the problems unique to his district or common to our entire country. A piece of legislation to him was judged on the basis of what it could do to make this a better Nation: Could it increase educational opportunities? Could it cut down unemployment? Could it provide decent medical care to the sick and aged or new growth incentives to rural and urban areas? He was a man keenly aware of the quality of life to which Americans are entitled and it was his desire to see such dreams realized.

I knew Frank Bow as a restless man; always proud of what he had accomplished, but even more dedicated to the tasks yet undone. I think he was most distressed by the fact that there seemed to be too few hours in a day to do all he wanted.

The people who knew Frank Bow intimately or those who only met him once share the loss of this great man. It is a loss which will be evident for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add the statement of President Richard Nixon upon Congressman Bow's passing:

I have been deeply saddened to learn of the death of Representative Frank Bow of Ohio. In over 20 years of outstanding service in the Congress, Frank Bow earned respect as a man of energy, principle, and dedication. As ranking minority Member of the House Appropriations Committee, he was a strong voice for fiscal responsibility, repeatedly taking his stand against excessive Government spending.

I hardly need to add that as President, I found in Frank Bow a staunch friend and supporter—a man whose loyalty never wavered and whose commitment was always total. His loss will be felt by his colleagues in the Congress, and by all Americans who value the example of a life well spent in publice service. Mrs. Nixon and I extend our heartfelt condolences to Frank Bow's family and many friends.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman in the last Congress one of the first things I did was make my acquaintance with one of the most distinguished of our Ohio delegation, Mr. Frank Bow, from the neighboring city of Canton.

Of course, Mr. Bow was already a legend in my home area, as he was in the country. I had some trepidation because, coming from the other party and perhaps from a different philosophy, I thought Mr. Bow might take a rather frigid approach to me, and I was delighted to find instead a warm, outgoing, sympathetic and helpful human being.

I came to him several times for help on various projects for my district, including a Federal office building which was happily authorized and now is under construction, and including cosponsorship of bills to promote parks and recreation in our part of Ohio. Mr. Bow gave not only moral support but practical help. I could not help but be impressed by his straightforwardness and his bigness.

I was also deeply saddened at his passing. I feel very grateful to have been able to serve in this House with Mr. Bow and to have gotten to know him as a friend and a colleague.

I believe it is most appropriate that on this day when we are celebrating the birthday of one of Ohio's great sons we are also celebrating again the memory of another of its great sons, the Honorable Frank T. Bow.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a great pleasure to hear our new colleague, the Representative from Mr. Bow's former congressional district (RALPH REGULA) in his first speech to this House, present such an elequent commemoration of the anniversary of President McKinley's birthday and eloquent tribute to his distinguished predecessor, Representative Frank Bow.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we are honoring a man whom the President called "Mr. Responsibility." Frank Bow believed that Government should be responsible to its citizens. During World War II, Frank was selected as a war correspondent with Ohio's 37th Division in the South Pacific. For his service in reporting and investigating the conduct of the war for his fellow Ohioans, he received a press commendation. After the war, Frank Bow continued his efforts to insure the American peope truthful information about their Government. In 1947, he was appointed general counsel of the House committee investigating publicity and propaganda, and later served as counsel to the Subcommittee on Expenditure and the Select Committee to Investigate the FCC. Frank Bow never forgot that without an informed public, Government often becomes neither responsive nor responsible.

In 1950 Frank was elected to the 80th Congress as a Representative from his home State of Ohio. As a junior member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, Representative Bow began a 22-year fight for Government fiscal responsibility. He continually sought out Government bureaucratic waste and excessive Federal involvement in local affairs. As ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee. Frank Bow became one of the most vigilant watchdogs of the Federal treasury and was one of the strongest advocates for a legislative ceiling on Government spending. One of his last acts as a Representative was introduction of President Nixon's proposed $250 billion spending ceiling bill in August 1972, after Congress refused to limit its own spending.

Frank Bow's dedication to Government responsibility extended, of course, to himself as a Representative. At the age of 71, he issued a statement to his district in Ohio stating that it was time to retire after his present term. In August of last year though, his old friend, Richard Nixon, asked him to continue in Government service as Ambassador to Panama. This promise of continued service to America was cut short by his untimely death. Frank Bow will be deeply missed by citizens and colleagues, but most of all, by his country.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member from an adjoining district, I probably had a closer awareness of the impact of Frank Bow because it was my good fortune to represent Wayne County for 6 years. Wayne County had previously been in the 16th District, and I am daily reminded of the effectiveness of Frank Bow, the Congressman, and the warmth people had for Frank Bow, the human being. From time to time, Frank would good naturedly accuse me of stealing Wayne County from him, and we both felt that both of us represented that fine county.

It will be remembered that Frank had been confirmed as our new ambasador to Panama when his tragic death occurred on November 13 of last year. As the ranking Member on the powerful House Appropriations Committee he had come to know many key officials in the executive branch as they appeared before the committee to justify their upcoming expenditures. His assignment to Panama, I am sure, would have proved just as challenging.

I extend my sympathy to Frank's family and especially to his delightful wife Caroline whose help and devotion were a key factor in his outstanding service to his Nation and the people of Ohio.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened, as we all were, at the untimely death in November of one of our most distinguished former colleagues, Frank Bow.

I am grateful that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) has requested this Special Order so that we may pay tribute to the memory of that fine man.

It was my privilege to have served alongside Frank on the Appropriations Committee. He performed as the ranking minority member of that committee with the dignity and deep sense of responsibility that characterized all of his service. It was to Frank that we on the minority side looked for leadership as we went about our committee work.

Frank came to the Congress in 1951. The citizens of his 16th Ohio District can attest to his diligence and dedication to their needs. That he served his people well is evident as they returned him to office again and again. This body was enhanced by the presence of Frank Bow from the 82d to the 92d Congress.

Constituents and colleagues alike, we were all consoled when Frank voluntarily retired last year with the knowledge that he would turn his talents to another phase of public service. But as Frank stood on the very brink of a new, and what I believe sincerely would have been a brilliant, carrer as our ambassador to Panama he was struck down.

To say that the 16th Ohio District has lost one of its best friends would be only part of the truth. The State of Ohio has lost one of its favorite sons and the Nation and the world have been robbed of the services of an eminent public servant.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow and a deep sense of personal loss that I add my tribute to the mounting chorus of praise for the late Congressman Frank T. Bow. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. Working with Frank was an education as well as an unfailing pleasure.

He was an individualist and a born leader; no man in Congress was better liked or more widely respected. He earned a well-deserved reputation for sound fiscal policy, for he saved the Treasury and the taxpayers of the Nation millions upon millions of dollars. He authorized an amendment for example, which reduced all congressional appropriations by 5 percent.

But Frank was not hard nosed or inflexible. He bore great compassion in his heart for the needy; he was kind and gentle, generous and fair. In short we shall miss him as much as a man—a friend—as an legislator. We grieve especially for his wife and family and offer them our sincerest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I join my colleagues in this tribute to my late friend and colleague from Ohio, Frank Bow.

From my very first day in this body I had the privilege of the advice and counsel of this distinguished Member. Over the years during which I had the honor to serve with Frank on the Appropriations Committee I came to have the highest respect for Frank's knowledge of the committee and his complete dedication to the interest of the American taxpayer. Frank worked hard on the committee and, as ranking minority member, contributed significantly to a needed sense of Federal fiscal responsibility. Frank was devoted to the Congress and to the work of the Appropriations Committee and we on the committee were all sorry to hear of his decision to retire early last year.

In Frank Bow, the people of the 16th District of Ohio had a superb representative. A man who devoted himself to public service and to the best interests of his district, his State, and the country. I am sure that the people who he represented so well over 22 years in the Congress shared the sense of loss which we all felt as he announced that he would not be a candidate for the 93d Congress. Surely we would all miss his friendship and counsel.

Frank's untimely passing, I am sure, was a shock to all of us. I know that we all felt that Frank was deserving of a long and enjoyable retirement after his years of untiring service. I join my colleagues in expressing to Frank's family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the loss of Frank Bow to the Congress, to the great State of Ohio and to the Nation has been recognized here in most realistic terms by those of us who were privileged to know him. It is a most unhappy occurrence to lose a man of his stature who had the capacity and great desire to serve.

As a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee, I was privileged to hear him so very capably express his concern for the welfare of his fellow man, and I must add, he was most persuasive because his concern was so genuine and sincere. We will miss his wise counsel.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family on their loss, certainly they will always be proud of his memory because of the record that he made during his lifetime and the respect and admiration everyone had for him.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to our distinguished former colleague, the late Frank T. Bow of Ohio. Frank Bow served with distinction in the U.S. House of Representatives for 22 years, and the Nation and his 16th District of Ohio is much the better for his service.

As ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, Frank Bow was a real inspiration to many of us on the committee through his steadfast work toward bringing economic stability to our Government. Late last July, Frank Bow responded to President Nixon's request for a $250 billion statutory budget ceiling on expenditures in fiscal year 1973 by introducing legislation to carry out the President's budget initiative. It was my privilege to acknowledge Frank Bow's leadership by cosponsoring this important piece of legislation.

When Frank spoke on the floor of the House in support of this legislation, he said:

> The greatest national interest—greater than any desirable federal program in any of our bills—is continued progress to overcome inflation, increase real wages and provide general prosperity.

Frank Bow meant what he said, and he pursued his beliefs with tenacity and skill throughout his tenure in the House.

As my colleagues know, Frank Bow had decided to retire at the end of the 92d Congress. But as was typical of this dedicated public servant, he was not content to rest on his laurels after retirement from the Congress. At the time of his death, he was preparing for the important post of U.S. Ambassador to Panama.

The Nation, the State of Ohio, and Frank's 16th District have lost an outstanding citizen. I salute his many contributions to our country.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to have had the opportunity to serve with Frank Bow these past 12 years. While he will surely be remembered for many accomplishments during his tenure in Congress, he became well known for his efforts to reduce the ever-mounting Federal expenditures. Despite several heart attacks in recent years, he continued to work 110 percent in behalf of the reduction of Federal spending and his famous Bow amendment of 5 percent across-the-board reduction in many appropriations bills was supported by many Republican Members.

The Republican Members always turned to him for leadership and intelligent guidance in trying to effectively reduce appropriations and initiate Federal economies. He possessed a complete mastery of the many and difficult details of the comprehensive appropriations legislation and always was willing to discuss with us the rationale for his position. He was a great and effective Congressman—one of our very best.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege to serve in this House with a distinguished and able Member from Ohio, the Honorable Frank Townsend Bow. I valued him as a friend as well as a colleague.

Frank Bow was a dedicated and respected Member of Congress for more than two decades. For 19 years, he was a member of the House Appropriations Committee and was acutely familiar with every activity and expenditure of the Congress. He was a hardworking, dedicated Representative who loved this body, the people he represented and the country he served so well for so long. We in the Congress were better able to perform our function during his years of service thanks to his untiring efforts to keep the legislative machinery running properly.

The loss of Frank Bow is a loss not only to his family and friends, but a loss to the people of Ohio whom he served for so long and to the Members of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at the request of our former colleague, William H. Ayres, now special assistant to the national chairman of jobs for veterans in Arlington, Va., I would like to include Bill's tribute to the late Frank Bow with whom he served so many years:

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FRANK BOW

(By William H. Ayres)

When I left the Congress my friend and neighbor had some very kind words to say about me.

Frank and I, as he said, on the floor of the House over two years ago, came to Congress together. Our districts were joined together—our wives are good friends.

Frank Bow was a true friend. May God

give his widow, Carolyn, added strength to carry on.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join in today's tribute to Frank T. Bow. It was my good fortune to have served with Frank. It was my misfortune that our service overlapped for only one term.

Frank was a great American and a great Congressman. He was a good friend and wise counselor of all Members, especially younger ones.

The Congress will miss Frank Bow. Each Member who served with him will miss him personally. I believe he would consider our own conscientious service as the finest possible tribute to his memory.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our late colleague and friend, Congressman Frank Bow of Ohio, who passed away during the recent recess of the Congress.

It was my pleasure and privilege to serve with Frank Bow on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years and I always found him to be personal, congenial, and able gentleman. He was an apostle and champion of fiscal integrity.

Frank Bow had strong convictions and he consistently stood strong for economy in Government. He was firmly and unalterably committed to the need for fiscal solvency and integrity in Government.

During his long and distinguished service in the Congress he rose to become ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and in that capacity joined in deliberations of the various subcommittees. While I did not at times agree with Frank Bow, his suggestions and recommendations were always offered in a constructive and reasoned manner and on many occasions we were in agreement on matters of appropriations.

Frank Bow served his district, State, and Nation faithfully and well during his more than 20 years of service in the House. He had an excellent background in Government, ranging from service as an assistant attorney general in Ohio to staff work in the House prior to his election to the 82d Congress.

We shall all miss Frank Bow and I want to take this means of extending to his wife, Mrs. Caroline Bow, and other members of the family this expression of my deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement. My wife Ann joins me in these sentiments.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, Frank T. Bow's death has removed from Congress not only a true friend of all of us but an outstanding student and practitioner of sound fiscal policy. I have known Frank Bow and admired him since I came to the House of Representatives 18 years ago. He was never too busy to discuss legislation, particularly that dealing with appropriations, with new arrivals in the House.

His counsel was sound, forthright, and frank. Frank Bow was a devoted public servant. After having served 22 years in the House, he retired voluntarily to continue a career of service as Ambassador to Panama. Unfortunately, his untimely death prevented him from accepting the new challenge presented by an ambassadorship.

Despite several heart attacks which slowed him down only temporarily, Frank Bow refused to retire completely from the arena of public service.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those paying tribute to the memory of our former colleague, Frank T. Bow, who was a member of this body for over two decades.

I had the privilege of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee of which he was ranking Republican and where he waged a continual campaign against wasteful Government spending. His experience and expertise are sorely missed, and it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I take note of his passing.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring the memory of our late colleague from Ohio, the Honorable Frank Bow. We will all miss his presence in this Chamber and his very special dedication to protecting the American taxpayer against the abuse of wasteful spending.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I was privileged to work with Frank Bow and to witness his energetic and determined efforts to reduce Federal spending programs. He was an active and forceful ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and left his mark on many important bills passed by the Congress.

I join my colleagues and the many friends of Frank Bow in extending personal sympathies to his family.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I join in tribute to our colleague whom I was privileged to call friend.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio sat in the ranking minority chair the first time I testified before a House committee, the Appropriations Committee. Some of you may remember your freshman terms, and remember the feeling that experience will give you. Certainly you will understand that I was scared to death.

In his gentlemanly manner, Frank Bow put me at ease in about half a minute. He seemed to sense my apprehensions, and even more than that, he made me feel that he was genuinely interested in the points I was trying to make, and was anxious to hear them. I have never forgotten his kindness on that occasion, even though I learned quickly that he was not giving me any special treatment, for indeed he was kind and considerate to all.

When he made the decision to retire from this body, I regretted the loss. When death blocked his service as Ambassador to Panama, I regretted that loss to the diplomatic area.

But more than that, I regretted the loss of a personal friend and a distinguished lawmaker, and I join my colleagues in conveying sympathy and our deep regrets to his family.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Frank Bow was a Congressman's Congressman. As the ranking member of his party on the great Appropriations Committee, his was a position of great importance. In an era of constant pressure for ever higher Government spending his was a strong voice for moderation and efficiency. Frank Bow was devoted to protecting the integrity of the U.S. dollar. He had an understanding of the appropriations process and a grasp of the various Government expenditures programs that was unexcelled. Frank Bow served in close cooperation with the great and beloved chairman of the Appropriations Committee, GEORGE MAHON of Texas. The entire House can rightly be proud of our Appropriations Committee and of Chairman MAHON's leadership; and we greatly appreciate, too, Frank Bow's splendid contribution to this outstanding record. Mr. Speaker, Frank Bow was a gentleman, a man of great kindness and consideration. We miss him greatly and extend to his family our deepest sympathy and respect.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, most of us assembled here remember with deep affection and sincere respect the Honorable Frank T. Bow. Most of us wished him good luck and happiness as the 92d Congress adjourned because he was retiring and taking on the assignment of Ambassador to Panama.

But, before Frank could move into the assignment which he had been looking forward to so eagerly, he passed away. It is entirely appropriate then, on this day which is the anniversary of the birthday of President McKinley, that we pay tribute to Frank T. Bow. President McKinley was born in Niles, Ohio, which was in the congressional district served by Congressman Bow. Both men provided unremitting public service in their lifetimes.

Born February 20, 1901, in Canton, Ohio, Frank Townsend Bow received an education in law at Ohio Northern University and was admitted to the bar in 1923. From 1929 to 1932, he was assistant State attorney general. During World War II, he became news editor of radio station WHBC and was selected to serve as war correspondent with Ohio's 37th Division in the Philippines.

Subsequently, he became general counsel to the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Expenditures, then to the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission in 1948. During the 81st Congress, he was legislative assistant to Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel.

Before the 82d Congress convened, Frank Bow was elected to his first term in the House. By the time he retired, he had become ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations and ranking House Republican on the Joint Commission or Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

He built a reputation as a champion for fiscal responsibility. In the 83d Congress, he was chairman of a subcommittee which recommended savings of $11 million as a result of an overseas investigation into State Department activities. During his last year of service, he led the fight here to hold Federal expenditures beneath $250 billion. He said

it was necessary to curb inflation and make the dollar sound.

Frank Bow died November 13, 1972, and is interred at Canton. We will miss his leadership and counsel and extend our heartfelt consolations to his wife, Caroline, and their sons, Robert and Joseph.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) in this commemoration of one of the real giants of the House of Representatives, our late colleague, the Honorable Frank Bow.

For 22 years, Frank Bow served in this House as one of the most able and conscientious legislators in the Congress. He was one of Ohio's and the Nation's finest public servants. While Frank and I were often on different sides of votes, there was always a feeling of the greatest respect for his intellectual and personal integrity.

In the last Congress, Representative Bow was very active with a group of other Members from northeast Ohio in developing legislation for a major national park system in our populous urban areas. It is my hope that the work which we began together in the last Congress can proceed in this Congress, for surely there could be no finer tribute to Frank than the creation of a living park, used and enjoyed by the people whom he so faithfully served for so many years.

The citizens of Ohio and the whole Nation, but most of all, we in the House of Representatives, will miss Congressman Bow.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are taking the opportunity this day to memorialize a man whose memory cannot be summed up in mere words, our former colleague, Frank Bow.

For 22 years of his life, Frank Bow served here in the Congress of the United States as Representative from the 16th District of Ohio. He had learned the work of Congress before his election through his work as general counsel to the Subcommittee on Expenditures, and general counsel of the Select Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission in the 80th Congress.

He was an indefatigable worker. No one who knew Frank Bow could fail to know the countless hours he worked daily on the matters of the Appropriations Committee. His reports to his constituents on Federal expenditures were known by every colleague here in the Congress as marvelously perceptive analyses of the whole Federal spending process, and they became authoritative reference works for all of us.

I want to pay my own personal tribute to this most extraordinary man with whom I worked on the Appropriations Committee. We have had few men in the 20th century who were more devoted public servants. He left his own personal mark on the history of the 20th century, and it is a mark that all of us might envy.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Frank Bow earned the respect of everyone in this House during his 22 years of service, and his death saddened all of us who worked with him and admired his dedication and integrity. He had the courage to take unpopular positions when he felt this was in the national interest, but he always fought clean and with due regard for the rights and beliefs of others.

I am particularly saddened by his passing because I had great confidence in the abilities of Frank Bow, as Ambassador to Panama, to represent our Nation effectively in that area of the world where our relationships in recent years have been, to say the least, delicate.

During my years of service on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, including 14 years from 1957 to 1971 as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, I have become convinced that the United States cannot succeed in protecting our legitimate interests in the canal and in the Canal Zone by continuous appeasement of nationalist elements in the Republic of Panama. The more we have offered to give, the more intensive the demands have come for more.

When President Nixon named Mr. Bow Ambassador to Panama, I was pleased because I felt that Frank Bow could not only represent our country in this important diplomatic post with great diplomacy, but also with the kind of candor and honesty and straightforwardness we associated with his work in Congress. His death deprived us of the fine service he could have rendered as an Ambassador.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to pay my respects to the memory of the late Honorable Frank T. Bow of the Ohio 16th District, a man of remarkable attainments in many fields.

Although I knew him only briefly as a fellow member of the Ohio delegation, I was decidedly impressed by his conduct in this Chamber, and deeply grieved by the news of his demise. As ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee and second ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures, he was a leading figure in the discussion of all money matters confronting the Congress, and his opinions in this regard were of importance to everyone.

Frank Bow acquired the bulk of his education in Ohio before obtaining a law degree at Columbia University. Although he entered early into politics as a Republican, serving from 1929 to 1932 as assistant attorney general of Ohio, his political fortunes were blighted for a time by the initial impact of the Roosevelt New Deal and he was out of office for several years, during which period he became associated with the radio broadcasting industry. As news editor of station WHBC, Canton, Ohio, he acquired an outstanding reputation and in 1945 was selected to serve as a war correspondent with Ohio's 37th Division in the Philippines.

With the resurgence of Republican power in the 80th Congress, Frank Bow was appointed general counsel to the House Subcommittee on Expenditures and to the Select Committee to Investigate the Gederal Communications Commission. Impressive in these assignments, he was hired in 1949 as administrative assistant to Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel of Kansas, and the following year received the Republican nomination to represent the 16th Ohio Congressional District. He was duly elected.

Throughout his service in the House, Frank Bow came to be known as a stanch opponent of wasteful Federal spending. He was one of several cosponsors of legislation which would have limited Federal spending for fiscal 1973. In addition, he was a consistent supporter of civil rights legislation.

There were some issues on which Frank Bow and I disagreed. But, he was the kind of man who could disagree without being disagreeable. Moreover, he was the kind of Representative who was intent upon getting the job done for his constituents. He had a great capacity for compromise and fairness. In short, Frank Bow was an outstanding Congressman who surely will be missed by the people of the 16th Ohio District and by his many friends in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest regret that I learned of the death of our former colleague, Frank Bow, on November 13, 1972.

As the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations, he was a diligent and dedicated watchdog of fiscal spending, always ready and willing to do the hard day-to-day work required by his influential position.

To the Bow family I extend my deepest sympathy upon the loss of this fine gentleman. I will miss my fellow Ohioan, as will the House of Representatives and the people of Ohio whom he served proudly and so well.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, the people of America and more particularly, the people of Ohio, have sustained the loss of a great statesman and dedicated servant. For nearly a quarter of a century Frank Bow epitomized and personified the convictions, the needs and the well-being of those he represented. In the Halls of Congress he made friends by being one and earned the esteem of those who with him bore the scars of battle, as well as enjoyed the fruits of victory.

By precept and example, the name of Frank Bow will be remembered as one who cared and served.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing sadness in the death of a former Member of this House, the Honorable Frank T. Bow of Ohio.

It was my privilege to serve on the House Appropriations Committee with Congressman Frank Bow for 18 years. He was one of the hardest working and most dedicated member of the committee.

In his 22 year career here in the House of Representatives, Frank distinguished himself as a man of reason, warmth, wisdom and strength. An understanding man in all that he did for his community, his State, and for the Nation, Frank Bow will be sorely missed by all those with whom he has served in the Congress.

I join my colleagues in expressing my profound sympathy and deep sorrow to his family.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr.

Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I again rise in this Chamber to make some further remarks about a very, very distinguished gentleman, the late Frank Bow, the gentleman from Ohio. Just about 3 months ago, I joined my colleagues in wishing Frank well upon his retirement from the House of Representatives and in his new position as U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Panama. Today, with sadness, we honor the memory of Frank Bow—memories that provide consolation in the fact that it was my privilege to know and work with this sterling man. His word was his bond and maybe if he had not taken so seriously the trust placed in him by the people who elected him to Congress he may have been able to serve and enjoy the privileges of Mr. Ambassador.

I did not just lose a colleague with Frank Bow's death, I lost a close and dear friend. A friendship that goes back about 24 years, when he was a counsel to the Forest Harness Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. He joined us as a Member of Congress in the 82d Congress and the intelligent voters of his congressional district saw to it that people of the United States had the benefit of his wisdom and knowledge ever since.

During all this time he served with me on the Appropriations Subcommittee for 20 years, 18 years as the ranking minority member. To those who blatantly make the statement that an Appropriations Subcommittee chairman gets what he wants did not know Frank Bow. Frank Bow and I over those 20 years have skinned many a cat. We did succeed in getting our will exerted once in a while against the wishes of—what should one say—a powerful and spirited few. Frank Bow's successor will have awful big boots to fill.

It was not only my privilege to work with Frank Bow as a member of the Appropriations Committee and a Member of the Congress, but also as a regent of the Smithsonian Institution, a post to which Frank Bow brought the same attitudes and attributions that made him such a great Member of Congress and such an extraordinary man.

I know that he will be missed. Mrs. Rooney shares with me the sorrow of losing such a friend. To his lovely and devoted wife Caroline and his two sons, Robert and Joseph, go our fervent prayers. We are well aware of our sense of loss we therefore know how great theirs is.

Mr. POWELL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as I enter my second term in the House of Representatives, I rise to pay tribute to a great man from Ohio—a man who was always a pillar of strength and who served with honor and distinction from the 16th District of Ohio. I refer to Frank T. Bow.

The untimely death last December of Frank Bow brought sadness to all of us who had the privilege and pleasure of knowing and working with this distinguished gentleman. He will be sorely missed in the days ahead.

As the ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, Frank Bow was an inspiration to his colleagues—and certainly to me. He was the voice of conservative and responsible government—always in the forefront of introducing legislation to help bring economic stability to our Government.

Rather than retire last year, Frank accepted the nomination to be the Ambassador to Panama—a position where his diplomatic acumen and political skills would have been put to the greatest test.

To all of us who knew him, Frank Bow will be remembered with affection and respect.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, before my arrival on the national political scene, Congressman Frank Bow had established himself as a leader in the Congress in favor of a sound dollar and fiscal integrity. His conscientiousness and great energy devoted to attention to the budget could only be admired even by those opposing his position.

During my first 6 years in Congress, I came to know Frank as a man of great warmth and kindness. This combination of virtues is one which serves as a worthy example for all of us in political life.

I wish to extend my condolences to his family upon their great personal loss. They can take justifiable pride in the knowledge that the country has benefited from the life and service of Frank Bow.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for taking this special order to permit us to pay our respects to the memory of the Honorable Frank T. Bow. I want to extend my sympathy to his family and friends.

Although our political views differed markedly, Frank and I had a very warm relationship. When I joined the Ohio delegation, he welcomed me. He provided valuable advice and assistance as I was getting oriented. In the 92d Congress, we served together on the Appropriations Committee. As the ranking Republican on that committee, Frank served with distinction for many years. I enjoyed working with him on the committee and know that his loss will be deeply felt by all of its members.

His service to his district, his State, and his Nation reflected his desire to excell in all that he did. His country will miss his services and, as a colleague and friend, I will miss him.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is especially fitting, it seems to me, that these tributes—so richly deserved—to the memory of our late colleague, Frank Bow, should be entered in this RECORD on the same day as it will show our receipt of the President's new budget and budget message.

For Frank Bow had one abiding interest here—and that interest was in advancing the cause of fiscal responsibility, as, by his lights, he understood that concept. His voice was not only a constant voice in that increasingly complex and divisive effort—as our Nation and the Congress of which Frank was so much a part struggled to tailor its felt needs to its resources—but, in recent years, his was undoubtedly the steadiest and strongest such voice.

All too often, too, it was a lonely voice. But that did not deter—indeed, nothing could deter—Frank Bow from doing what he conceived to be his duty, both to his people and to his Nation of which they were a part.

Mr. Speaker, we will miss that voice.

It is obvious that we already do, especially on this day when some of the arguments Frank so often advanced in support of congressional self-discipline have—in the context of current events—again been so dramatically called to our attention by our President.

But we will miss that deep and confident voice of his even more, as time wears on, and we find ourselves caught up in the rough and tumble of debate over who is "right" and who is "wrong" in the developing argument over the proper role of the Federal Government in, first, establishing national priorities for action and, then, assigning a proper share of our national resources, at the proper governmental level, toward the cost of action programs designed to meet those needs.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Frank Bow will be missed—and sorely so.

By all of us.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the high points of my service on the Appropriations Committee during the past 12 years was the professional and personal association I enjoyed with our late colleague Congressman Frank Bow of Ohio.

His convictions determined his actions, and his firm and reasoned approaches to hard fiscal problems were an inspiration to his fellow committee members. He held strong convictions about sound fiscal policy and never hesitated to speak up on that subject no matter what the climate of the moment. He counseled moderation repeatedly during the years when Federal spending increased by leaps and bounds. His statements about fiscal policy and Federal spending become more meaningful with each passing day as we contemplate deficit budgets and their effects.

We are entering a period in which his presence among us would be more valuable than ever. We shall miss his dignified but determined insistence on principle and his reasoned argument in support of fiscal balance in Federal affairs. His legacy will help sustain all of us as we meet the problems of this Congress without him.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of my friend and former colleague from Ohio, Frank T. Bow. Frank Bow in his more than 20 years in the House of Representatives gave to his constituents and our country dedicated and distinguished service. I was honored and privileged to serve with Frank on the Appropriations Committee, and all of us on the committee benefited from his ability and knowledge. He earned my respect and my highest esteem as both a great American and a great patriot.

Frank, in his concern and devotion to the American people, exemplified the model of the sincere and conscientious public servant. Throughout his 22 years as a Member of this body he continued his courageous drive for the betterment

of the American people and the American way of life.

I feel that I was truly honored to have known and served with Frank Bow, and I shall miss him.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the House in paying deserved tribute to a distinguished American, the late Frank T. Bow of Ohio. I feel privileged to have served with Frank Bow on the House Appropriations Committee, where, as the ranking member of his party, he so conscientiously and steadfastly worked to bring economic stability and integrity to this Nation's economy.

I am confident that if Frank were with us today, he would be leading the fight for a return to fiscal responsibility and balanced budgets. He would have been encouraged by the efforts of the Nixon administration in its attempts to cut Federal spending and reduce the debt.

In his 22 dedicated years in this House, Frank Bow was a strong leader in the fight for fiscal integrity.

We, from Kansas, are proud of the fact that he served as legislative assistant to the distinguished Andrew Schoeppel, a Senator from Kansas, following World War II.

As we honor the memory of our former colleague, we recall his many legislative accomplishments; his reasoned and impassioned oratory on the floor of this Chamber. We recall his good humor, his friendship, his integrity and his faith in America.

He was dedicated to the service of his constituents of his beloved 16th District of Ohio, and to the State of Ohio.

Frank Bow was a hard-working leader, and we know that he often put his work before his health. When he decided to retire from the Congress, he still wanted to serve his country and had been confirmed as our Ambassador to Panama. It was a post he was never to fill. Death on November 13 prevented him from fulfilling that last dream.

We have lost a good friend and distinguished minority chairman and we miss him very much. Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Caroline and her family.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the life and memory of Frank Bow, the late Representative of the State of Ohio, who was profoundly respected for the fine qualities he possessed. His death is a sad loss to the State of Ohio, to the House, and to this Nation.

Frank Bow served in the House for 22 years. As the senior Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee, he became the prudent and watchful guardian of the Treasury, and a friend to American taxpayers everywhere.

He was a great American who believed wholeheartedly in the virtues that have made this the country it is today. Frank Bow was a man of firm convictions and of deep devotion for the welfare of our Nation.

I extend to his wonderful family my deepest personal sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our friend and colleague of more than 20 years, the Honorable Frank T. Bow of Ohio, has been marked by an unusual amount of comment and praise. His great integrity, dedication, and energy in serving our country impressed all who knew him. He left a fine mark in these Halls and the contributions he constantly made to prudent action will be sorely missed.

There is one facet of this great man that I think should be made a part of our record of his service. More than 16 years ago, when I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handled the legislative budgets, Mr. Bow was the ranking minority member of that subcommittee.

We became very close friends. His cooperation was most valuable to me in trying to cope with this very difficult appropriations action. Almost from the first day Mr. Bow began to impress upon me what he considered to be a matter of such great urgency that it approached emergency status. This was the enormous fire hazard that existed in the Capitol Building itself.

So urgent was his pleadings that we decided to make a personal inspection of the building. Most of one entire day was required as Mr. Bow and I looked into room after room, on floor after floor. I have been told we entered more areas and rooms of the Capitol than any other Members in modern times. It required 17 different employees of the House and Senate to provide the keys we needed to penetrate some of the Capitol doors. There is no master key for all the rooms of the Capitol.

We found fire hazards throughout the building, some so dangerous as to invite disaster at almost any hour of the day or night.

In cooperation with the Architects Office, and on the advice of the many experts in that Office, we made funds available to begin the long and difficult task of eliminating fire hazards in the building. In 3 years the job was finished. Today the building is reasonably safe from fire.

It is not the sort of project that can be viewed by the public. There were no spectacular exhibitions or actions that commanded headlines.

But the priceless heirlooms of a free people contained in the Capitol, our National Shrine of Liberty, are safe today because Frank Bow cared enough to begin the fight and to persist until it was finished. This little known and unrecognized service is, in my opinion, of such great importance that I believe our archives should always contain evidence of the work and the men who brought about these safety measures for protecting this building, measures so long neglected and so sorely needed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, word of the death of our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Frank Bow, brought to me a particular sadness and sense of personal loss. He extended his warm friendship to me during my first term in this House, and I know that gratefulness for his kindness, his encouragement, and his sound advice always will attach to my memories of our colleague.

His approbation was a key factor, I know, in my being elected to the distinguished Committee on Appropriations during my initial term, and, together with all of my colleagues on the minority side, I was assisted immeasurably in the difficult work of the committee by his wise counsel and the balanced judgment of his leadership.

Through long and conscientious service, Frank Bow had earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He was a major figure in this House whose influence was felt in many important legislative decisions over the years. He loved his country, and he gave it his best efforts.

His particular loyalty, beyond that to the Nation, however, was to the citizens of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio. Eleven times, his Ohio neighbors had chosen him to represent them in this House. They had first claim on his talents and energies, and he served them faithfully and effectively.

Our colleague will be mourned and missed by us all, but our sympathies go today to his family and to his Ohio neighbors. I count it a rare privilege that I had the opportunity to be favored by his friendship, and I know I am far from alone in this House today in being painfully aware of the vacancy created by the passing of a true friend.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 92d Congress, members of the Ohio delegation paused to pay tribute to our retiring colleague, the Honorable Frank T. Bow, who had served in the House of Representatives for 11 terms. While we deeply regretted Frank's decision to leave the House, we were pleased and proud that he would be continuing his service to the Nation as Ambassador to Panama. Thus, his sudden death just a month later shocked all of us.

During his House tenure, Frank excelled in his capacity as ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee. Certainly, he deserved the title of Mr. Fiscal Responsibility he earned as the result of his diligent efforts to shape sound fiscal policy. His expertise in budgetary matters was surpassed by few in the history of the House.

Frank also served as the Ohio representative on the Republican Committee on Committees. In that position he always was willing to help a fellow Buckeye, and he was a wise counselor. I am particularly grateful to him for the assistance which he gave me during the past 6 years.

Mrs. Whalen joins me in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Bow and her family.

May Frank rest in peace.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of regret to me that I was unable to be present this past Monday—January 29—when tributes were paid by a number of my colleagues to the late Frank Bow, my longtime friend and eminent Member of this House. Monday was Kansas Day, a long-observed event in my native State marking the 112th anniversary of the admission of Kansas into the Union, and incidentally long ap-

propriated by the Republican Party in the State as an occasion to celebrate or commiserate, as the case may be.

Frank Bow was for 22 years an esteemed legislator and deservedly so. It was my good fortune, however, to have had his friendship for an even longer period, dating back to the time he served as an aide to the late Senator Schoeppel of Kansas, where I too served.

When I came to this House some 10 years ago, Frank Bow became my mentor, as he had been my friend. He knew the legislative process at first hand and he was a first-rate teacher. He gave leadership and good counsel to many of us and in full measure to me. He practiced what so many of us must learn if we are to be capable legislators—work, work without stint. To him this responsibility as a Member of Congress was a duty to his constituents in Ohio, to his State, and to his Nation. He served each well by immersing himself long hours in the details of budgets and expenditures as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, a thankless but essential job.

When he made known his decision last year not to seek reelection I was saddened but I was aware that his duties here had taken their toll. Thereafter, I was gratified when I learned that President Nixon had nominated him to be the Nation's next Ambassador to Panama, a particularly difficult and delicate post at this time. I thought it a wise and forward looking decision by the President. It was my judgment that Frank Bow would be able to present Panama's claims in such a manner as to quiet the extremists in both lands and perhaps bring into being a treaty so essential to the welfare of both countries.

Unfortunately, Frank Bow did not live to assume those duties. He left us on November 22, 1972, his great heart stilled by the ardors of almost a quarter of a century of intense devotion to duty. He would ask for no better epitaph. I salute his memory.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, Frank Bow was one of the first citizens of his State and country. He was a man of tremendous energy and ability. His great talents were used to advance the welfare of his constituents and all Americans. He will be sorely missed.

No one ever accused Frank Bow of doing anything which was demeaning or unkind to any other person. He was a genial, understanding friend who was always ready to listen to the problems of others, and to lend assistance whenever possible. He not only was greatly admired for his many talents and abilities, but he was one of the most popular Members personally who has ever served in the House of Representatives.

For the last several years of his service, Frank Bow was ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee. In this position he worked tirelessly to try to hold the expenditures of the Federal Government in control, but also to make sure that the vital functions of the Government were adequately funded. As ranking Member, he always exhibited only the most careful consideration of the feelings and desires of his colleagues, and therefore he received the cooperation of the other Members of the Appropriations Committee to a remarkable degree.

The United States and the State of Ohio are poorer places because of the death of Frank Bow. Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his dear wife Caroline, and to the entire Bow family.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague in expressing the deep sense of loss that we all feel over the passing of Frank Bow. At his death Frank was beginning a new career as diplomat after serving 22 years in the House of Representatives.

As a young man Frank Bow was news editor for radio station WHBC in Canton, Ohio. During the Second World War he served as war correspondent with the Ohio 37th Division in the Pacific.

After the war he came to Washington as general counsel to the Select Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission. By this time Frank had the taste of politics and became legislative assistant to Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel of Kansas in the 81st Congress.

In 1950 Frank returned to Ohio and was elected to the 82d Congress. He was reelected to the next 10 Congresses. As Congressman, Frank Bow rose to the position of ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee. He knew the Federal budget as few other men in Washington. As dean of the Ohio delegation he helped the new Members from my State as we came to Washington.

As he excelled as a reporter, as a congressional aide, as a Congressman, and as a member of the Republican leadership, so, too, he would have excelled as a diplomat. Frank Bow demanded excellence of himself and those around him. The whole Nation mourns his loss.

Frank Bow was a particular friend of President Nixon and was consulted by him frequently.

As a personal note, he was very kind to me when as a freshman legislator I needed correct, honest information and advice. I will remember Frank Bow and his role in the development of this Nation.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the kinship felt among Members of the House of Representatives is close but there is something closer yet among Members of each congressional "class."

Frank Bow and I were classmates—Members of the freshman class of the 82d Congress, coming to Washington in January 1951. Our friendship began in those first few weeks and it remained firm and steadfast over the years.

I knew him as a hard-working and respected Member of the House, and, with many privileged to know him well, felt a deep sense of pride when he was named Ambassador to Panama, and I felt great personal loss at his passing.

This is a loss to the country as well. His patriotism, ability, courage, and intelligence knew no partisanship nor factional lines. His home State of Ohio, the U.S. Congress, and the American Republic are better because he served them.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to my good friend, Frank Bow, whose death in November came as a great shock, leaving me with deep feelings of personal loss and grief.

I believe I was the last Member of Congress to see Frank. I spent the Sunday afternoon before he died visiting with him in his hospital room. I shall always cherish the memory of that afternoon. We listened to the Washington Redskins football game together and we talked about public affairs. He was as alert and cheerful as ever. During our conversation, he revealed again his continuing intense love and respect for the Congress as an institution essential to our representative system of government. He indicated, however, that he was looking forward to serving his country further in another capacity as Ambassador to Panama.

Serving his country—that was his hallmark, his ambition. He was fervently devoted to his country and to helping people. To him there was no greater calling than public service and no one could have labored harder to fulfill his committee and other congressional responsibilities. America has lost one of its greatest patriots and a recognized leader in the Congress who has left his mark.

Frank was a man of integrity and principle. Untiring and skillful in pursuing the principles in which he firmly believed, he was at the same time always a gentleman. His kindness and consideration for others earned him the affection and respect of even those who, from time to time, might disagree on legislative issues.

He will be sorely missed by us all, not only as a legislator without peer, but as a warm friend and wise counselor.

Mrs. Harvey joins me in extending our deepest sympathies to Frank's devoted wife, Caroline, and to his family.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, you and many other distinguished Members of this House already have spoken eloquently and in detail of the late Frank Bow's remarkable record of public service. I associate myself with those well-deserved tributes, and I will speak very briefly only of my personal appreciation of our departed friend and colleague.

Frank Bow will for me forever be unforgettable, a uniquely interesting and forceful personality. I often was amazed by the positive, persuasive energy with which he so convincingly spoke his views.

Undoubtedly, in my opinion, he sacrificed too much of himself in the intense personal interest, the long, grueling hours of work, the tremendous energy and emotional drive that he devoted to the crucially important public responsibilities he carried so successfully as ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee, as our Ohio representative on the Republican committee on committees, and the several other posts he filled, all in addition to his constantly effective efforts in representing so very well the people of Ohio's 16th Congressional District.

I suspect Frank would still be with us today, had he not given so strenuously of himself in concentrated public serv-

ice. We salute him; we profoundly honor him for this personal sacrifice and his extraordinary service.

I am personally very grateful for Frank's innumerable acts of helpfulness to me during the 12 years I was privileged to work with him here. From the moment I arrived in the House until his retirement, I often turned to him for help, and even when he and I disagreed in matters of policy, he was generous in his advice and assistance and in his often delightfully jovial tolerance of my contrary views.

His leadership in and for our Ohio delegation was wonderfully effective.

So, for all those great qualities of public leadership, as well as his personal friendship as I was privileged to know it and benefit from it, I am most thankful.

All of us miss Frank Bow profoundly.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of serving with our late colleague, the Honorable Frank T. Bow, only through two terms of the Congress, but I would not wish the occasion to pass without joining my colleagues in expressing my liking for him, and my respect.

Mr. Bow had long and distinguished service in the Congress, and it is most regrettable that he did not live to serve his well-earned ambassadorship to the Republic of Panama, to which he had been appointed by the President.

This is particularly true in view of the delicate negotiations now pending with the Republic of Panama over the status of the Panama Canal, in which I am satisfied that Frank Bow, as our Ambassador, would have represented American interests with a single-minded devotion.

One of his several kindnesses to me was a request that I furnish him a copy of testimony I gave on this subject before the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, chaired by our colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY)—a request with which I was happy to comply.

Frank Bow's passing is a loss to his country, as well as to his family and friends, and as a junior colleague I wish to add to that of his many friends my own expression of respect and regret.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of Frank Bow, late Congressman from Ohio, in all their statements as to his fine and lasting service.

Frank was a fine person, an able lawyer, and great Congressman. For many years he was ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations where I had the privilege of a close association and a close friendship with him.

Frank's death was a blow to all of us. While we shall all miss him, there are many monuments to his service in the annals of the Congress.

To his loved ones we extend our deepest sympathy in their loss.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, during my 20 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, I have known few Members who were so genuinely respected and loved by their colleagues as Frank T. Bow of Ohio. When Frank Bow announced that he would not seek reelection to the 93d Congress, we wished him well in his leisure years and expressed appreciation for the faithful and distinguished service he had rendered. It was a sad thought that the Congress would lose the talent and active effort of one its ablest legislators and one of its true statesmen, but the choice was his and he retired from Congress. He wanted to continue serving the Nation he so well loved and had been confirmed as our Ambassador to Panama, but this was a post he would never fill.

Many words have been spoken about his great service to his State and our Nation and his effectiveness as a Representative. He was a warm man and he is deeply missed by his friends here in the House.

Mrs. Haley and I extend to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Frank Bow was a worthy colleague and a worthy friend. I do not believe I could name any person who was more dedicated to his principles and who more sincerely believed in the greatness of this Nation than Frank Bow. What is more, he practiced Americanism every day of his life and every day of his service in the Congress of the United States.

If it was possible for Frank to help a friend while also serving the best interests of the Nation, you could always be assured that you would receive all the help that Frank could give.

He was a great man, a great American, and I for one feel that the Nation has suffered a great loss.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the recent passing of Frank Bow, who served his country and his constituents with honor and distinction for 22 years as a Member of this body.

Whenever a Member had a question about an appropriations bill, Frank Bow, as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, was always happy to share the answer with his colleague if he knew it, which he almost always did. His knowledge of the budgetary process and his willingness to share that knowledge left many Members, including me, in Frank Bow's debt.

The residents of Ohio's 16th Congressional District were fortunate to have had as their Representative a man as dedicated, courageous, and astute as Frank Bow. I was fortunate to have served with him in the House from the very beginning of my congressional service in 1963. He was keenly interested in the cultural center for East-West exchange, located on the University of Hawaii campus, and frequently remarked that next to being a Congressman he would like to be the chancellor of the East-West center, if he had a choice. His interest led him to support the center and for this Hawaii owed him a debt. America was, indeed, fortunate to have had the benefit of his judgment and integrity, in a leadership capacity, for so many years.

I extend to Caroline Bow and the other members of the Bow family my deepest sympathy in this trying hour, and assure them that their sense of loss is shared by many others like myself who enjoyed his friendship in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I think I would be remiss if I did not add these few remarks, because as all of you gentlemen know, I was a very close and very good friend of Frank Bow, and we had many closed sessions together in which we discussed the facts of life and Frank's future, and I can remember full well several years ago, when we were in one of these sessions, that Frank looked up at me and he said:

> You know, Bill, I am not going to be here forever, and I do think I have the guy that can fill my shoes in the 16th district.

He said further to me:

> He is a young State legislator who has served with distinction in Columbus, and if for any reason I choose not to run. I would like to see Ralph Regula hold this job that I now have. He's a comer.

Frank eventually did choose not to run.

Ralph, I am awfully glad that that dream of Frank's came true, because with your distinguished record of public service in the Ohio Senate, I know that you have big shoes to fill and big steps to follow, but I know that in due course, with the initiative you have shown thus far in this early session, you will be a worthy successor to Frank Bow.

A DETENTE WITH CUBA

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very pleased that over the past several months the President has taken positive steps in easing tensions between the United States and China, and between the United States and the Soviet Union. I think this is a much more realistic foreign policy than has been followed in the past, and in this light, I have joined 11 of my House colleagues in studying in some depth the current relations relations between Cuba and the United States. Today we are presenting our findings to the House membership for its scrutiny. In our paper, entitled "A Detente With Cuba," we have concluded that the time is ripe for the United States to take appropriate steps to normalize relations with Cuba.

For the past decade the relations between these two countries has been marked by deep cleavages and hosility, initiated by the Cuba subversive activities in Latin America, the Russian military buildup on the island, the expropriation of U.S.-owned properties in Cuba, and the Bay of Pigs invasion. The United States in 1961 severed its economic and diplomatic ties with the Castro Government, encouraged other nations in the Western Hemisphere to follow suit in the Organization of American States, and in effect, isolated Cuba in the Western Hemisphere.

However, over the years an increasing number of Latin American countries, which in 1964 voted in the OAS to terminate diplomatic and commercial relations with Cuba, have defied the ban by reestablishing diplomatic relations.

My colleagues and I state in our study that the political realities of 1973 indicate a careful review of United States-Cuba relations is in order. Three reasons, Mr. Speaker, underlie this conclusion.

First, since the President has taken the first step to normalize our relations with both Russia and the People's Republic of China, it seems only right that we should extend this same philosophy to Cuba. In seeking rapprochement with the Soviet Union, it seems contradictory not to extend this same thinking to Cuba, where the Soviet Union is a significant presence.

Second, as noted previously, several Latin American nations are normalizing their relations with Cuba, primarily because Cuba's subversive activities in those nations have lessened perceptibly since Che Guevara's unsuccesful 1967 efforts in Bolivia. In the eyes of these governments, Cuba no longer poses a serious threat to their existence.

Third, Castro himself seems to be pursuing a more realistic foreign policy position with regard to the United States. For example, two recent U.S. hijackings which landed in Cuba resulted in an apparent willingness, indeed desire, on the part of the Cuban Government to negotiate some kind of bilateral agreement to put an end to this air piracy. This, certainly, would be an important benefit resulting from normalization of relations between the two countries.

Another significant benefit to the United States would be the restoration of Cuba as an important trading partner. During the last year the United States traded with Cuba, we exported to that nation $19.1 million more than we imported from them. Cuba supplied us with sugar and certain needed minerals, while buying primarily finished goods from us. Again, it is inconsistent for us to trade extensively with the Soviet Union while maintaining a complete trade embargo with Cuba for doing the same thing.

Finally, normalization of United States-Cuba relations should lead to a significant reduction of the hemispheric tensions generated by the isolation of the Castro Government.

Accordingly, in our paper my colleagues and I make several recommendations for the legislative and executive branches of Government to pursue, in hopes ultimately of establishing normal ties with Cuba.

For the Congress, we urge hearings be held by the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and by the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the present state of United States-Cuba relations. These forums will permit thorough consideration by the public and the Congress of our current policy and of proposed changes.

Once these congressional studies have been completed—and concurrent executive negotiations successfully concluded—then the following legislative initiatives should be considered:

The removal of the trade embargo against Cuba inherent in section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

The removal of section 103 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which prohibits sale of U.S. agricultural commodities to countries which sell, furnish, or permit their ships or aircraft to carry any equipment, materials or commodities to or from Cuba.

The repeal of the Cuban resolution passed by Congress in 1962.

Insofar as the executive branch is concerned, we urge the President to take the following initiatives:

We urge the President to make every effort to achieve an effective antihijacking accord with the Cuban Government.

We urge the President to direct an interagency review of United States-Cuban relations.

We urge the President to confer and consult with Latin American countries in advance of any significant policy change.

We urge immediate consideration of recognition of the legitimacy of the Castro government.

We urge U.S. support for the Peruvian Resolution of 1972 in the Organization of American States to permit any member of that organization to normalize its relations with Cuba.

If these steps ultimately lead to a resumption of diplomatic and economic relations with Cuba, we feel that the United States will make a significant contribution toward hemispheric peace and prosperity.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, at this time I include the complete text of the study be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the study be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks and that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this subject.

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

There was no objection.

A DETENTE WITH CUBA

(Prepared by Mr. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR. of Ohio, Mr. ALPHONZO BELL of California, Mr. EDWARD C. BIESTER, JR. of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN R. DELLENBACK of Oregon, Mr. MARVIN ESCH of Michigan, Mr. WILLIAM FRENZEL of Minnesota, Mr. ORVAL HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. JOHN H. HEINZ III of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAUL MCCLOSKEY of California, Mr. STEWART B. MCKINNEY of Connecticut, and Mr. CHARLES S. MOSHER of Ohio)

United States-Cuba relations have been marked by over a decade of mutual distrust, hostility and recriminations. Political and strategic considerations suggest that it may be in our national interest to initiate a dialogue with Cuba that might lead to an eventual normalization of relations between the two countries.

The United States severed commercial and diplomatic ties with Cuba in 1961, as a result of a threatening Soviet military presence on the island, Cuba's subversive activities against Latin American countries and the expropriation of U.S. owned properties in Cuba. In subsequent actions the U.S. halted economic and military aid, eliminated the Cuban sugar quota and placed an embargo on exports to Cuba. The Bay of Pigs invasion and the missile crisis further exacerbated the deep cleavages and hostilities between the two governments.

Relations between other Latin American countries and Cuba were equally bad. In 1964, the Organization of American States (OAS) voted to cut off diplomatic and commercial ties with Cuba. The ban proved relatively effective until several years ago when some OAS countries began to defy the ban and to establish diplomatic relations with Cuba.

American isolation of Cuba has continued to this day. Administration officials have publicly indicated that to date two factors have dictated our present hardline policy and impede any kind of policy review: (1) the Soviet military presence in Cuba, and (2) Cuba's export of subversive revolution to the rest of Latin America.

But action which was understandable, and even right, at one time and under one set of circumstances may no longer be right or even wise at another date and under another set of circumstances.

THE POLITICAL PENALTIES OF 1973: THREE DEVELOPMENTS INDICATING A NEED FOR A POLICY REVIEW

The political realities of 1973 indicate to us the need for a review of United States-Cuba relations. Specifically, during the past several months three developments have occurred which make the normalizing of relations between the two countries desirable and potentially attainable.

First, President Nixon is pursuing a pragmatic policy designed to deal realistically with all governments. This approach has resulted in relaxation of tensions between the United States and respectively, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union.

Our rapproachment with the Soviet Union has brought about the SALT agreements, established medical, environmental and space research contacts and increased trade and commercial ties.

The President's China visit renewed communications after more than twenty years of hostility. The recent announcement of a multimillion dollar grain sale to China further improves the favorable climate brought about by the President's initiative. Increased trade contacts with East European socialist countries have also materialized as a result of the President's policy.

In light of the Administration's efforts to negotiate and cooperate with Russia and China, a dialogue with Cuba would represent an extension of this philosophy. It would eliminate an apparent policy contradiction which strives for friendship and an increasing dialogue with Russia while concurrently condemning Cuba for harboring a Soviet presence.

Second, there has been a growing trend among Latin American countries to normalize relations with Cuba. In the past two years, an increasing number of Latin American States either have recognized the Government of Cuba or have strongly indicated a desire to do os. This development represents a significant change from the policy of isolation of Cuba followed by the nations of the OAS since 1964 when Cuba was excluded from participation in the Inter-American system and member states collectively severed diplomatic and economic relations with Fidel Castro's government.

Mexico was the only Latin American country that did not sever relations with Cuba, holding that the OAS measures against Cuba were in violation of the principles guiding the Inter-American system. In November, 1970, Chile, under the newly elected government of Salvador Allende also recognized Cuba.

Even prior to the Chilean move, Peruvian leaders indicated a disposition to change their country's policy toward Cuba. Fidel Castro on occasions had praised the Peruvian military government for its reformist policies and it can be assumed that the Peruvians were grateful for the massive earthquake relief effort extended by Cuba during the 1970 disaster.

Peruvian initiatives brought the matter of Cuban hemispheric relations to the surface and were responsible for the first OAS consideration of the issue since the 1964 ban. On May 31, 1972, the Permanent Council of the OAS held a special session to consider the draft resolution submitted by Peru which would permit any member state to normalize its relations with Cuba. The Peruvian resolution said:

". . . Some member states for different reasons maintain official relations with the Republic of Cuba and . . . others have expressed, on the basis of their own appreciation of the changes that are taking place in the world and inter-American circumstances, the convenience of re-establishing relations with the Republic."

By a vote of 14 to 1 with 8 abstentions, the matter was referred to the general committee of the Permanent Council for consideration. The Peruvian representative saw the agreement to debate the proposal as ". . . a representation of the current spirit of the Americas, a spirit that precisely indicates that Inter-American policies are aimed at the future."

At the conclusion of the meeting to consider the Cuba question on June 9, 1972, the OAS decided against the Peruvian resolution by a vote of 13 against, 7 for, and 8 abstaining. The Central American bloc, Brazil and the United States, voted against the resolution, as did Bolivia, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Uruguay, and Paraguay. In favor of the resolution were Chile, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago. Argentina, Barbados and Venezuela abstained.

In July, 1972 Peru recognized Cuba. In December, 1972, Cuyana, Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados announced the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Castro government. Panama and Ecuador have indicated their willingness to re-open relations. Venezuela has hinted that a change in her policy is possible.

Several factors are responsible for the trend toward recognition of Cuba. Many Latin American governments believe Castro's revolutionary fervor has waned and no longer see Cuba as a subversive threat. Furthermore, many of the states feel change toward Cuba is very much in line with the changing world situation as illustrated by the U.S. rapprochement with China and the Soviet Union.

Whether or not the United States makes overtures to Cuba, indications are that the number of Latin American governments re-establishing relations with Cuba will continue to increase.

The third reason for reviewing our Cuba policy is that Cuba itself seems to be softening its formerly intransigent foreign policy position. There is growing evidence to support this contention. Fidel Castro, for example, has hinted his willingness to cooperate on the hijacking problem.

In fact, the two most recent hijacking incidents indicate a firm willingness on the part of Cuba to reach some kind of bilateral agreement to discourage these practices. The Cuban government gave the State Department a prompt reply regarding the requested extradition of the Tuller family who hijacked an Eastern Airlines plane. Prior to this incident, Cuba failed to acknowledge any extradition requests.

On the Tuller case, the Cuban formal note relayed through the Swiss Embassy indicated that the four accused hijackers were under arrest. The Cuban government also asked the United States to provide them with detailed information of the other crimes the hijackers had committed. This unprecedented action by the Cuban government is a favorable sign that the hijackers could be returned to the U.S. to face prosecution under our laws.

The recent hijacking of a Southern Airways jet resulted in further cooperation by the Cuban government. The Castro government went out of its way to assist the thirty-one passengers and crew members after the hijacked plane finally landed. Cuba announced that the hijackers would be tried promptly and the State Department thanked the Cuban government formally for their cooperation.

In 1970–1971, there has been increased evidence that Cuba's revolutionary activities and the Soviet interest in Cuba are diminishing: subversive activities throughout Latin America have reduced significantly since the Che Guevara effort in Bolivia in 1967. Both State and Defense Department officials have testified that Cuba has reduced its aid to local insurgents throughout Latin America and no longer shows the revolutionary fervor of earlier days.

During 1971 in Castro's visit to Chile, it was significant that he stated that his methods of revolution were not to be prescribed for all other nations. This is considered an acknowledgment by Castro of his unsuccessful efforts to establish his own brand of revolution throughout the hemisphere. The victorious election of Salvador Allende in Chile through a coalition of leftist parties represented a victory for the "via pacifica," a policy earlier scorned by Castro.

American officials continually have asserted that the Russian missiles in Cuba are defensive in nature and pose no offense threat to the United States. However, some authorities contend that the Russian presence does present a security threat which could be minimized by our establishing relations with Cuba.

There have been several indications that the Soviets would welcome a detente or at least a warming of relations between the United States and Cuba. On February 13, 1969, the *Wall Street Journal* reported that a secret message was sent from the Soviet Union to a Western nation that might mediate a United States—Cuban settlement. The note reportedly stated that the Russians would "look favorably on anything the mediating country could do to normalize relations between Cuba and the United States.

An American reporter who recently visited Cuba reported that Soviet diplomats told him that Russia would reduce its military presence in exchange for an American withdrawal from Guantanamo. The economic burden of Cuba upon the Soviet Union, coupled with the lack of any tangible political benefits, could be motivating factors for their alleged interest in reducing their presence.

SOME NEGOTIATION ISSUES

A number of problems would have to be dealt with prior to any full restoration of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba. These include Cuban refugees to the United States, the American tenancy at the Guantanamo Naval Base, expropriation, and the sugar quota.

It can be anticipated that steps to normalize relations with Cuba would cause particular concern in the Cuban-American community about the problem of refugees. Currently Cuban refugees are exempted from the regular quota system. When Castro has permitted it, the State Department has arranged and paid for the airlift of refugees from Cuba to the United States. In December alone, 3,400 refugees immigrated in this fashion.

Should the special immigration status change further, Cuban immigrants would have to apply for permanent immigration status as part of the quota for the Western hemisphere. This quota permits a total of 120,000 persons to immigrate each year.

The United States presence at the Guantanamo Naval Base is certain to be an issue in negotiations. In view of the continued military presence of the Russians on the island, the United States is justified in remaining in Guantanamo. Although an American presence there does not place any significant restrictions on Soviet military activities in the area, the base does provide a convenient training center for naval ships.

Publicly, the Cuban leadership persistently demands that the U.S. evacuate the base; privately, Cuban leaders reportedly have indicated that Guantanamo would not be a major issue in negotiations.

Another issue that is certain to be raised is that of compensation for expropriated properties. In terms of expropriated properties, major corporations have already taken tax write-offs to satisfy some of their claims. Most of the remaining claims, smaller amounts in the $20,000 to $50,000 range, have already been determined by the Foreign Claims Commission, and it is hoped that a re-establishment of relations between Cuba and the United States would open the way for these claims to be negotiated and settled through Cuban administrative and judicial procedure.

In 1959, Cuba exported 3.2 million tons of sugar to the United States under the Sugar Act quota system—approximately 34% of the quota. When relations with Cuba were terminated, Cuba's allotment was redistributed among the other Latin American sugar producing countries. The major beneficiaries were the Dominican Republic and Mexico.

In the event normal relations are re-established between Cuba and the United States, the Sugar Act grants the President the discretion to reallocate the existing quotas. Many options are available to him to provide for a phased redistribution of quotas which would allow affected nations time to make the necessary readjustments.

Each of the above issues would be knotty and resolution would not be simple. But none would be impossible to resolve.

BENEFITS OF NORMALIZATION

If renewed dialogue with the Castro government eventually leads to more normalized relations between Cuba and the United States, it is our opinion that at least three significant benefits will accrue.

The first and clearly a major benefit is a probable reduction of plane hijackings to Cuba. Obviously the United States and the Cuban government are equally disturbed by this problem and are willing to cooperate in an effort to curb these criminal acts.

Almost eighty percent of planes hijacked since 1963 have gone to Cuba. In general, the Cubans have been cooperative about returning these planes. Hijackers who have sought asylum in Cuba are clearly not welcome there as has been made obvious by the punitive treatment they receive from the Cuban government.

The president of the American Air-Line Pilots Association has called for a resumption of relations between the two countries to curb hijacking. American pilots are threatening to strike unless stronger anti-hijacking measures are implemented and enforced. A normalization of relations would result in cooperation between the two nations for the return and conviction of hijackers.

It is hoped that the Swiss-moderated negotiations will produce an agreement that will discourage further hijacking. These talks should serve as a point of departure for a broader discussion of issues of mutual concern. They are clearly a first step toward normal ties between the two countries.

Second, with normalization Cuba once again could be an importat trading partner

for the United States. In 1958, the year before Castro came to power, the U.S. imported $527.8 million worth of goods from Cuba and exported $546.9 million worth of goods to Cuba. Cuba supplied sugar and sugar-by-products, and some minerals, principally nickel. The United States exported finished goods, grain, and automobile parts, as well as the machinery for the sugar industry. The re-opening of the Cuban market to American products could again lead to healthy and productive commercial relations between the two countries.

Now, some of our closest allies maintain strong trade ties with Cuba. Cuba presently imports British and Japanese buses and trucks, Spanish fishing boats and many other Japanese and European products. Canada and Mexico still maintain consular and diplomatic relations and have been exporting foodstuffs to Cuba. There are strong indications that the Chilean trade agreement with Cuba is just the beginning of a movement among some Latin American States to resume trade if not diplomatic relations. Trinidad and Tobago's resumption of relations is based largely on their interest in Cuba as a lucrative oil market.

Cuba has recently made two major trade commitments in an effort to improve its economic position. In November 1971, Cuba was admitted to membership in the "Group of 77," the organization of developing nations within UNCTAD (United Nations Commission for Trade and Development), with strong backing from the Latin American bloc. In 1972, Cuba joined COMECON, the Communist counterpart of the European Common Market organization allegedly to expand its commercial ties and obtain development and technical assistance.

It seems inconsistent that we impose commercial restrictions and limitations on our OAS allies for trading with Cuba while at the same time we sell millions of tons of grain to the U.S.S.R. and China and enourage commercial relations with other Communist nations.

Third, a warmer political atmosphere and improved hemispheric relations are bound to occur if relations between the United States and Cuba normalize. Nearly every year the Cuban matter severely cripples the OAS and makes it appear ineffective, besides becoming an extremely divisive issue among Latin American countries. Any further defiance of the OAS ban by Latin American countries would continue to strain relations of member countries. Unless changes are made in view of present realities, the Cuban issue will continue to impair relations between Western Hemisphere nations.

For over a decade, American isolation of Cuba has given substance to much anti-American rhetoric and ill feeling towards the United States among various groups in Latin America. Removing this vestige of the Cold War would significantly reduce tensions and redirect hemispheric policy, focusing attention on more urgent priorities such as trade, economic development, foreign investment and regional integration.

Normalization of relations and a relaxation of tensions might provide an impetus for a regional economic integration program in the Caribbean which would involve Cuba. Although such a development is not imminent, the potential is there and should be explored further.

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

A normalization of relations with Cuba is in the United States' best interest. The time is ripe for diplomatic and economic initiatives to be made. However, much depends on the receptivity of Cuba. A willingness on their part to seriously negotiate with the United States would produce an atmosphere conducive to debate and action by the Congress.

In an effort to improve relations with Cuba, we propose recommendations for Legislative and Executive action.

It must be recognized that these proposals cannot be implemented immediately. Action as important to our hemispheric relations as a detente with Cuba must be undertaken only after the most careful review. The Congress should fully participate in the decision making process of any change in U.S.-Cuba relations.

Accordingly, we make the following recommendations:

Legislative initiatives

We urge that hearings be held in the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and in the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the present state of the U.S.-Cuba relations so that the American public and Congress can evaluate the viability of our present policy towards the Republic of Cuba and thoroughly and publicly consider proposed changes therein.

After such a complete Congressional assessment of the political and economic implications of normalization for the United States, and the success of executive negotiations, the following legislative initiatives should then be considered:

The removal of the trade embargo against Cuba inherent in section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as amended).

The removal of Section 103 under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 prohibiting sale of U.S. Agricultural commodities to countries which sell, furnish, or permit their ships or aircraft to carry any equipment, materials or commodities to or from Cuba.

The repeal of the Cuban Resolution passed by Congress in 1962 and which still describes basic U.S. initiative policy towards Cuba.

Executive initiatives

We urge the President to make every effort to achieve an effective anti-hijacking accord with the Cuban government. We should utilize maximum flexibility to obtain a solution to curb the continuing proliferation of these acts. The anti-hijacking talks should be used as an opportunity to discuss other issues of mutual concern.

We urge the President to direct an interagency review of U.S.-Cuban relations with the objective of establishing concrete steps to normalize relations with Cuba.

We urge the President to confer and consult with Latin American countries in advance of any significant policy change. This would honor the President's commitment to utilize a policy of prior consultation with our Latin allies as enunciated in his State of the World message.

We urge immediate consideration of recognition of the legitimacy of the Castro government as the representative of the Cuban nation and people. Any kind of negotiations with Cuba should be conducted in a clear, frank and positive manner exemplary of two sovereign nations.

We urge United States support for the Peruvian Resolution of 1972 to permit any member state of the Organization of American States to "normalize its relations with Cuba" should it be re-introduced in the Permanent Council of the OAS, or support for similar initiatives.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

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

May I say a few brief words in further pursuance of what the gentleman in the well has said.

First of all, let me begin by commending him for his work in sparking this particular study to which he has just referred. It was his particular concern about this problem and his leadership in it that gave rise to the work of a number of other Members of the House as we put together the staff and the field work to yield the document which has been introduced in the RECORD, and I commend him for that.

Mr. WHALEN. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. DELLENBACK. May I emphasize a couple of points that have already been touched upon or which are made clear by a reading of the study itself.

One of these points is that the situation existing in the world of 1973 is a vastly different situation from that which gave rise to the actions of the early 1960's. The documents that came forth from the Congress, the trade embargo and the Cuba resolution of 1962, the Agricultural Trade Assistance Act of 1954, even before the 1960's, were all based upon the circumstances and situations in existence at that time.

As the document that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) has referred to expressly says:

> But action which was understandable, and even right, at one time and under one set of circumstances, may no longer be right or even wise at another date and under another set of circumstances.

Today, in 1973, the actions of President Nixon in 1972 in connection with the U.S.S.R. and with the People's Republic of China, and after the recent agreement which was signed in Paris in connection with Southeast Asia, provide the background against which this paper should be read. And it is against this background this paper should be used as a springboard, because we feel this kind of action is a move in the direction of world peace.

Secondly, if one would read pages 8 and 9 of the report he will see the conclusions and the recommendations.

The committee recommends further legislative initiatives by urging that hearings be held in the House and in the Senate by the appropriate subcommittee in each of those bodies so that the American public and Congress—and again I quote—

> . . . can evaluate the viability of our present policy towards the Republic of Cuba and thoroughly and publicly consider proposed changes therein.

It is against those hearings that we feel will come forth information upon which to base further action.

We then made three recommendations, insofar as legislative action was concerned, and also urged that the President take certain executive initiatives which we feel will be thoroughly and fully consistent with what the President has already done in the field of foreign affairs.

I think that the key to the fruitfulness of these results that will be forthcoming from the hearings and the fruitfulness of what this Congress may then elect to do will in a large part depend upon Dr. Castro. If he is receptive, if he talks about peace and is desirous of further

showing that the policies to which he adhered so rigidly in the early 1960's are not the policies to which he adheres today, as we feel current events indicate, then this initiative taken by the Congress and directed by the President can yield results of great benefit to the world.

It was with this hope that we made the specific recommendations that are included in this particular paper.

Mr. Speaker, as I began in commending the gentleman from Ohio on his leadership in this particular report, I do so again, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) and I certainly want to congratulate the gentleman for the fine contributions that he has made in the preparation of this paper, and also for his perceptive observations today.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL).

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, again I, too, wish to congratulate the gentleman in the well, Mr. WHALEN, for his leadership, and the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK), for his work in the preparation of this paper.

To me this paper is of particular interest, because it is a careful and a thoughtful presentation which demands no unilateral action on our own part, nor any precipitous change in our present policy, but instead asks for a review of a condition which all of us, I think, find unsatisfactory.

We have all applauded our President in his nearly incredible international achievements. He has turned a situation of confrontation with Peking, Moscow, and more recently Hanoi, into a situation of negotiations which we hope will ultimately lead to international peace and friendship. And now there may be the possibility to extend those negotiations, and to turn from confrontation with another country which we have considered our enemy for over a decade.

Mr. Speaker, there are obstacles to normalization noted in the paper that the gentleman from Ohio presents, and I do not underestimate those obstacles. The report notes and contemplates that we will have great difficulty resolving our problems concerning the Guantanamo Naval Base, the difficulty of possible redistribution of our sugar quotas, the refugee problem, the expropriation problem, and indeed many, many other difficulties which may stand in the way of meaningful and fruitful negotiations.

But, the paper also points out the advantages of attempting to normalize our relationships with Cuba, and they are great, too. If this paper is helpful, as I think it will be, in preparing the way for the President and the Congress to jointly consider and move forward in this area, I think the entire Congress and the country will owe the gentleman from Ohio an enormous debt.

Again I commend him for his work. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHALEN. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota, not only for his contribution today, but for the great help that he gave me and our colleagues in the preparation of this paper.

WOMEN IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I take note of the fact that women are moving into positions of responsibility in the U.S. Postal Service.

Happily, postmasters are now chosen on professional merit, and, as a result, more than half the new ones chosen last year were women. That is all those of us who support the concept of equal rights really want: that public positions of responsibility be filled on merit and that women be given an equal chance to qualify for them. We feel that if that is the case, a normal complement of women will advance in their chosen fields.

I commend the Postal Service and I am happy to include herewith Postmaster General E. T. Klassen's announcement on the progress of women in the Service.

Postmaster General E. T. Klassen announced that he has appointed 1,101 women postmasters during 1972—almost half of the total postmasters selected since he was named to head the U.S. Postal Service last January.

All were chosen under the nonpolitical merit system established in November 1970 to remove the old Post Office Department from patronage. Mr. Klassen said:

> I am pleased to see so many women interested in the job of postmaster and even more pleased that such a high percentage of them qualify for these managerial positions.

There are a total of 11,901 women and 17,712 men currently serving as postmasters throughout the Nation. Mr. Klassen appointed 2,407 this year, 1,101 of them women. He said:

> Our women postmasters do an excellent job. They're dependable. They're very good managers and they do well at employee relations.

Mr. Klassen stated that in the New York Region alone, 54 women head major post offices. Mr. Klassen also said:

> Because we draw our people from within the Postal Service, I hope more women will be encouraged to become eligible for postmasterships.

Under procedures established to remove the old Post Office Department from patronage, postmasters are chosen for all but the largest offices by Regional Management Selection Boards. A National Management Selection Board chooses postmasters for the approximately 200 largest post offices.

In each case, first consideration is given to qualified employees within the service. A total of 7,139 postmasters have been selected on this basis since November 28, 1970. Of the total, 2,870 were women.

ROBIN HOOD IN REVERSE

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

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, again our hopes have been crushed. Millions of Americans believed that an end to the war in Indochina would mean new money available for human needs. But this is not to be, according to President Nixon. He wants the new money to go where the old money has always gone—straight into the Pentagon grabbag. Mr. Nixon's new budget shows a shocking disregard for both the big-city dweller and the poor farmer, for the hungry, the sick and the deprived, the young and old, the unfortunate—and an even more shocking willingness to continue the military waste that has so outraged our Nation.

Military spending is to be increased from $74.2 billion in fiscal 1973 to $78.2 billion in 1974 and $82.2 billion in 1975. Lest we thought that the war in Indochina was really over, note that military aid to Laos and to South Vietnam is not cut but increased.

Development of the Trident missile, the B-1 bomber, Minuteman III and the Poisedon monstrosity, is to continue. Still newer weapons are to be developed: a strategic submarine launch cruise missile, for example. On the other hand Food for Peace is being cut from $877 to $766 million—a tiny sum at best.

What happened to human needs? Like a reverse Robin Hood, Mr. Nixon socks the poor to give to the rich.

Funds are totally terminated for the Community Action organizations of OEO—that antipoverty agency which has made so many people better able to express and to fill their own needs. Mr. Nixon says he wants Americans to do more for themselves—but apparently he does not approve of their organizing to do so. Too many community organizations have been telling him how it really is.

Desperately needed housing is about to be tossed back to the real estate interests—who have consistently refused to build low- and middle-income housing. There will be no more Federal assistance under the rent supplement, homeownership, or mortgage programs, rural loans, or loans to small farmers. For thousands of poorly housed tenants in New York City, Mr. Nixon is slamming shut the door on their hopes for a decent place to live at rents they can pay.

Totally terminated, also, are many programs in which citizens have received Federal aid for local improvements: the Model Cities program, urban renewal, rehabilitation loans, neighborhood facilities grants, open space grants. Do it yourself, New York, Detroit, Chicago.

The Economic Development Administration will receive no funds. Community Development and Housing are now part of the revenue sharing plan. Successful programs are being torn apart and thrown as bones to petty State bureaucrats. If there is anything more immovable than a Federal bureaucrat, as

you and I well know, it is a local bureaucrat. Yet this dismantling of Federal aid in favor of State and local control does not—as Mr. Nixon pretends—give power to the people; it gives power to local politicians to control the people.

Where bias exists, this new budgetary control will reinforce it. Antiblack politicians, for example, are not likely to be generous toward the housing, health, and educational needs of blacks. Political enemies can be silenced by wiping out their projects.

The Republican-controlled legislature in Albany is not likely to help Democratic New York City, which has the greatest need in my home State.

Education likewise is pared. Mr. Nixon makes a bow to youth in increasing Headstart funds and educational opportunity grants; but at the same time, title I funds for education in poor areas are cut from $1.5 billion to $411 million—an unbelievable slash. Milk subsidies are cut from school lunches. General Federal aid to impacted areas is cut from $468 to $131 million.

There is a token increase from $778 million to $844 million for child care, but presumably this is to get mothers of young children out of the home and into the already-sagging work force. The "work incentive" program is also increased. Meanwhile, the real child care needs of working mothers are neglected. In New York City, programs to continue and expand child care centers for moderate and middle income as well as low-income families are threatened by the Federal ceiling on social services expenditures.

At the same time, public service jobs are being discontinued. The President must know little of cities if he expects the private sector to employ workers from the welfare rolls, however capable.

Social workers have helped greatly in training and placement—but all Federal social work training programs are also to be terminated in 1974.

Health needs, of rising concern to the Nation, get the brushoff. The country is disgracefully short of medical and paramedical personnel—yet Mr. Nixon asks us to begin a 3-year phaseout of health training grants—and to limit these to physicians and dentists only, excluding nurses, physicians' aides, and others who can ease the burden. Here the President flies in the face of the medical profession's own recommendations. This budget also terminates construction assistance to hospitals, no matter how much we need them. We are also asked to phase out mental health agencies—despite increasing evidence that mental illness is a national problem.

In an age when science can help to solve many of these problems, Mr. Nixon closes his office to a science adviser; some of them in recent years gave advice he did not like. But if there is any way out of our national predicament, science will have to find it and the President will have to listen.

Pollution controls, for instance, have been long known to science—but not implemented because of the howls of industry. The present budget cuts funds for control of water pollution from 6 billion to 3 billion. New York City, among other jurisdictions, has filed suit to free the water pollution funds which the President has impounded.

Richard Nixon's theory that every American should go it alone was no good even in those pioneer days he harks back to. If society's strongest and healthiest members had not taken care of the less fortunate, our civilization would have collapsed long ago; for talent, ability, and genius have repeatedly risen from unexpected sources. Have we now reached the point where we pay taxes, not to feed the hungry and house the shelterless but only to bail out giant firms making monstrous weapons? Is this what we want our country to be?

Senator PROXMIRE has reminded us of Abraham Lincoln's view that "government should do for the people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities." In the complex America of the 1970's it is literally impossible for any but a relative few to fill their needs alone.

If President Nixon really believes what he says, Senator PROXMIRE suggests, why does he not apply the same principle of self-reliance to the corporations and the wealthy his administration has continually favored?

Why not insist that Lockheed return the $250 million loan guarantee the Government has granted them?

Why not propose tax reform legislation to remove the inequities that give tax breaks to corporations and to millionaires, some of whom now pay no Federal income tax at all?

Will we in the Congress demand a reassessment?

My own position is clear. I have introduced and will shortly reintroduce a bill to cut off all military aid to the Thieu regime; a bill which will lock the door behind the President so that he can never again intervene in Asian affairs.

On the home front, I have introduced a bill to prohibit the President from impounding funds without the consent of Congress, and have joined other Members in attacking Nixon's freeze on housing funds. I have introduced H.R. 226 to make housing available for the elderly and H.R. 227 to assist in rehabilitating housing for low and moderate income persons. I have sponsored legislation to double the number of jobs in the Emergency Employment Program. I have called for a Department of Elderly Affairs (H.R. 234) and for better transportation for the elderly and handicapped (H.R. 231).

In our society it is the middle-aged and elderly who are most afflicted—through no fault of their own—by poverty. We must see that they are protected against such further onslaughts as are proposed in this budget. I have also introduced legislation to prevent States from taking back with one hand the aid they are giving with the other. H.R. 242 would prevent the reduction of State aid because of increases in social security or other benefits. H.R. 223 protects recipients of food stamps from unreasonable cutoffs. H.R. 243 eliminates medicare taxes, deductions, and co-insurance and extends coverage to items not now covered, for instance, eye care and hearing care.

Mr. Nixon has urged us to get big Government off our backs and out of our pockets. The ordinary citizen finds that without Government aid he is very quickly devoured by rising costs, medical bills, and misfortunes beyond his control. Since this House is the primary representative of the ordinary citizen, I urge that we stand firm in protection for individual rights.

Many of us have long called for a reordering of priorities. We did not mean a revision downward for the big-city dweller, for working people and for the poor, and upward for the rich and the military.

I call upon those—Democrats, Indedents, and Republicans—who have helped to build strong social legislation not to stand aside while it is being destroyed.

Instead, let us join forces to repudiate the cuts in human welfare.

Let us provide the jobs, the housing, the education, the health care, so badly needed.

Let us tell Mr. Nixon that we will not supinely agree to his proposal.

Let us in Congress propose our own state of the Union message outlining our postwar priorities for human needs, and let us fight to enact them into law.

THE HANDGUN CONTROL ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, all too often, we in this Congress are put in the position of reacting to a crisis, rather than moving positively to avoid one. The gun-related tragedies of the last decade are good examples of the congressional propensity for lament which, unfortunately, was not coupled with the appropriate energies needed to implement change. We in Congress should develop the foresight to anticipate difficulties rather than merely lament their occurrence until their frequency forces us to act.

Therefore, in the hope that we might avert future tragedies, I am today introducing the Handgun Control Act of 1973. Last Congress, I introduced similar legislation with Congressman Abner Mikva, who unfortunately is no longer here to continue his fight for strict regulation of handguns.

This legislation does not ban possession of handguns. It does, however, attempt to dry up the free supply of handguns by banning the importation, manufacture, transfer, sale or transportation of them except by or for military or certain persons and pistol clubs licensed by

the Secretary of the Treasury. It is an attempt at creating a national firearms policy which restricts the availability of handguns for nonlaw enforcement purposes.

In recent years, many distinguished groups of Americans have spoken out against the handgun epidemic. Three presidential commissions—the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in 1968, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in 1969, and the Brown Commission on the Reform of Criminal Laws in 1970—have urged stringent Federal firearm controls. Yet, we have failed to meet the need for legislation which could have prevented much tragic gun violence.

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence estimates that there are 24 million handguns in civilian hands in the United States. They also indicate that the handgun is the criminal's primary weapon. Although only about one-quarter of all firearms in this country are handguns, they are used in three-quarters of the homicides involving firearms. Handguns play a disproportionate role in comparison with long guns in the commission of aggravated assault and armed robbery.

The primary function of a gun is to kill. Yet we permit ready accessibility of guns which cannot be discounted as a major weapon in violent crimes. We are shocked and sickened when a prominent national figure is the victim of gun violence, yet we can easily forget that 10,000 Americans were murdered by gunfire in 1971. We are persuaded that handguns provide a measure of comfort and safety for their owners when in fact, they contribute substantially to violence in American society. Too many of our citizens own guns. The right to own a .45 should not be more important than the opportunity to save human lives.

It is a kind of national insanity that allows the frenzy of the gun lobby in this country to put the convenience and amusement of gun enthusiasts ahead of the welfare and safety of the American people. The United States is no longer a frontier society and pistols as playtoys are not tolerable in crowded urban communities. Increases in hunting and sport shooting only partly account for the spiraling sale of firearms and can have little to do with handguns. I do not believe that we must deny any citizen the opportunity to sport-hunt or collect antique guns. But these activities must be controlled and may not preclude any possible measure to insure the safety of our citizens.

It is not true that the possession of guns is limited to sportsmen or persons living in rural areas. Much of the recent handgun buying is taking place in urban areas—places where there can be few legitimate sporting or recreational uses for them. In my city of Chicago, half of the murders committed in 1970 involved handguns and nearly 70 percent involved firearms. More than half of the homicides by firearm were committed by young persons under the age of 21.

Figures provided by the Chicago Police Department demonstrate that the number of homicides committed with firearms has more than doubled since 1955. The number of persons under 21 years of age involved in gun homicides increased 613 percent between 1965 and 1970. We must put an end to the mounting pattern of death by gun. Unless strong measures are taken to prevent firearms from becoming easily acquired by youth and other individuals, law enforcement officials will be unable to cope with a problem that is growing faster than our population rate. Congress must meet the real, immediate, and fundamental need to make the tools of murder inaccessible.

The gun lobbyists may bemuse themselves with their cant that "guns don't kill people; people kill people." But the plain fact is that guns enable people to kill people easily, thoughtlessly, comfortably, and on the spur of the moment. It is a form of madness to allow guns—especially handguns—to be in the possession of anyone who wants them. The mere passage of gun control legislation would not induce every criminal to surrender his crime tools. But it would begin the process of curbing the spread of pistols and make it more difficult for potential criminals to obtain their weapons.

At least five European countries totally prohibit the private possession of handguns. The murder rate in these countries is between 10 and 90 times lower than the murder rate in the United States. In these countries there is no registration, no regulation—just no handguns. We, too, must take a first and initial step toward sanity. It is callous, immoral madness not to do anything to stop this gunplay.

Increased guns mean increased violence. Gun control legislation does not curtail individual liberty, but protects liberty, and indeed life, by restricting possession of the weapon most frequently used for crime and for killing. The shocking familiarity of firearms deaths is not justifiable, tolerable or necessary. It is simply the result of our inability to take a strong and fundamental position to save human lives.

A BUDGET OF BAUBLES AND BUBBLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, January 29, the administration has released its budget for fiscal year 1974—the 12 month period beginning July 1, 1973. I certainly support the administration's efforts to hold spending to the $269 billion level; I believe that this is a time for strict controls on Government expenditures if we are to avoid accelerated inflation or the imposition of unwanted Federal taxes.

My staff and I have completed our first review of this 1,100 page document, and I am sadly disappointed in the direction, the emphasis, and the priorities of this budget. With only limited funds available to meet so many problems, billions are being directed in unneeded, obsolete, and useless programs.

This is a budget of subsidies for special interests; it is a budget that cancels programs for the people—for the young, the old, and the ill. It is a budget which helps those who least need its help—and denies programs to those who most need them. This is a budget which provides $66.4 million for airline subsidies, but eliminates a $50 million feeding program for hungry children during the summer. This is a budget which increases military foreign aid by $132 million to a total of $685 million but reduces domestic health research and health service funds by over $600 million.

This is a bureaucrat's budget. It provides for increases in Government employment in the office of Cabinet Secretaries, but reduces delivery of Government services. This is a budget which increases employment in the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by 500, but reduces employment at the National Institutes of Health research centers by 500. It is a budget which creates 400 new jobs for the Secretary of Commerce, but which expects the VA hospitals to treat 28,000 more patients in the coming year, including thousands of Vietnam casualties, with 2,200 fewer doctors and hospital attendants. It is a budget which expects the Postal Service to handle 1.8 billion additional pieces of mail with 103,000 fewer workers. It is a budget which maintains the headquarters staff of the Peace Corps, but cuts the volunteers in the field by over 200.

This year's budget continues to place a heavy emphasis on defense and the machines of war. Our involvement in the Vietnam war has ended—but somebody forgot to tell the Pentagon. The Department of Defense had a budget authority of $77.8 billion in the present fiscal year. But for the year starting July 1, they have requested $83.5 billion—an increase of nearly $5.7 billion. In the coming year, the Department wants an additional $2 billion for weapons procurement, development, and construction. Billions of dollars of these procurement programs are spent on obsolete and unnecessary weapons—and on correcting the structural flaws in airplanes already procured through sloppy contracts. At a time when we should be preparing for a new round of strategic arms limitation talks, we are building whole new generations of multi-billion-dollar weapons systems—such as an extra billion for the start of the construction of the Trident submarine and a new nuclear aircraft carrier. But the budget cuts the funds for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from $10 million to $7 million. There is no generation of peace built into this budget—only a new race for the weapons of war.

In addition, this is a budget which totally fails to recognize new problems. While this budget's commitment to the solution of the environmental crisis is very weak—it does not even recognize that there is an energy crisis. Never have I seen so much rhetoric about a problem—with so little hard action in way of programs and expenditures. As in the past, the energy research and development programs of the Federal Govern-

ment are badly fractured among dozens of agencies, and it is hard to get a clear picture of the total amount to be spent on new energy research. But following is a short table of the major potential sources of "new" energy research funding:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—	
	1973	1974
Department of the Interior:		
Office of Oil and Gas	1.5	1.5
Office of Coal Research	43.4	52.5
Central Energy Research and Development Fund	0	25.0
Atomic Energy Commission (including nonnuclear research)	2,633.4	2,429.4
NASA (including new forms of energy research)	3,406.5	3,015.0
National Science Foundation (including basic scientific research on energy)	645.0	582.0
Federal Power Commission	23.6	27.2
Total	6,753.4	6,132.6

The conclusion is obvious. The civilian scientific research capability of the Government is diminishing, and the President's recent reference to increased energy research is illusionary. Three-fourths of the energy money referred to in the "Special Analysis of the Budget" goes to nuclear energy. New, clean energy research is almost totally lacking. In that portion of the budget covering the White House, we were told that the President's Office of Science and Technology was not really being abolished but that it was just being transferred to the National Science Foundation—yet NSF's budget is drastically reduced. Apparently our Nation's top executive leaders not only do not want scientists near them—they do not want them at all.

While the table I have just provided lists the Nation's major research and energy agencies, when one looks inside these agencies, one sees that they are doing very little energy research. The construction of new tankers is extremely short range solution to the energy crisis; it is not environmentally sound—it is simply another subsidy to the producers. The increase in the Federal Power Commission budget does not provide for any studies or solutions to the energy crisis. It just allows the FPC more staff to improve rate increases for the producers.

The one wholly new energy program, the Central Energy Research and Development Fund in the Department of the Interior is funded for a mere $25 million and will make expenditures of only $15 million in the coming budget year. The AEC budget is consumed mostly by the development of existing nuclear technology—a technology which we increasingly realize to be potentially dangerous. Research into one of the great potential energy sources of the future—fusion energy—is increased from only $37 to $44.5 million. In reality, a great deal of the AEC budget goes for nuclear warheads. They are spending $12 million on shells for nuclear artillery—hardly a weapon designed for the missile age.

Most of NASA's budget, rather than shifting to earth-related research and the meeting of national energy and pollution control needs, is spent on launching rockets into outer space. Funds for the space shuttle increase from $200 million to $475 million. Construction for these items are increased, while facilities such as the Lewis and Plumbrook Research Centers, which could be used for propulsion, energy, and pollution control research, are cut back.

It is obvious: The administration may say there is an energy crisis—but they do not attempt to meet it. The Congress will have to take the initiative in this area and develop a coordinated national energy policy with properly directed research for clean, cheap and safe energy supplies for the future.

Finally, this budget is a flimflam operation. There is so much reorganization and shifting of funds from department to department that it is nearly impossible to tell which programs have been cut. Reading this 1,100-page document is like trying to use a telephone book stapled together by a chimpanzee. The budget says that the Office of Economic Opportunity's health and nutrition programs of $165 million are being transferred to HEW. But when one adds the HEW health delivery programs together, one realizes that the total cut in health delivery services in the coming year is about $600 million. At first glance, one would gather that higher education expenses are up by half a billion—until one gets to the back of the budget where amendments and reductions in the fiscal 1973 budget are listed. Then one realizes that higher education programs for fiscal 1974 have been cut by about $200 million from the original fiscal year 1973 requests. It is a budget which eliminates the emergency public service employment programs by assuming that the unemployment rate will fall below 4.5 percent by July 1.

These reorganizations and new revenue sharing programs are a camouflage for the elimination of major programs. They are a smokescreen for a distortion of basic priorities. Two thousand years ago a Roman official summed up the operation of the present administration's reorganization plans:

> We trained hard but it seemed that every time we were beginning to form up we would be reorganized. . . . I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by reorganizing, and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralization.—Petronius Arbitar

In the following days, I will submit a "counter-budget." This budget will fit within the expenditure limitations which the President has set and which I believe are basically valid. But it will be a budget which would eliminate billions of dollars in programs which are obsolete, unwise, and unneeded. It will be a budget which will shift the moneys saved from these programs to programs better designed to serve the American people.

MAJOR MODERNIZATION OF THE PANAMA CANAL: INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 1517

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since November 29, 1971, the House Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, under the able chairmanship of my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. MURPHY), has been conducting comprehensive hearings on certain aspects of the interoceanic canal problem. In addition to matters already considered, this subject existing Panama Canal under the includes the major modernization of the strongly supported Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan. This proposal was developed in the canal organization as the result of World War II experience and promptly won the approval of President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a postwar project. To provide for such modernization, I have introduced H.R. 1517, which will be quoted later in my remarks.

Because many new Members of the Congress may not be informed as to important features in the vital canal subject, I shall summarize some of them:

First. The major increase of capacity of the existing canal by the construction of a third set of larger locks was originally authorized in 1939 at a cost not to exceed $277,000,000, primarily as a defense measure.

Second. Construction started in 1940 but was suspended in May 1942, because of more urgent war needs. A total of $76,357,405 was expended, largely on huge lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, a roadbed for relocating the Panama Railroad near Gatun, and a railroad bridge across the Miraflores locks, all of which can be utilized. No excavation was started at Pedro Miguel, which was fortunate.

Third. The great principle in the Terminal Lake plan is the creation of an expansion chamber for traffic in the summit level at the south end of Gaillard Cut.

Fourth. In brief, the plan calls for the elimination of the bottleneck Pedros Miguel locks, the consolidation of all Pacific locks at Agua Dulce to match the layout and capacity of the Atlantic locks, creation of a summit-level terminal lake at the Pacific end of the canal, and raising the maximum summit lake water level from 87 feet to its optimum height. One set of the new Pacific locks would be the same size as the new set of larger locks at Gatun. The optimum summit water level of 92 feet mentioned in section 2(a) of the bill is that recommended in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, 79th Congress.

Fifth. A total of $95,000,000 was expended on the enlargement of Gaillard Cut from a width of 300 feet to 500 feet which was completed on August 15, 1970. When this sum is added to that spent on the previously mentioned suspended Third Locks project, it totals more than $171,000,000 already invested toward the canal's major modernization.

Sixth. The total U.S. investment in the canal enterprise, including its defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1971, was $5,695,745,000, which, if converted into 1973 dollars, would be far greater.

Seventh. Among the outstanding ad-

vantages of the Terminal Lake-Third Locks plan are that it:

Enables the maximum utilization of all work so far accomplished on the Panama Canal, including that on the suspended Third Locks project.

Can be constructed under existing treaty provisions, a paramount consideration.

Preserves the existing fresh water barrier between the oceans, thereby protecting the Atlantic from infestation by poisonous Pacific sea snakes, the crown of thorns starfish, and other marine biological dangers.

Can be constructed at relatively low cost with every assurance of success and without the danger of disastrous slides.

Does not require the negotiation of a new treaty with Panama.

Has strong support from major environmental groups as well as independent canal and other experts.

Safeguard the economy of Panama.

Provides the best operational canal practicable of achievement at least cost, and without diplomatic involvement.

In contrast, the strenuously propagandized proposal for a new canal of so-called sea level design, located in the Republic of Panama about 10 miles west of the existing canal and initially estimated in the 1970 report under Public Law 88–609, as amended, to cost $2,880,000,000, would require a new treaty with Panama involving a huge indemnity and the cost of a right of way, both of which would have to be added to the cost of construction.

Such a project would take an estimated 15 years to construct and open a Pandora's box of difficulties and be less satisfactory operationally than the existing canal as modernized. Moreover, the construction of a salt water channel between the oceans is strongly opposed by important biological, environmental, and scientific groups and publications at home and abroad, would seriously dislocate the economy of Panama with major consequences, and hinge upon the surrender by the United States of the canal's indispensable protective frame of the Canal Zone to Panama. The last would place the United States in the impossible position of having grave responsibility without requisite authority.

When the question of increased transit facilities is evaluated from its most significant angles, the evidence is conclusive that the major modernization of the existing canal under the time-tested Terminal Lake-Third Locks proposal offers the best operational, the most economical, the most logical and the most historically based solution of the canal question ever devised.

The indicated bill follows:

H.R. 1517

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409 Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of one hundred and forty feet by one thousand two hundred feet by not less than forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Agua Dulce in new lock structures to correspond with the locks capacity at Gatun, raise the summit water level to its optimum height of approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at an estimated total cost not to exceed $950,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose: *Provided, however,* That the initial appropriation for the fiscal year 1974 shall not exceed $45,000,000.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Governor of the Canal Zone may act and exercise his authority as President of the Panama Canal Company and may utilize the services and facilities of that company.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which its work under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from private life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is $500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control of jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations there in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of $200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such

period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Servives or the President of the Panama Canal Company, or both, shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 13. Any provision of the Act of August 11, 1939 (54 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), or of any other statute, inconsistent with any provision of this Act is superseded, for the purposes of this Act, to the extent of such inconsistency.

HEARING ON COMPREHENSIVE OLDER AMERICANS SERVICES BILL

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues that on Thursday, February 8, the Select Committee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, will conduct hearings on legislation to extend and amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, with particular reference to H.R. 71 and other identical measures.

The Honorable Caspar Weinberger, Secretary-designate of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been invited to testify at the hearing, which will be held in room 2261 of the Rayburn House Office Building, beginning at 9:45 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, on January 3, I introduced H.R. 71, the comprehensive older Americans services bill, and since that time 123 Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, have joined in sponsoring identical measures.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that these bills are identical to H.R. 15657, which was passed unanimously in both the House and the Senate last year, and which the President vetoed after the 92d Congress had adjourned.

I am enclosing at this point, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, a summary of H.R. 71 and the other identical bills:

TITLE-BY-TITLE SUMMARY OF THE COMPREHENSIVE OLDER AMERICANS SERVICES AMENDMENTS

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES

The Congress expanded the objectives contained in the original Older Americans Act of 1965 by placing emphasis on the need to make comprehensive social service programs available to older Americans and to insure their participation in the development of these programs.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

This title establishes the Administration on Aging and places it within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. AoA is headed by a Commissioner on Aging who is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Administration on Aging is given primary responsibility for carrying out the programs authorized under this act.

Language has also been included which is designed to protect the administrative integrity of the Administration on Aging so as to guarantee that AoA carries out the mandate prescribed by Congress in this legislation. The legislation specifically states that the Commissioner shall be directly responsible to the Secretary and not to or through any other officer of the Department. The Commissioner's functions may not be delegated unless a delegation plan is submitted to Congress for approval.

Title II also creates a "National Information and Resource Clearinghouse for the Aging" which is designed to collect, analyze, prepare and disseminate information regarding the needs and interests of older Americans.

The bill authorizes $750,000 for fiscal year 1973; $1 million for fiscal year 1974 and $1,250,000 for fiscal year 1975.

In addition, title III contains a provision establishing a "Federal Council on the Aging" which will be composed of 15 members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The Council will assist and advise the President on matters relating to the needs of older Americans; review and evaluate the impact of Federal policies and programs on the aging; serve as a spokesman on behalf of older Americans by making recommendations to the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Commissioner on Aging, and the Congress with respect to Federal activities in the field of aging; and undertake programs designed to increase public awareness of the problems and needs of our senior citizens. The Federal Council on the Aging will also undertake various studies designed to further clarify the specific needs of the elderly and recommend solutions to them, with special emphasis on the impact of taxes of the elderly.

The act provides that for the purposes of administering the act, that there be authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

Title II also includes:

(*a*) provision for evaluation, not to exceed 1 percent of the funds appropriated under this act or $1 million whichever is greater;

(*b*) requirement that the Commissioner submit to the President for transmittal to Congress a full and annual report;

(*c*) provision for joint funding of projects, with the Federal agencies principally involved and designated to act for all in administering the funds provided; and

(*d*) provision for advance funding.

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING

Under title III, the Administration on Aging will work with State aging offices to develop a statewide plan for delivering social services to senior citizens. Each State may be divided into planning and service areas which will bear the primary responsibility for developing the apparatus required to deliver social and nutritional services to the elderly. These area aging units are designed to coordinate existing governmental services, purchase services, and/or provide services where they are otherwise unavailable.

In addition, the Commissioner may undertake "model projects" within a State, giving special consideration to projects involving the housing needs of older persons, transportation needs, continuing education, preretirement information, and special services to the handicapped. It is hoped that these model projects will expand and improve the delivery of social services to older persons.

There is authorized to be appropriated $100 million for fiscal year 1973; $200 million for fiscal year 1974 and $300 million for fiscal year 1975.

The sums appropriated will be alloted as follows:

(*a*) Each State is allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 percent of such sum.

(*b*) From the remainder, each State shall be allotted an amount that bears the ratio to such remainder as the population age 60 or over in such State bears to that population in all States. Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territories are allotted an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 percent. In fiscal year 1975 the formula will be based on population aged 60 and over in each State as it relates to that population in all States except that no State will be allotted more than one-half of 1 percent (or one-fourth of 1 percent) as the case may be. In addition, no State shall be allotted an amount less than it received in fiscal year 1973.

(*c*) Of each State's allotment not more than 20 percent thereof shall be available to pay not more than 75 percent of the cost of social services provided as a part of a comprehensive and coordinated system. Of the remainder, but not more than 65 percent may be used to pay not more than 90 percent of the cost of social services as a part of a comprehensive and coordinated system.

When a State is divided into planning and service areas, the State agency shall, after consideration of the views of the local government designate a public or nonprofit private agency or organization as the area agency on aging for such area.

An area agency on aging designated must be:

1. an established office on aging, or
2. any office or agency of a unit of general purpose local government, or
3. any office or agency designated by the elected officials, or a combination thereof, or
4. any public or nonprofit private agency which is under the supervision or direction of the designated State agency—so long as assurance can be provided that it has the ability to develop a plan and to carry it out.

The State agency shall give preference on an established office on aging unless it finds that such office does not have the capacity to carry out the area plan.

An area plan shall provide for a comprehensive and coordinated system for the delivery of social services within the area and provide for the establishment and maintenance of information and referral sources in sufficient numbers to assure that all older persons within the area will have reasonably convenient access to such sources. The area agency, among other things, will establish an advisory council in the area.

State plans, also requires that throughout the State, information and referral sources be established in sufficient numbers to as-

sure that older persons have convenient access to such sources.

Title III also provides funds to States based on population age 60 and over with a proviso that no State will be allotted less than one-half of 1 percent of the sums appropriated or $100,000, whichever is greater and that Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territories shall be allotted no less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the sums appropriated or $50,000, whichever is greater for the purpose of planning, coordination, evaluation and administration of State plans.

For this purpose there is authorized to be appropriated $20 million for fiscal year 1973, $20 million for fiscal year 1974 and $20 million for fiscal year 1975.

Provision is also made that any amount not used by a State agency may be transferred to the area agency to cover part of the cost of the area planning.

In addition, the Commissioner may undertake "model projects" within a State, giving special consideration to projects involving the housing needs of older persons, transportation needs, continuing education, preretirement information, and special services to the handicapped. It is hoped that these model projects will expand and improve the delivery of social services to older persons.

For the purpose of carrying out the model projects there is authorized to be appropriated $70 million for fiscal year 1973, $105 million for fiscal year 1974 and $140 million for fiscal year 1975.

TITLE IV—TRAINING AND RESEARCH

The Commissioner on Aging may undertake programs designed to attract qualified persons into the field of aging and to provide training programs for personnel in this field. There is authorized to be appropriated for these purposes $15 million for fiscal year 1973, $20 million for fiscal year 1974 and $25 million for fiscal year 1975.

There is also provision for special transportation problems of older Americans. There is authorized to be appropriated for this purpose $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1973, $15 million for fiscal year 1974 and $20 million for fiscal year 1975.

The Commissioner on Aging is further authorized to make grants and contracts for research and development projects in the field of aging. There is also a provision for the establishment and support of multidisciplinary centers of gerontology, which will assist in the research and training programs as well as provide technical assistance for State and local aging units. There is authorized to be appropriated for these purposes $20 million for fiscal year 1973, $30 million for fiscal year 1974 and $40 million for fiscal year 1975.

TITLE V—MULTIPURPOSE SENIOR CENTERS

This title provides for the acquisition, alteration, renovation and construction of multipurpose senior centers to serve as a focal point in communities for the development and delivery of social and nutritional services. The Commissioner on Aging may make grants or contracts to pay up to 75 percent of the cost. Construction is to occur only where utilizing existing facilities is not feasible.

There is authorized to be appropriated 35 million for each fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973 and ending June 30, 1975.

This title also provides for loan insurance for senior centers, annual interest grants (anything above 3 percent per annum—approval by the Secretary required) and grant authorizations for staffing of such centers.

For initial staffing there is authorized to be appropriated $10 million for 3 fiscal years beginning July 1, 1973 and ending June 30, 1975.

TITLE VI—NATIONAL OLDER AMERICAN VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

This title expands and extends the authorization for the Foster Grandparents program and other Older Americans Community Service programs. These programs, which were transferred to the ACTION agency in 1971 seek to involve Older Americans in a variety of programs designed to benefit persons, both children and adults, having exceptional needs.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the RSVP program $20 million for fiscal year 1973; $30 million for fiscal year 1974 and $40 million for fiscal year 1975.

For the ongoing Foster Grandparents program, there is authorized to be appropriated $35 million for fiscal year 1973, $45 million for fiscal year 1974 and $55 million for fiscal year 1975.

For the expanded Foster Grandparents program such as care for older persons and other persons with exceptional needs, there is authorized to be appropriated $6 million for fiscal year 1973; $7 million for fiscal year 1974 and $8 million for fiscal year 1975.

TITLE VII—NUTRITION PROGRAM

This title makes several minor conforming changes in the nutrition legislation which was passed earlier this year. The changes are primarily designed to produce greater coordination between nutrition programs and the social service programs provided in title III.

TITLE VIII—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

This provision amends the Library Services and Construction Act, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act, the Higher Education Act, the Adult Education Act and the Economic Opportunity Act, so as to provide expanded opportunities for older Americans to participate in programs of continuing education.

There is authorized to be appropriated for Older Readers Services under the Library Services and Construction Act $11,700,000 for fiscal year 1973; $12,300,000 for fiscal year 1974; $12,900,000 for fiscal year 1975 and $13,700,000 for fiscal year 1976.

There is authorized to be appropriated for special programs and projects under the Higher Education Act $5 million for fiscal year 1973 and each succeeding fiscal year prior to July 1, 1977.

There is authorized to be appropriated for special educational projects (speech and reading) under the Adult Education Act such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1973, 1974, and 1975.

There is authorized to be appropriated under the Economic Opportunity Act (SOS program) $7 million for fiscal year 1973 and $7 million for fiscal year 1974.

TITLE IX—COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

This title is designed to provide community service jobs for low-income older Americans 55 years of age and older in the fields of education, social services, recreation services, conservation, environmental restoration, economic development, etc. The programs created by title IX are structured in such a way to draw upon the experiences of numerous pilot and demonstration projects conducted by the Department of Labor under its Operation Mainstream program. It is estimated that as many as 40,000 to 60,000 jobs could be created under the provisions of this title.

There is authorized to be appropriated $100 million for fiscal year 1973 and $150 million for fiscal year 1974.

TITLE X—MIDDLE AGED AND OLDER WORKERS TRAINING ACT

This title is designed to provide manpower training programs and other services to increase job opportunities for middle-aged and older persons. The Secretary of Labor will carry out the provisions of this title within the framework of existing programs during the remainder of fiscal year 1973.

There is authorized to be appropriated $100 million for fiscal year 1974 for this title.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE OLDER AMERICANS SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1972

	Fiscal year—		
	1973	1974	1975
Title I			
Title II: National Information and Resource Clearing House	$750,000	$1,000,000	$1,250,000
Title III:			
Area planning and social service programs	100,000,000	200,000,000	300,000,000
Planning, coordination, evaluation, and administration	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Model projects	70,000,000	105,000,000	140,000,000
Title IV:			
Training	15,000,000	20,000,000	25,000 000
Studies and demonstrations on transportation	7,500,000	15,000,000	20,000,000
Research and multidisciplinary centers of gerontology	20,000,000	30,000,000	40,000 000
Title V:			
Multipurpose senior centers	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Annual interest grants	1,000,000	3,000,000	5,000,000
Personnel staffing grants	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Title VI:			
RSVP	20,000,000	30,000,000	40,000,000
Foster Grandparents	41,000,000	52,000,000	63,000,000
Title VII: Nutrition program (authorized in Public Law 92-258)	$100,000,000	$150,000,000	
Subtotal, Funding for Older Americans Act	440,250,000	671,000,000	$699,250,000
Title VIII—Amendments to other acts:			
Older Reader Services	11,700,000	12,300,000	12,900,000
Special programs and projects relating to problems of the elderly (Title I—Higher Education Act)	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Senior opportunities and services (Economic Opportunity Act)	7,000,000	7,000,000	
Title IX: Older American Community Service Employment Act	100,000,000	150,000,000	
Title X: Middle-Aged and Older Workers Training Act		100,000,000	
Subtotal, other programs	123,700,000	274,300,000	17,900,000
Total (H.R. 71 and other identical bills)	563,950,000	945,300,000	717,150,000

"MALIGN NEGLECT," AN ARTICLE BY FRED M. HECHINGER, NEW YORK TIMES, JANUARY 29, 1973

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of Congress concerned with the improvement of education in our country will read with great interest the following article, "Malign Neglect," by Fred M. Hechinger in the New York Times of Monday, January 29, 1973:

MALIGN NEGLECT

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

A succession of leaks by the usual well-informed sources in preparing Congress and the American people for the impending bad news about drastic cuts in education expenditures. The dire predictions seem part of a campaign to make the impact less painful when the ax falls.

The President gave away the game plan with his pledge that "we are going to shuck off . . . and trim down those programs that have proved simply to be failures." In contrast to Mr. Nixon's generous tribute last week to the late President Johnson, White House staff members have been telling candidates for key posts in the second Nixon Administration that they must be willing to bury the Johnsonian antipoverty programs.

Education is, of course, at the heart of any serious effort to offer the children of the urban and rural slums an escape from poverty. Most Federal education subsidies were earmarked for that purpose. Administration ideologists have therefore been spreading the word that the concept of compensatory education for the disadvantaged, which was given its first serious test during the Johnson years, has failed.

Edward Zigler, who served the first Nixon Administration as director of the Office of Child Development, recently exposed that strategy of deprecating compensatory education. Premature and flawed evaluation reports on Head Start, he said, were given wide public exposure by "an unnamed White House official" who spread the word: "Head Start is clearly a failure. It is nothing but a babysitting service for welfare mothers."

As the fiscal authorities sharpen their knives, the political anesthetists are trying to put the opposition to sleep by saying that "research shows" that the money that is being cut out would do no good anyway.

The use of such distorted research to rationalize budget-slashing glosses over the fact that the principal reason for the disappointing results of some—by no means all—compensatory education programs is that they were never given a fair chance.

The unfavorable official assessment of the compensatory programs ignores the fact that they were expected to do the impossible—overcome in a few experimental years the handicaps created by decades of past neglect reinforced by an environment that continues to be destructive. They were supposed to inoculate deprived children with a serum of instant academic success.

The real surprise is that many of the programs which are being written off as costly failures have accomplished so much in so little time and at so low a cost. Many Head Start children, for example, made notable gains in academic readiness as well as in attitude. Thousands of these youngsters benefited from desperately needed health care that corrected hitherto overlooked physical deficiencies. Schools in urban slums enjoyed all too briefly the services of added teaching staffs.

During the past two years, those essential "extras" have begun to disappear from many city classrooms. One middle-class father, himself an educator, last year withdrew his children from a New York City public school. It had been, he said, a model school—racially integrated, with an able staff, small classes and happy, learning children. "It all went down the drain," he said. "A fine school has been destroyed."

Parents in the black ghettos know only too well what the trend means for their children. The black workers' classic complaint of being last hired and first fired now seems to them the new policy for their schools—last to be discovered and first to be abandoned again.

The Administration's new line that spending must be curtailed until new research shows how the schools can be improved is a flight from reality. Of course there has been waste. Not all experimental programs have been sound. But it is absured to save money by turning off the heat on cold winter nights pending new research on how to manufacture better fuel. Enough is known about the immediate needs of children to justify adequate funding of the best available approaches toward meeting those needs.

Elliot Richardson, in his farewell address as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, blasted what he called "proliferating programs." He warned that "high promise and humane concern can be responsibly expressed only through operational performance which is pragmatic and realistic." It would be hard to quarrel with such cautions, if realism were merely to mean better leadership rather than less support.

But the message from the second Nixon Administration has been that the faucet is to be turned off. And so, attention is shifting to that nucleus of concerned members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—who have been personally involved in the study and analysis of the schools' requirements. They are angry. They say privately that they are now prepared to respond to the Administration's threatened ax-wielding by shaping their own cohesive Federal Education policy. They are seeking to create a coalition for a Congressional take-over in a campaign to save the nation's children from malign neglect.

TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL J. N. DEAN

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1972, shortly after the 92d Congress adjourned, one of the stanchest and most distinguished advocates of assistance for the handicapped and crippled in America passed away.

I refer, of course, to Russell J. N. Dean, who had become familiar to many of us here on Capitol Hill, on both sides of the aisle, for his unstinting efforts on behalf of America's handicapped people.

Born in Athens, Ohio, 62 years ago, Russell Dean had devoted his life to medicine and rehabilitation since being called into the Army Air Corps in 1941 to serve in medical and hospital administration. One of his proudest memories was the successful completion, under his oversight, of the transportation of over 6 tons of equipment to the Philippines, so that a rehabilitation center could be opened in Manila during the war.

For 22 years after World War II, Mr. Dean was a leader in the American rehabilitation movement as he worked ceaselessly and tirelessly for medical and rehabilitation programs as a legislative, public relations, and administrative officer of the Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For his persistent efforts and remarkable contributions to bettering the lives of handicapped people, Mr. Dean received the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, Russell Dean traveled around the globe in his efforts to increase man's understanding of, and concern for, the handicapped and the disabled and the crippled of our world. He was a member of U.S. delegations to international conferences on rehabilitation in the Philippines and West Germany, as well as a Vocational Rehabilitation Administration consultant on research projects in such far flung spots as Burma, India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic.

Not satisfied with these contributions, Mr. Dean also put in countles hours writing articles for professional journals and magazines, as well as serving on the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Those of us who worked with Mr. Dean over the years, and came to know him, learned to respect not only the magnificent contributions he had made to rehabilitation legislation, but also his integrity and honesty, as well as his willingness to consider all points of view in his efforts to improve the lives of the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, just weeks before Russell Dean died, his latest publication became available, "New Life for Millions: Rehabilitation for America's Disabled," a book chronicling the history of vocational rehabilitation in America.

Said Mr. Dean in the preface to his book:

> I realized early that it was not possible to tell this full story, to portray the role played by every person who helped build the Nation's present structure for restoring disabled people to activity and usefulness. That would require several volumes. But I felt that a start must be made now, while the story is still fairly recent and many of the key figures can be consulted. Perhaps other authors will be encouraged to add to the story.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that when other authors do turn their hands to adding to the story of rehabilitation in America, one of the additions will be an account of the generosity and selflessness Russell Dean brought to that cause.

Mr. Speaker, the 93d Congress will share the loss of Russell Dean with his wife, Jo. We will miss his expertise, and experience, and his dedication, as we consider new ways to advance and carry on his life's work, the rehabilitation of handicapped people.

WORLD WAR I PENSION BENEFITS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would give

World War I veterans, their widows, and children, pension benefits on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Very simply, my bill merely amends the existing law to remove the World War I veteran from inclusion with the veterans of World War II and the Korean war and places the World War I veteran in the pertinent chapters of the public law dealing with the Spanish-American veteran, and widows and children. As such, the bill transfers the World War I veteran to sections 412, 536, and 537 of title 38, United States Code, retaining to the World War I veteran the right to make an irrevocable election to remain under section 541, if he should so desire. This legislation would provide a long-needed reform to the World War I veteran who for pension is treated like the World War II and Korean veteran, and yet has never had the many other veterans' benefits which have been made available to the other veterans groups. And while confining the World War I veteran to the pension requirements of World War II and later wars, we have not given the World War I veteran and his survivors the benefits which have been made available to the veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, nor even the China Relief Expedition.

To continue to place World I veterans in the outside income limitations of the veterans of World War II and later wars results in undue hardship and discrimination against the World War I veterans as a group. While it is true that the income limitations are low, consideration must also be given to the effect of inflation and the impossibility of a World War I veteran existing on the small pension allotted to him unless he has substantial outside income. The World War I veteran without financial reserves is forced to seek outside income to exist, which in turn causes him to lose his pension.

On the other hand, the World War II and Korean veterans are for the most part still in their prime and working and therefore, except in the more serious instances of disability, are not forced to the pension route to exist.

It is estimated by the Administrator that 2,001,500 World War I veterans at an estimated cost of $1,488,863,000 represent the initial number and the cost of increased awards by enactment of this legislation. By the end of 5 years, it is estimated that this would decrease to 4,688,000 individuals at an anticipated cost of $1,212 million.

The opposition to enactment of this bill offered by the administration is based on the cost of the program. However, I strongly feel that the award increases herein requested are the minimum that we should consider in responding to the World War I veterans, their widows, and children.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that this bill be adopted.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Monday marked the 55th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Unfortunately this is not exactly a happy occasion because 5 years after the people of the Ukraine proclaimed their independence they were gobbled up by the newly formed Soviet Union. And with a powerful army and a deliberate campaign of terrorism that nation has continued to blot out the hopes and aspirations of the Ukrainian people for freedom and self-determination.

These recent attempts at repression mean one thing to the free world—that all the vicious tactics employed by the Communists have failed.

Yet the spirit of freedom still survives in the hearts of the Ukrainian people after more than two generations of harassment and execution, and it will continue to survive until that freedom has finally been attained. That is the lesson we always recall on this anniversary occasion.

At the opening of this Congress I introduced once again my bill to provide for a national day of observance of the Ukrainian Independence, House Resolution 88.

National recognition of this day here in America would serve not only to remind us all of the plight of those still trapped behind the Iron Curtain, but also as a rallying point for a rededication of our own efforts as a nation to work for the day that the Ukrainian people, and all those other captive nations trapped behind the Iron Curtain will once again be free.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely passing of President Johnson last week came as a heavy blow to me. He was more than a leader and a President to me. He was a personal friend. I first met him over 32 years ago when I came to Washington to serve as a congressional secretary and he was a young, third-term Congressman from Texas. Since then I have had the opportunity to watch his progress through the leadership channels in Washington to the White House.

As a President no man did more than Lyndon Johnson to maintain close and continuing consultation with Congress. In the Johnson days Members of Congress were in the White House repeatedly and many of us flew with him on important occasions in Air Force One. He was a dynamic and persuasive, most effective in small groups. But somehow this charm never came across on television, unfortunately.

I believe that history will be much kinder to Lyndon Johnson than his contemporaries have been. His actions in Vietnam were most courageous and prevented a dangerous shift in the balance of world power in Asia. His legislative record on domestic issues is almost without parallel, especially in civil rights.

The last time I saw President Johnson was 3 weeks ago at the memorial mass in New Orleans for our beloved majority leader, Hale Boggs. Mr. Johnson looked tired then and his pace had slowed. But he had not hesitated to fly halfway across the country to pay tribute to a great friend and a very loyal supporter. It was characteristic of a big heart and a great man. That was Lyndon Johnson.

THE VIETNAM PEACE AGREEMENT

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday morning I had the unusual and very exciting experience of meeting with several other Members of the House and Senate for 2 hours with the President and Dr. Kissinger in the Cabinet room of the White House for a full briefing on the detailed terms of the Vietnam peace settlement, now signed into force in Paris on Saturday.

On the basis of the text as it has been made available, and Dr. Kissinger's personal account of some of the negotiating background, I am convinced the President and Dr. Kissinger have achieved a very remarkable success.

This is certainly a far better document that what was being offered to us last October. It fully justifies the President's dogged persistence, despite great pressures and provocations, in holding out for terms that were both understandable and enforceable. And, I also believe it more than justifies the support which I have consistently given to the President, regardless of partisan politics, in his quest for an honorable and workable settlement.

No peace agreement is ever perfect; it must be a compromise and this is no exception. But what we have here is a formula not only for getting our prisoners back and our troops returned home, but also for an end, at long last, to the killing throughout Indochina, and a chance for real peace in a vital area of the world that has seen no peace for over 30 years.

The American people, I believe, owe a great debt of gratitude to President Nixon and to Dr. Kissinger.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, as I said last Friday evening at a church dinner in my home city of Amsterdam, the chances for turning impending Vietnam cease-fire into a meaningful and lasting peace in Southeast Asia depend to a very large extent on all of us, the American people, and especially on whether we take a posi-

tive view of the possibilities which this agreement opens up.

Obviously nobody can say with 100 percent certainty, that this intricate and delicate agreement, which will bring our prisoners and our troops home 2 months from now, can also produce something more than a mere temporary truce in Indochina.

But the thing that burns me up is that the people who are now picking out all the flaws in the Kissinger-Tho agreement are the very same people who only a week ago were shrilly demanding that President Nixon get out of Vietnam on any terms at all.

No military agreement is ever perfect, but this one does achieve our basic objectives: our prisoners home, our troops withdrawn, and a reasonable chance for South Vietnam to control its own future. And that is a lot more than anyone thought we ever could get 4 years ago. Basically there are two reasons why this is so.

First, I believe the North Vietnamese have really had it. The war, the mining, and the bombing have all taken a very heavy toll. It is just barely possible that the North Vietnamese might be as much interested in switching from killing to rehabilitation as we are.

Second, in sharp contrast to where we were 4 years ago, the Russians and Chinese—even though neither is mentioned anywhere in this document—have been very vital parts of this phenomenal peacemaking effort. They helped to get the North Vietnamese to sign; and it is to their own interests, as much as it is to ours, to see that this new arrangement does not suddenly fall apart.

But most of all, Mr. Speaker, whether this settlement does or does not usher in a stable and lasting peace in Asia is up to us here in America. We have been poor-mouthing on Southeast Asia for so long, it is going to be hard suddenly to become boosters. But here, if there ever was one, is a prime candidate for a massive dose of Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's "power of positive thinking." We must do three things, I believe.

First, we cannot simply abandon Asia just because we got a cease-fire. Stability in Asia will depend on our continuing participation in that area to maintain that new triangle of Russia, China, and America. If we go isolationist, then Asia polarizes again, and peace goes out the window.

Second, we must remember that in dealing with both the Russians and the Chinese, we cannot let our guard down. They respect power, and by keeping our own defenses strong and our powder dry we run the best chance of never having to use either, as President Kennedy reminded us many years ago.

Third, and most difficult of all, we are going to have to lend a hand in the rebuilding of Indochina, including North Vietnam, just as we rebuilt Germany and Japan after World War II. This may seem hard to take, after a long and bitter war, but it can be as much an investment in long-range peace and stability as was the Marshall Plan in 1946.

Besides, what better leverage could we get for keeping the North Vietnamese from violating the terms of the agreement they have signed in Paris? If they really want our help, then they will not return to do any monkey business in South Vietnam, or else that will be the end of any aid for them.

So we must keep both the carrot and the stick, and only if we are willing to do both can we hope to achieve lasting peace.

CRIME COMMITTEE APPRECIATES LOUISVILLE RACING EDITORIALS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, both Louisville, Ky., newspapers recently printed extremely constructive and helpful editorials on the eve of the issuance of a Crime Commission report on horse racing.

Kentucky, of course, is a State rich in the tradition of horse breeding and racing dating back to the opening of the Williams Race Track in 1797. It is a fact that racing was so popular in Kentucky that the Williams Track in Lexington, home of Churchill Downs and the Kentucky Derby, had to be built to get the riders off the main street of town.

I imagine that the operators of Williams Race Track faced in the 18th Century many of the same problems confronting the sport today, with one important exception.

While the fixing of races and the running of substitute horses may be nothing new to racing, our committee uncovered one trend that must be stopped immediately—the acquisition of stock in tracks and the ownership of thoroughbreds by individuals tied to organized criminal syndicates.

To effectively prevent this potentially fatal assault on the integrity of a great sport, the Crime Committee will shortly be making a number of legislative recommendations.

We are grateful, therefore, to have the thoughts of those on the Louisville papers as we finalize our own recommendations. The editorial suggestions were obviously made by persons with a keen awareness of the problems of the sport.

Following the printing of the January 16 editorial in the Louisville Times entitled: "A Hopeful Plan to Clean Up Racing," and the January 18 editorial in the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled: "The Integrity of Horse Racing Needs More Protection—Now," I submit a table listing the 31 States currently permitting such sports activity.

The table dramatically shows the interstate activity of a sport that affects the lives of millions and the revenues of a majority of the States.

A HOPEFUL PLAN TO CLEAN UP RACING

Instead of vigorously policing itself, as it should, the horse racing establishment has an unfortunate tendency to close ranks when even a hint of scandal threatens to corrode its already badly tarnished sport-of-kings image. This willingness to cover up the hanky-panky in which everyone from state racing commissioners to stable boys seems to be engaged has predictably led to proposals for tough federal regulation of the industry.

During the past few years, allegations of race fixing, horse doping, conflict of interest, infiltration by organized crime and just plain cheating have been eating away at the patina of Blue Grass romanticism that has long hidden a multitude of sins. Yet a congressional committee, not the breeders, owners, track officials and others who have a direct interest in racing's good health, is in the forefront of the housecleaning.

If Kentucky's record is any indication, the states have done little to root out corruption at race tracks or to set high standards of personal and professional behavior for the officials who regulate the sport. The horsemen frequently appointed to serve on racing commissions are all too happy to wink at the pecadillos of their brothers in the racing fraternity.

So it was left to the U.S. House Select Committee on Crime to probe, in hearings held last year, some of the more unsavory aspects of racing. The committee, expressing particular concern about the involvement of organized crime in the sport of kings has now made a number of recommendations to Congress and to the states for protecting both racing and its patrons.

The proposal that is certain to generate the most controversy calls for the appointment of a national racing commissioner to oversee the sport and a Track Security Office to investigate criminal activity. In view of the interstate movement of what the committee calls "groups of sophisticated criminals" and the industry's apparent inability to stop them, some type of national authority to make rules and investigate violations seems essential. The licensing of virtually everyone involved in racing, also suggested by the committee, would be a further safeguard against illegal activity.

Recent experience in Kentucky indicates the need to enact some of the new federal and state laws recommended by the congressmen. For instance, the committee urged a prohibition against hidden ownership of horses, and a statute outlawing conflicts of interest among track owners, regulatory officials and politicians.

The proper response of the Kentucky Racing Commission should be a detailed study of the report followed soon by some recommendations of its own for protecting the integrity of the Thoroughbred industry. This will not necessarily forestall or prevent federal regulation, nor should it. But Kentucky, as the Mecca of racing, should lead the way in setting the highest possible standards for a sport that, in the opinion of a large segment of the public, is degenerating into a fraud and a swindle.

THE INTEGRITY OF HORSE RACING NEEDS MORE PROTECTION—NOW

There is a real danger the public one day soon is going to look at thoroughbred racing with the same amused disdain that many people now reserve for professional wrestling and roller derbies. The difference between racing and those pseudo-sports is credibility, and a report being filed this week by the House Select Committee on Crime indicates that racing's credibility is being steadily frittered away.

The committee identified the culprits specifically, saying that the real and potential involvement of organized crime in racing is "the greatest threat to the sport." But a solution must focus on a less obvious set of culprits. The committee made reference to them when it said, "An inadequate security staff, especially those competent to

conduct criminal investigations involving interstate conspiracy, is the rule in racing."

That is to say, the self-policing apparatus of racing is vegetating without producing anything (an impossibility in biology, but a commonplace in bureaucracy).

A JUMBLE OF JURISDICTIONS

The enforcement machinery has to be improved if racing's plausibility with the public is going to survive. The question is whether the federal government is going to have to do the job, or whether the states and the industry itself can do it. The committee obviously feels that federal intervention is necessary, since it is recommending a federal racing czar, a federal racing commission, a federal racing security force and extensive federal licensing of racing personnel.

There are strong arguments for such initatives. Racing regulation varies from state to state; communication among the state regulatory bodies is limited; jurisdictional lines complicate the eradication of racing's criminal element. A comprehensive federal program, complete with the proposed national data bank for racing investigation information, would begin to rationalize the approach to this sport. With such a system it is much less likely the public would be treated to the current spectacle of Emprise Corporation under hot pursuit by authorities in some states, while Kentucky remains virtually supine before the issue of Emprise's alleged Mafia connections.

INTERSTATE COMPACT MIGHT HELP

On the other hand, it might be best to give the leadership of thoroughbred racing another chance to cleanse its own image. Other sports have been able to police themselves, and there is no reason to believe racing cannot. But the effort is going to require more enthusiasm than that now generated by the somnolent Thoroughbred Racing Protective Bureau or Kentucky Racing Commission. It probably would necessitate something like an Interstate Racing Compact, designed by the various state racing authorities and approved by their state governments. Such a compact would avoid the imposition of federal control from above, while accomplishing the necessary cooperation. Since the racing interests themselves are content with the present state regulatory bodies, they ought to be content to let those bodies form some sort of powerful national consortium to manage racing affairs.

With respect to other aspects of the committee report, the call for federal licensing of everyone in racing, from owners to exercise boys, seems excessive if simpler guarantees—such as holding an owner responsible if his employes cheat—can be devised. Also, the proposal for public ownership of all racetracks might have merit if it could be shown that this is the only way to protect the public interest. But does anyone imagine that states which tolerate "see no evil" racing commissions would suddenly get superb efficiency and unchallengeable honesty from the boards appointed by politicians to run publicly owned tracks?

In addition, electronic surveillance of suspected racing crooks, even with the permission of a federal judge, runs afoul of the need to curb government affection for wiretapping and bugging. And long-term racing dates—granted for 10 to 25 years—admittedly would stabilize the politicized competition within the industry, but also would eliminate one of the present yearly opportunities to review changing racing trends, track operations and good management vs. bed.

So not all that the committee has to recommend is worthy of precipitate adoption. But the committee's warning about the credibility gap that is opening between the public and the racing world is fully justified. Kentucky, more than any other state, has a stake in insuring that racing is a legitimate sport, not a seamy sideshow. If the public ever starts laughing at racing, the sport is in deep, deep trouble, and so is Kentucky's horse industry.

STATES PERMITTING PARIMUTUEL RACING AS OF JANUARY 1973

State	Population	Percent to United States
1. Arizona	1,772,482	0.88
2. Arkansas	1,923,295	.96
3. California	19,953,134	9.83
4. Colorado	2,207,259	1.08
5. Connecticut	3,302,217	1.63
6. Delaware	548,104	.27
7. Florida	6,789,443	3.35
8. Idaho	713,008	.35
9. Illinois	11,113,976	5.47
10. Kentucky	3,219,311	1.58
11. Louisiana	3,643,180	1.79
12. Maine	993,663	.49
13. Maryland	3,922,399	1.92
14. Massachusetts	5,689,170	2.81
15. Michigan	8,875,083	4.39
16. Montana	694,409	.35
17. Nebraska	1,483,791	.73
18. Nevada	488,738	.24
19. New Hampshire	737,681	.37
20. New Jersey	7,168,164	3.55
21. New Mexico	1,016,000	.49
22. New York	18,190,740	8.96
23. Ohio	10,652,017	5.24
24. Oregon	2,091,385	1.04
25. Pennsylvania	11,793,909	5.81
26. Rhode Island	949,723	.47
27. South Dakota	666,257	.33
28. Vermont	444,732	.22
29. Washington	3,409,169	1.68
30. West Virginia	1,744,237	.86
31. Wyoming	332,416	.16
Total [1]	136,529,092	67.24

[1] In addition to the States listed above, Virginia and Texas are actively considering legislation through their respective legislatures to institute racing in 1973. If these 2 States are added to the existing number in 1973, the totals will reflect the following change and mean that States with ¾ of the U.S. population will have parimutuel racing:

State	Population	Percent of United States
32. Texas	11,196,730	5.52
33. Virginia	4,648,494	2.29
U.S. total	152,374,316	75.08
Total U.S. population	203,184,772	

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS CAN BRING "SPEED" TO A STOP

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs now has all the facts it can possibly need to end forever the legal overproduction of amphetamines—stimulants—that for so many years have contributed to the Nation's drug crisis. These are the drugs that the Crime Committee found 3 years ago were falling into the hands of young people in huge quantities and were being injected—sometimes fatally—into the bloodstream.

The final, conclusive information of which I speak is a flat, unequivocal statement from BNDD's medical adviser—the Food and Drug Administration—that amphetamine drugs have only limited medical usefulness and great potential for abuse.

This, of course, is what the Select Committee on Crime, which I chair, has been arguing for the past 3 years when we first disclosed the widespread abuse of amphetamines by adults and young people alike. We achieved some setbacks and more important successes in an unending effort to bring these abusable substances under reasonable controls and quotas.

The task was made all the more difficult because while the Crime Committee and a few others were calling for controls, the drug industry and its supporters continued to argue and lobby for actual increases.

When the Crime Committee first inquired, there were an estimated 6 to 8 billion such pills produced each year. After considerable effort and formidable opposition, we did manage to see an 82-percent cutback in 1972 over the number of amphetamine stimulants produced in 1971.

While we were advised by the Federal regulatory agencies and others that this was the best we could possibly hope for, I am proud to say that the entire committee went on record in stating that 500 million pills were still too many to meet the legitimate medical needs of the country. We asked for further cuts because we were convinced then, as now, that amphetamines are of marginal use in the treatment of obesity, their primary production purpose according to the manufacturers.

On January 19, 1973, in a front page article in the New York Times, under the byline of Mr. Harold M. Schmeck Jr., the Times' knowledgeable and respected medical writer, there appeared a report entitled "FDA Urges a New Cutback in Amphetamine Output Quotas." And it said:

> The Federal Government is moving toward reduction in amphetamine production quotas for the second straight year.
>
> Last year the total manufacturing production quota for the country was reduced more than 80 percent from the previous year. Recommendations made today by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (through the F.D.A.) would probably cut 1973 production at least 50 percent below that for 1972.

This is certainly welcome news.

Most intriguing, however, is the subsequent paragraph which states:

> The reasons for the cuts lie basically in the Food and Drug Administration's view that amphetamine drugs have only limited medical usefulness and great potential for abuse.

This was an apparent reference to a report issued last October by a group of four physicians and two statisticians headed by Dr. Thaddeus E. Prout, associate professor of medicine at the Johns Hopkins University, which found that amphetamines in use as diet pills were of "clinically trivial" value in weight loss.

This conclusion is exactly what the Crime Committee discovered through the testimony of competent medical persons who appeared at our hearings in 1969 and 1970.

I can remember vividly a fight on the floor of this House in late 1970 to place controls and quotas on amphetamine production based on medical testimony that found only two legitimate uses for the substances—the treatment of two rare diseases, narcolepsy and hyperkinesis.

We received a setback then, Mr. Speaker, but we did not quit.

And today I say we are on the verge of winning an important victory for those concerned about this Nation's drug problem and the crime and degradation it breeds.

If ever there was a time for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to carry out its responsibilities to the public, it is now.

The facts are all in now, Mr. Speaker, there can be no cause for further delay.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following items in the RECORD:

An article from the New York Times dated January 19, 1973, and entitled "FDA Urges a New Cutback in Amphetamine Output Quotas."

An article from the New York Times dated February 10, 1972, and entitled "U.S. Plans 82 Percent Cutback in Amphetamines."

An article from the Washington Post dated October 11, 1972, and entitled "Diet Pills Rated 'Clinically Trivial' in Weight Loss."

A statement issued by the Crime Committee dated January 19, 1973, urging the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to further restrict amphetamine production as recommended by the Food and Drug Administration.

A statement issued by the Crime Committee dated February 23, 1970, calling for a strict quota system on amphetamines.

A statement issued by the Crime Committee dated December 17, 1969, upon submission of legislation forbidding either legal or illicit production and distribution of "speed."

The articles and statement follow:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1973]

FDA URGES A NEW CUTBACK IN AMPHETAMINE OUTPUT QUOTAS

(By Harold M. Schmeck Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—The Federal Government is moving toward sharp reduction in amphetamine production quotas for the second straight year.

Last year the total manufacturing production quota for the country was reduced more than 80 per cent from the previous year. Recommendations made today by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare would probably cut 1973 production at least 50 per cent below that for 1972.

The reasons for the cuts lie basically in the Food and Drug Administration's view that amphetamine drugs have only limited medical usefulness and great potential for abuse.

The recommendations, sent to the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, stem primarily from the F.D.A. They call for a 20 per cent cut in production quota for amphetamines prepared to be taken by mouth and elimination altogether of injectable amphetamines and amphetamines in combination with other drugs.

There are no hard figures yet on just what this will mean in terms of an over-all cutback, but an officer of the bureau said it is expected to mean a drop of 50 to 70 per cent below last year's quota. It is believed that something between 50 and 60 per cent of amphatemines are used currently in combination with sedatives or other drugs. The combinations are used primarily in treating obesity.

Amphetamines are powerful stimulants that are also used for obesity control to suppress the appetite over a short period.

Last year the F.D.A. completed an extensive review of drugs used for weight control and concluded that amphetamines are of only limited value.

In an announcement of the recommendations today, the drug agency said it had concluded that the injectable form of amphetamine was unsafe and that the nonamphetamine ingredients in the various combination products did not contribute to the contended weight loss. The agency estimates that 72 per cent of the appetite-suppressing drugs prescribed by doctors are amphetamine combinations.

In a bulletin sent to the nation's doctors last month, the drug agency said the amphetamines and related drugs should be used by doctors only with extreme care because of their significant potential for abuse and for making patients dependent on them.

The bulletin said adult patients using weight-reducing drugs in combination with diet tend to lose a fraction of a pound more per week than patients using diet alone, but that this applies only to short-term use.

In 1971 the total production quota for amphetamine was 9,356 kilograms. Last year this was dropped to 1,564 kilograms. If the new recommendations result in a further 50 per cent cut, the 1973 quota will be 782 kilograms—enough to treat roughly 1.5 million average patients for a month.

A spokesman for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs said production quotas might be below the recommendations from the F.D.A. because the bureau would take into account manufacturers' inventories in establishing the limits.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1972]

U.S. PLANS 82 PERCENT CUTBACK IN AMPHETAMINES

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—The Government plans to cut the 1972 domestic production quota for amphetamines to about 17 or 18 per cent of last year's production in an effort to cope with one of the nation's most serious drug problems, officials said today.

In December, the Justice Department announced that the proposed 1972 production quotas would be 60 per cent of last year's estimated production. Since then, there have been several indications that the final quota would be substantially lower.

Today, officials of the department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs said final figures would probably be published next week. Barring some last-minute, unexpected change, they said, the final quota will be in the range of only 17 to 18 per cent of last year's estimated production.

It has been estimated that, in recent years, 20 per cent of all amphetamines produced in this country have been diverted into illicit channels.

The powerful stimulants are used by drug abusers for the "high" they produce. Other persons, notably long-distance truck drivers, use the drugs to stay awake for long periods of time.

Even among those who use the drugs legitimately on prescription, doctors believe there are many who use the stimulants excessively. Improper use of the drugs is considered extremely dangerous and has led to deaths.

Persons in and out of Government view the restriction of production as an important means of reducing the abuse of amphetamine and related drugs.

The current year is the first for which the Government has had authority to set production quotas for these products. Proposed quotas were published about two months ago to allow interested persons to comment or object.

Such comments are considered in the setting of final quotas.

Although manufacturers had asked for a 1972 total that was double last year's estimated production, officers of the bureau said they did not receive a single objection from industry to the proposed over-all cut.

There were several objections of the opposite kind from persons and groups not related to the industry. In essence these called the proposed cuts a step in the right direction, but far too small in scope.

For example, the Huntington (Long Island) Narcotics Guidance Council said the cut to 60 per cent of last year's production still left a quota that was 700 per cent above the amount really needed for legitimate medical purposes.

Mayor Lindsay of New York called the quota "grossly excessive" and said the city's special committee on amphetamine abuse had recommended no more than 10 per cent of the 1971 production figure.

STEP IN RIGHT DIRECTION

Spokesmen for the American Public Association called the originally proposed cut of 40 per cent a step in the right direction, but said it should not exhaust efforts to reduce production.

Last month John E. Ingersoll, director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, announced that it might be possible to cut another 9 or 10 per cent from the original quota because the nation's largest exporter of amphetamines had decided not to apply for an export license this year.

The concern, Strasenburgh Prescription Products, a division of the Pennwalt Corporation of Philadelphia, had exported large amounts of amphetamines to Mexico. The bureau discovered that much of this production was being returned illicitly to the United States.

Last week, Dr. Charles C. Edwards, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, said he would recommend a further cut of 30 per cent, partly because of evidence that physicians were prescribing less of the amphetamines than they had last year. They were evidently reacting to adverse publicity about the drugs, as well as on information concerning the limited medical uses of the stimulants.

EFFECT ALREADY NOTED

Donald E. Miller, chief counsel for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, said he believed that tightened regulations governing the ordering and prescribing of amphetamines were also proving effective in reducing their use.

He noted that the final production quotas, to be published soon, would be revised upward or downward if new evidence warranted a change.

In particular the bureau is awaiting an opinion from the Food and Drug Administration on the use of amphetamines in treating obesity. Although the drugs have been used widely for their temporary appetite-suppressing effects, many doctors doubt that they have any legitimate value in obesity control. The F.D.A. report is expected by July 1.

The currently accepted primary medical uses of the amphetamines and their related compounds are in treating two conditions: narcolepsy and a hyperactivity disorder among children.

Narcolepsy, which involves an excessive tendency to sleep, is considered uncommon. The hyperactivity problem among children is considered fairly common by some experts, but only some of the patients respond to stimulants and amphetamine is not considered the first-choice drug even for these.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1972]

DIET PILLS RATED "CLINICALLY TRIVIAL" IN WEIGHT LOSS

(By John Stowell)

A government-hired panel of consultants has concluded that diet pills are of "clinically

trivial" value in weight loss and, with one exception, should be tightly controlled.

The recommendation, if accepted by regulatory agencies, would permanently crimp the profitable, multimillion-dollar antifat business by prohibiting refillable prescriptions and imposing manufacturing quotas.

After reviewing mountains of effectiveness data sorted in a pioneering computer project, the consultants said diet pills in general cause the loss of only a fraction of a pound per week in short-term use.

The total impact of drug-induced weight loss over that of diet alone "must be considered clinically trivial," they said, especially in light of the high potential for abuse of the diet drugs.

The group of four physicians and two statisticians was headed by Dr. Thaddeus E. Prout, associate professor of medicine at Johns Hopkins University and a former member of the Food and Drug Administration's advisory committee on metabolic and endocrine drugs.

The FDA is undertaking an extensive review of all diet drugs in preparation for recommendations to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

The lone exception to the panel's findings was fenfluramine, patented as Pondimin by A. H. Robbins Co. of Richmond, Va.

Clinical trials have shown fenfluramine to be significantly effective in weight controls but with an apparent absence of the stimulant side-effects which make other diet pills popular among youths, truck drivers, athletes and other persons seeking a boost.

FDA officials are concerned, however, that the panel's recommendations would give the Robbins firm a virtual monopoly on the market for appetite-curbing pills. The drug is not yet approved for weight control.

"Everybody would like to treat them all equally," said Dr. Barrett Scoville, deputy director of FDA's division of neuropharmacological drug products. "But we are scientists and there are some facts we can't ignore."

Last year the Justice Department reclassified amphetamines and methamphetamines alongside opium, cocaine and methadone under the Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act.

With an 82-per-cent cutback in production quotas this year, their share to the diet market "dropped significantly," said a spokesman for a major manufacturer.

At the same time uncontrolled drugs producing a loss of appetite, such as Richardson Merrill's Tenuate and Tepanil and Pennwalt's Ionamin, climbed sharply in sales and profits.

The consultants recommended that the chemical and pharmacological cousins of amphetamines also be slapped with the same drug-abuse controls.

The FDA estimates there are between 80 and 100 different formulations of diet pills but almost all involve manipulation of the amphetamine molecule.

CRIME COMMITTEE NEWS RELEASE, JANUARY 19, 1973

WASHINGTON.—Chairman Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) of the House Select Committee on Crime, hailed today a recommendation of the Food and Drug Administration "which finally should end the legal production of 'speed' in this country."

Pepper, whose committee initiated the effort to bring amphetamines under federal production controls, commended the Food and Drug Administration for recommending the elimination of legal production of injectable amphetamine and a further 20 percent cut in the production of the pill form of the drug.

"Amphetamines have very little medical usefulness and the injectable form, which drug abusers know as 'speed,' has no legitimate use which would warrant this continued production," Pepper said.

"The FDA is to be commended for recommending a further cut in amphetamine production and especially for recommending a ban on the injectable form, which finally should end the legal production of 'speed' in this country."

The FDA recommendation was sent yesterday to the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, which has the power under the Controlled Substances Act to set quotas limiting the production of abusable drugs.

Amphetamines, in addition to being the speed of young drug abusers in its injectable form, is a strong stimulant widely used as an appetite suppressor in diet programs.

The House Crime Committee, in an unsuccessful floor fight to include production quotas on amphetamines in the 1970 legislation, contended that the drug had relatively little legitimate medical use—only in small quantities for treatment of hyperactive children and persons who have an uncontrollable tendency to fall asleep.

The committee's effort against amphetamine production led, however, to a decision by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to bring the drug under production controls through its discretionary powers. As a result, production was cut from 9,356 kilograms in 1971 to 1,564 kilograms last year. The FDA-proposed cuts would further reduce this production to about 782 kilograms in 1973.

CRIME COMMITTEE NEWS RELEASE, FEBRUARY 23, 1970

WASHINGTON, February 23, 1970.—A strict quota system curtailing the number of amphetamine tablets produced annually in the United States was sought today by a bipartisan majority of the House Select Committee on Crime. Cited testimony by expert witnesses in San Francisco and Washington, Chairman Pepper spoke for the majority in stating:

"Amphetamine or 'pep' pills alone pour out of the drug factories at a rate of 5 billion tablets a year and account for 8 percent of all prescriptions written.

"This is highly questionable given the testimony of expert witnesses before our Committee such as Dr. Sidney Cohen of the National Institute of Mental Health who said only several thousand are needed for noncontroversial medical purposes. It appears that as much as half go into illicit use while the remainder are prescribed for such medically questionable uses as weight reduction and to combat fatigue."

Congressman Waldie added that the Committee "saw first hand what happened with a million-and-a-half amphetamines allegedly shipped to a wholesaler in Mexico whose address turned out to be the 11th hole of the Tijuana Country Club. If it's that easy to fool a pharmaceutical firm, then I fear to even hazard a guess as to how many millions of these pills find their way into the black market."

CRIME COMMITTEE NEWS RELEASE, DECEMBER 17, 1969

WASHINGTON, December 17, 1969.—Legislation to forbid legal and illicit production of "speed" as a dangerous drug will be proposed in the House of Representatives by its Select Committee on Crime.

Committee members Wednesday directed final staff action to draft a bill to forbid manufacture and sale of methamphetamines, and to crack down on ingredients and equipment used in illicit laboratories.

Claude Pepper (D., Fla.) chairman of the committee, explained that the decision developed from evidence taken by the committee in hearings in Washington, Boston, Ohama, San Francisco, Columbia, S.C., and Miami.

"We have heard scores of witnesses, from scientists to addicts, and there has not been one word pointing to any medical use of 'speed.'" Cong. Pepper said. "Instead, we have heard everywhere that children and adults have done massive damage to themselves and others through use of this drug, and our members have become convinced that the drug must be banned."

PROPOSED LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to give independent status to the Office of Economic Opportunity's Legal Services program.

Legal Services has proven itself as one of our most effective tools in redressing the problems of poverty. It has given millions of our Nation's poor renewed hope and developed new confidence in the American system of law and government. Equal justice under law is now within reach for everyone.

But despite equal justice being within reach it has been in jeopardy throughout the 7-year history of legal services. Regardless of the administration, the integrity of legal aid for the economically less fortunate has been challenged by politics and conflict. Legal Services clearly needs a new and independent home.

As we have been told recently, the administration will propose to establish a legal services corporation. My bill establishing a legal services corporation is identical to the one introduced with bipartisan cosponsorship of more than 100 Members of both Houses of Congress. It would create a truly independent legal services program.

The National Legal Services Corporation would be established in a separate title under the Economic Opportunity Act. It is patterned after the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The Corporation will be funded by annual appropriations from Congress of $80 million. This amount is just slightly more than is currently being spent. OEO officials estimate that present funding provides legal assistance to less than 25 percent of the eligible low-income Americans.

The Corporation would be administered by a 19-member Board of Directors. Five members of the Board would be chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. One member would be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, upon recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Six members would serve by virtue of their office in national legal associations. Three Board members would be chosen by the Clients Advisory Council and three would be chosen by a Project Attorney's Advisory Council.

Six months after the date of enactment of the legislation, the Corporation would become fully operative.

The National Corporation for Legal Services would insure unfettered legal representation for low-income Americans. Only when the attorney-client re-

lationship is free from political manipulation will we truly have equal justice under law.

SOME GOVERNMENT AGENCIES GIVE GOOD SERVICE

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the other day, I received a letter from a constituent, Mr. Walter Golman, of Silver Spring, Md., who began by saying,

Let me tell you how business is transacted at one government institution.

I immediately wondered what new horror story I was about to hear; what serious earth-shaking problem was in need of a solution. But, in reading on, I found myself in complete amazement. For the writer was not complaining, or demanding an instant solution to some serious situation. Rather, Mr. Golman was writing to tell me what an excellent job is done at the clinical center at the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Golman's comments contained such sincere praise for his experience at the clinical center, that I wanted to share his letter with all of my colleagues. It is truly refreshing to read of one program within this vast Federal bureaucracy that is not only merely doing its job, but is doing it with real devotion and dedication. I know that after hearing Mr. Golman's comments, you will wish to join me in congratulating the NIH Clinical Center and its staff on their outstanding performance.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
January 8, 1973.

Hon. GILBERT GUDE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUDE: Let me tell you how business is transacted at one government institution, the Clinical Center at the National Institutes of Health. My wife and I had abundant opportunity to see Wards 6 West and 7 East over the many weeks during which she underwent intense observation, difficult heart surgery, and a great deal of post-operative care.

The most remarkable feature about the Clinical Center, so far as we are concerned, is not only its professional competence—which is of the highest possible order. Nor do we refer alone to the superb attention given by the physicians and nurses. Of course, the physicians and nurses are well trained, devoted, and sensitive to the needs of their patients; that is expected of people in their calling, though these particular people appear to be a couple of cuts above their counterparts at just about every other institution we have seen.

No, sheer professional competence alone does not explain the warmth and concern displayed by every staff member with whom we had any contact at all: by every physician, nurse, and technician we met—and we met many—by everyone in the nutrition units, every clerk, every elevator operator, every person dispensing food in the cafeteria. Surely, one of these people must have had one bad day, must have wanted to be less than usually friendly. Well, if anyone there had such a day—the way the rest of us have them—the fact was hidden from sight. I have never before seen anything like the spirit at this institution.

I cite one example. During the evening and morning before my wife went into surgery, she was visited by everyone who had cared for her until then: not only the members of Dr. Morrow's surgical team, but all the people who had taken part in the weeks of tests and observation. They came to reassure her about the surgery and to tell her that they looked forward to visiting her afterward. And—would you believe it?—they did, in fact, find time to drop in on her after her surgery (successful, by the way) and to wish her well. It takes a special breed of people to behave like that.

I know that NIH's Clinical Center is mainly a research organization, yet it also appears to represent what every hospital in the country ought to be. The institution has combined needle-sharp professionalism with a type of friendly warmth that many of us had despaired of ever seeing again. The result is both refreshing and very precious.

I hope that, when appropriation time comes around, Congress will bear in mind that NIH and its Clinical Center represent a national asset of great value, for its own sake and as a model for other institutions.

Do I have to add the usual disclaimer, pointing out that I am not associated with NIH, that I have no relatives on any of its staffs? One source of bias I must admit, however: for me, as for others who come into contact with the institution—everyone I have met on the staff has behaved as my friend.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER GOLMAN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, for 1 hour, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WHALEN, for 1 hour, today.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Ms. ABZUG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BENITEZ, for 60 minutes, January 31.

Mr. BADILLO, for 60 minutes, January 31.

Mr. STOKES, for 60 minutes, January 31.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, for 60 minutes, January 31.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN to extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARMSTRONG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUIE.
Mr. KEATING.
Mr. RHODES in five instances.
Mr. SCHERLE.
Mr. CRANE in five instances.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. ARCHER.
Mr. BRAY in three instances.
Mr. HOSMER in three instances.
Mr. COCHRAN.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.
Mr. BROTZMAN.
Mr. BAKER in two instances.
Mr. DELLENBACK in two instances.
Mr. FORSYTHE.
Mr. RUTH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CULVER in five instances.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. RARICK in five instances.
Mr. CARNEY of Ohio in four instances.
Mr. HARRINGTON.
Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
Mr. FISHER in three instances.
Mr. REID.
Mr. HANNA in two instances.
Mr. MACDONALD.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. CLARK.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming in two instances.
Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS.
Mr. RANDALL in four instances.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. DRINAN.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 498. An act to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, for 1 year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution providing for a moment of prayer and thanksgiving and a National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on January 26, 1973, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution providing for a moment of prayer and thanksgiving and a National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 30, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

298. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive part of the Department of the Air Force at the seat of Government, as of December 31, 1972, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 8031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the 4-year limitation on additional active duty that a nonregular officer of the Army or Air Force may be required to perform on completion of training at an educational institution; to the Committee on Armed Services.

300. A letter from the Director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment covering the quarter ended December 31, 1972, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a copy of the publication entitled "Register of Retirement Benefit Plans", listing such plans, active as of January 1, 1972, which have been filed with the Department of Labor under the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

302. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, a report of the amount of Export-Import Bank loans, insurance, and guarantees issued during October–November, 1972, in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia and Romania, pursuant to section 2 (b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. A letter from the Federal and State Cochairmen, Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska, transmitting a report of the activities of the Commission for calendar year 1972, pursuant to section 17(a)(8)(A) of Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (85 Stat. 708); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

304. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for criminal penalties for all who knowingly and willfully refuse or fail to file required reports, keep required data or falsify records; provide criminal penalties for unlawful carriage of persons for compensation or hire; to increase the civil penalty limits; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

305. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a copy of a proposed "Policy Regarding Role of Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

306. A letter from the Vice President for Public Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting a report covering the month of December, 1972, on the average number of passengers per day on board each train operated, and the on-time performance at the final destination of each train operated, by route and by railroad, pursuant to section 308(a)(2) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

307. A letter from the Director, Federal Judicial Center, transmitting the Annual Report of the Center for 1972; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENNIS (for himself, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. MCCLORY, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 3046. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress of the United States or of a military attack upon the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3047. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide more equitable enforcement procedures; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3048. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 3049. A bill to provide that certain expenses incurred in the construction of a municipal building in Talladega, Ala., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. TREEN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. SIKES, Mr. CLARK, Mr. NICHOLAS, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.R. 3050. A bill to require the Supreme Court to report the reversal of State criminal convictions in written decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3051. A bill to clarify the right of States and local subdivisions to provide for domestic preference in acquiring materials for public use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 3052. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. RODINO, Mrs. GRASSO, and Mr. SARASIN):

H.R. 3053. A bill making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the national industrial reserve under the Independent Agencies Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3054. A bill to insure the separation of powers and to protect the legislative function by requiring the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the Senate and House of Representatives may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BADILLO (for himself and Mr. BOWEN):

H.R. 3055. A bill to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to provide tutorial and related instructional services for homebound children through the employment of college students, particularly veterans and other students who themselves are handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 3056. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as military service for purposes of civil service retirement all service in the National Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERGLAND:

H.R. 3057. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax, and to require that evidence of payment of such tax be shown on highway motor vehicles subject to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.R. 3058. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 3059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BAKER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROBINSON of Virgina, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., and Mr. RARICK):

H.R. 3060. A bill to protect the freedom of choice of Federal employees in employee-management relations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ABDNOR, and Mr. HANRAHAN):

H.R. 3061. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 3062. A bill to improve educational quality through the effective utilization of educational technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. LITTON, Mr. MINISH, Mr. DINGELL, and Mrs. BURKE of California):

H.R. 3063. A bill to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUIE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. THONE, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 3064. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services, to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. HOLIFIELD):

H.R. 3065. A bill to provide that appointments to the Offices of Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall be subject to confirmation by the Senate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 3066. A bill to provide, for purposes of computing retired pay for members of the Armed Forces, and additional credit of service equal to all periods of time spent by any such member as a prisoner of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for purposes of civil service retirement certain periods of imprisonment of members of the Armed Forces and of civilian employees by hostile foreign forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 3068. A bill to establish a system of capital transfer taxes for individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY of New York:

H.R. 3069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, his spouse, or his dependent, who is disabled, and to provide an income tax deduction for expenses of a disabled individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 3070. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3071. A bill to amend the act providing an exemption from the antitrust laws with respect to local blackouts of certain professional sports events in order to terminate such exemption when a home game is sold out, and to prohibit blackouts by stations more than 50 miles from the site of the event; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3072. A bill to expand the authority of the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to veterans where private capital is unavailable at the statutory interest rate; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3073. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance or benefits under the veterans' pension and compensation programs and certain other Federal and federally assisted programs) will not have the amount of such aid, assistance, or benefits reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H.R. 3074. A bill appropriating funds for the construction of certain portions of the Natchez Trace Parkway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 3075. A bill to amend subchapter G of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the accumulated earnings tax); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 3076. A bill to require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study and investigation of the effects of the use of pesticides, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3077. A bill to limit the procurement of California and Arizona lettuce by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3078. A bill to establish an urban mass transit trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3079. A bill to provide that certain expenses incurred in the construction of a rapid transit station in Oakland, Calif., shall be eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3080. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize the insurance of loans to defray mortgage payments on homes owned by persons who are temporarily unemployed; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3081. A bill to establish comprehensive and developmental child care services in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3082. A bill to authorize grants to the Deganawidah-Quetzalcoatl University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3083. A bill to establish and protect the rights of day laborers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3084. A bill to authorize the establishment of an older worker community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3085. A bill to encourage States to increase the proportion of the expenditures in the State for public education which are derived from State rather than local revenue sources; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3086. A bill to provide for the use of certain funds to promote scholarly, cultural, and artistic activities between Japan and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3087. A bill to provide for the creation of an Authority to be known as the Reclamation Lands Authority to carry out the congressional intent respecting the excess land provisions of the Federal Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3088. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Commission on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3089. A bill to enlarge the Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3090. A bill to enforce the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo as a treaty made pursuant to article VI of the Constitution in regard to lands rightfully belonging to decendants of former Mexican citizens, to recognize the municipal status of the community land grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3091. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to ban the use of certain internal combustion engines in motor vehicles after January 1, 1975; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3092. A bill to authorize a program of research, development, and demonstration projects for non-air-polluting motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3093. A bill to provide implementation of the Federal Trade Commission Act to give increased protection to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3094. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the establishment of certain standards with respect to light banks, governors, and speed control panels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3095. A bill to provide for the abatement of air pollution by the control of emissions from motor vehicles; preconstruction certification of stationary sources; more stringent State standards covering vehicular emissions, fuel additives and aircraft fuels; emergency injunctive powers; and public disclosure of pollutants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3096. A bill to ban from commerce toys which are copies of or resemble firearms or destructive devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3097. A bill to amend the National Emission Standards Act to require standards be set at the most stringent possible levels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation to handicapped persons and persons who are 65 years of age or older, and to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for persons who are 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3099. A bill to provide for the compensation of innocent victims of violent crime in need; to make grants to States for the payment of such compensation; to authorize an insurance program and death and disability benefits for public safety officers; to provide civil remedies for victims of racketeering activity; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3100. A bill to exonerate and to provide for a general and unconditional amnesty for certain persons who have violated or are alleged to have violated laws in the course of protest against the involvement of the United States in Indochina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3101. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the ocean, coastal, and other waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3102. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for citizens' suits and class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3103. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3104. A bill to amend section 16 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1121, 1153, ch. 425; 33 U.S.C. 411 and 412); to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3105. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, commonly referred to as the Refuse Act, relating to the issuance of certain permits; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3106. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act in order to provide assistance in enforcing such acts through Federal procurement contract procedures; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3107. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish health and welfare standards which must be

met by all synthetic detergents and to ban from detergents all phosphates and those synthetics which fail to meet the standards by June 30, 1975; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3108. A bill to amend section 402 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to informational, regulatory, and warning signs, markings and signals; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3109. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3110. A bill to provide for assignment of unused laboratory space and facilities to unemployed scientists; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 3111. A bill to increase Servicemen's Group Life Insurance coverage to a maximum of $50,000, to liberalize coverage under the GI life insurance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3112. A bill to assure a more adequate retirement income for employees by requiring the establishment of employee pension and profit-sharing-retirement plans and providing additional protection for the rights of participants in such plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing-retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan insurance program under corporate administration, to provide for the portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to carry out these programs and enforce these requirements, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3113. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in relation to expenses for care of certain dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an excise tax on fuels containing sulphur and on certain emissions of sulphur oxides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3115. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase personal exemptions after 1974 by an amount based on annual variations in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3116. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include qualified drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a formulary committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3117. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual may qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze if he has enough quarters of coverage to be fully insured for old-age benefit purposes, regardless of when such quarters were earned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3118. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3119. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3120. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 3121. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 3122. A bill to authorize the President, through the temporary Vietnam Children's Care Agency, to enter into arrangements with the Government of South Vietnam to provide assistance in improving the welfare of children in South Vietnam and to facilitate the adoption of orphaned or abandoned Vietnamese children, particularly children of U.S. fathers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 3123. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to extend coverage under the flood insurance programs to include losses from surface or floating ice; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. SCHRODER, and Mr. KOCH):

H.R. 3124. A bill to provide that meetings of Government agencies and of congressional committees shall be open to the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 3125. A bill to deem certain disabilities incurred pursuant to State National Guard service during World War I to be service connected for purposes of chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code (relating to compensation for service-connected disabilities), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3126. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 3127. A bill to revise the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3128. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3129. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3130. A bill to provide for the selection of candidates for President of the United States in a national presidential primary election, and for the election of a President and a Vice President by direct vote of the people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3131. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3132. A bill to postpone the effectiveness of any U.S. district court order requiring the busing of schoolchildren until such time as all appeals, including to the Supreme Court if necessary, in connection with such order have been exhausted and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3133. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to authorize the transmission, without cost to the sender, of letter mail to the President or Vice President of the United States or to Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3134. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain that recipients of veterans pension or compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3135. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase OASDI benefits by 15 percent (with a $120 minimum) and raise the earnings base, to provide various improvements in benefit computations, to provide full benefits for men at age 60 and women at age 55, to pay a wife's and widow's benefits without regard to age in disability cases, and liberalize eligibility for disability benefits; to liberalize the medical coverage of disabled beneficiaries under age 65, to finance the medical insurance program entirely from general revenues, and to cover prescription drugs; to require the furnishing of drugs on a generic basis under the medicare and public assistance programs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3136. A bill to Repeal the bread tax on 1973 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3137. A bill to establish policy and principles for planning and evaluating flood control, navigation, and other water resource projects and the use of the water and related land resources of the United States and setting forth guidance for the benefit-cost determinations of all agencies therein involved; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRINGTON:

H.R. 3138. A bill to provide public service employment opportunities for unemployed and underemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3139. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3140. A bill to provide for the transfer of authorizations for military assistance programs for Laos and Vietnam to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 3141. A bill to transfer the Coast Guard to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3142. A bill to designate the Emigrant Wilderness, Stanislaus National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3143. A bill to insure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 3144. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD (for himself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WON PAT, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. PODELL, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. SLACK, and Mr. MURPHY of New York):

H.R. 3145. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or

require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACDONALD (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. JAMES V. STANTON):

H.R. 3146. A bill to require the President to notify the Congress whenever he impounds funds, or authorizes the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may approve the President's action or require the President to cease such action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 3147. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal service program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 3148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 3149. A bill to amend section 707 of the Social Security Act to extend for 1 year the existing authorization of grants for the expansion and development of undergraduate and graduate programs in social work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3150. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3151. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3152. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of charitable contributions of copyrights, artistic compositions, or a collection of papers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 3153. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain technical and conforming changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3154. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 3155. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act to allow eligible households to purchase certain imported foods with food stamps; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3156. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the island of Kahoolawe to the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress to create within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare a National Overseas Education Board having responsibility for the elementary and secondary education of certain overseas dependents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3158. A bill to establish a Federal sabbatical program to improve the quality of teaching in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3159. A bill for the relief of certain orphans in Vietnam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3160. A bill to restore the wartime recognition of Filipino veterans of World War II who fought as members of the Commonwealth Army but whose wartime service records were subsequently stricken from official U.S. Army records and to entitle them to those benefits, rights, and privileges which result from such recognition; and to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to classify as special immigrants alien veterans who served honorably in the U.S. Armed Forces, together with their spouses and children, for purposes of lawful admission into the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3161. A bill to amend title IV of the Rural Development Act of 1972 to provide assistance to certain rural volunteer fire departments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3162. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of nonmarriage of certain annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3163. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRITCHARD:

H.R. 3164. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate transportation for elderly people on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. ROY, Mr. TREEN, and Mr. DENHOLM):

H.R. 3165. A bill to authorize the apportionment of funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for fiscal years 1974 and 1975; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. RARICK, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. ANDREWS of North DAKOTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. WARE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SATTERFIELD, and Mr. MILFORD):

H.R. 3166. A bill to authorize the apportionment of funds for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways for fiscal years 1974 and 1975; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3167. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns, in any manner affecting interstate or foreign commerce, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, and, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3168. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by repealing the present provisions with respect to income averaging and readopting the provisions in effect prior to 1964; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3169. A bill to establish the Cabinet Committee for Asian American Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3170. A bill to require sprinkling systems to be installed in certain new high-rise buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SCHERLE (for himself, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 3171. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3172. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3173. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to entitle veterans of World War I and their widows and children to pension on the same basis as veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows and children, respectively; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3174. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 3175. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 3176. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 3177. A bill to provide for a Federal ecological preserve in a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf in the Santa Barbara Channel and to provide for a moratorium on drilling operations pending the ability to control and prevent pollution by oil discharges and to improve the state of the art with respect to oil production from the submerged lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 3178. A bill to provide for a Federal moratorium on drilling operations in a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf in the Santa Barbara Channel pending the ability to control and prevent pollution by oil discharges and to improve the state of the art with respect to oil production from the submerged lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 3179. A bill to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.R. 3180. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to clarify the proper use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. MCSPADDEN, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 3181. A bill to assure the free flow of information to the public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 3182. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, with respect to schoolbus safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 3183. A bill to prohibit travel at Government expense outside the United States by Members of Congress who have been defeated, or who have resigned, or retired; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 3184. A bill to incorporate Recovery, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 3185. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft into or over the United States until certain findings are made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 249. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that any district, from which an official is elected to a legislative body, within a State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia shall contain substantially the same numbers of citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution relating to the war power of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide an age limit and a single 6-year term for the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide an age limit for Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of office of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to designate the Manned Space Craft Center in Houston, Tex., as the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center in honor of the late President; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution to authorize the emergency importation of oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming:

H.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating March of each year as Youth Art Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H. Res. 167. A resolution to amend rule XI of the House of Representatives to provide for adequate minority staffing on committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to authorize each Member, Resident Commissioner, and Delegate to hire within the monetary limits of the existing clerk hire allowance two additional clerks who are physically handicapped; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Res. 169. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives regarding instructions to members of committees of conference; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUNT:

H. Res. 170. Resolution: Canal Zone sovereignty and jurisdiction resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 72; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

20. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 3186. A bill for the relief of Jerry A. Langer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 3187. A bill for the relief of Fredi Robert Dreilich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 3188. A bill for the relief of Thomas G. Jolley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Elmer Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Edgar Buchowiecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 3191. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. McSPADDEN:

H.R. 3192. A bill for the relief of Larry Hoyt Lunsford and Estelene Lunsford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 3193. A bill to provide that Maj. Carvel de Bussy shall be advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3194. A bill for the relief of certain members of the civilian guard force of the 6487th Air Base Squadron, Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3195. A bill for the relief of John Balaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3196. A bill for the relief of James H. Davidson, Vincent W. S. Hee, and Kay M. Mochizuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Davis, Mrs. Carol Dumbaugh, Mrs. Judith Haworth, and Mrs. Doris Chula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3198. A bill for the relief of James L. Gerard, James W. Summers, and William D. Cissel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3199. A bill for the relief of Plotemia Mabanag Bareng and Bastiana Lilian Mabanag Bareng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3200. A bill for the relief of Servillano C. Espi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3201. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toyo Shota Ikeuchi and Mrs. Katherine Keiko Aoki Kaneshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3202. A bill for the relief of Takehito Kobayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3203. A bill for the relief of Nepty Masauo Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3204. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Corazon Evangeline Quimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3205. A bill for the relief of Esther Nano Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3206. A bill for the relief of Francisco M. del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRITCHARD:

H.R. 3207. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Enid R. Pope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 3208. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Trimarchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

35. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Fresno, Calif., relative to President Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 55th anniversary of Ukraine's independence.

In 1917, as the tsarist regime crumbled and Russia was torn by internal forces; the non-Russian areas of the empire were afire with a struggle not only to attain social freedom but national independence as well.

Nowhere was the drive for independence more alive than in Ukraine. Amid the complex events of that year the Ukrainian masses created a movement that led to the Ukraïn'ka Narodnia Respublika—Ukrainian National Republic.

However, as the new nation was hard at work establishing itself, its freedoms and its independence were snatched away. In 1922, the Bolsheviks, disregarding national boundaries and identities, seized Ukraine, clamping despotism over this nation of beauty, vast resources, and 50 million people. The result was, and is, that Ukraine is the largest non-Russian captive nation both in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe.

Since the plundering Bolsheviks enslaved this nation 50 years ago, repression has been a way of life in Ukraine. Yet, hope and the will to be free has not been taken from the people. The belief in the Ukrainian will and national spirit remains alive.

I also think something should be said here about the 2,000,000 Ukrainian-Americans and a tremendous effort they have undertaken.

Not only has knowledge of their homeland, its history, literature, and culture been disproportionately minimal despite Ukraine's importance, but the Ukrainian-American's experience as a community, their integration into the mainstream of American life, and their contribution to