

have every confidence it will in the future.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 19, 1973, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2408) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes and the enrolled bill (S. 2681), to authorize

appropriations for the U.S. Information Agency.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:39 p.m. the Senate adjourned until

tomorrow, Tuesday, November 20, 1973, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate November 19, 1973:

UPPER GREAT LAKES REGIONAL COMMISSION

Raymond C. Anderson, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, vice Thomas F. Schweigert.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PUBLIC FINANCING FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, last week I joined with my colleague from Minnesota, Mr. MONDALE, in testimony on public financing of Presidential primary elections.

Provisions of our bill, S. 2238, the Presidential Campaign Financing Act, dealing with public financing of Presidential general and primary elections, have been included in a comprehensive public campaign financing amendment we introduced last Tuesday to the debt ceiling bill, H.R. 11104.

Because of the crisis in confidence in our Government today, it is essential for Congress to exercise dramatic leadership in reforming our campaign processes to help recover from the scandals of Watergate and the gross improprieties and violations of law that surrounded financing of the Presidential elections in 1972. The debt ceiling extension bill will be acted upon this month. I can think of no single step that can provide greater assurance to the people of our country that Congress can, and will, provide necessary reform legislation than for us to endorse public financing as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the joint statement of Senator MONDALE and myself that was presented to the Senate Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATORS WALTER F. MONDALE AND RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

Mr. Chairman: We appreciate the opportunity to appear jointly before this distinguished committee this morning to emphasize the urgency of Congressional action this year on campaign reform and public financing of campaigns.

Elected officials, public commentators, and the American citizenry alike are gravely alarmed by today's on-going crises of confidence in government.

Two important points must remain clear to everyone: (1) First, it was Watergate that brought about this crisis of confidence.

(2) Second, it was the existence of unlimited campaign money that brought about Watergate.

The seemingly endless unravelling of the Watergate affair has testified more eloquent-

ly than we ever could to the need for public financing of campaigns. Unless the present system of financing campaigns with large, special-interest, private contributions is ended, it could ruin our democracy. It is no less serious than that.

Public financing of campaigns can cleanse our election process, and restore public trust and confidence in government. There can be no more essential business than this before the Congress. As Lincoln once said: "With public sentiment, nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed."

At the outset, we would like to emphasize again what a great debt all of us who favor public financing owe to the distinguished Chairman of this Committee. It is his leadership, imagination, and farsightedness that has made the \$1 check-off plan for financing Presidential general elections a part of our law, and paved the way for the further steps that we bring before you today. Russell Long is in every sense the father of public financing.

This committee has before it Amendment 651, a comprehensive proposal for public financing of Presidential and Congressional campaigns. We are proud to co-sponsor this bipartisan amendment with seven other Senators. It is similar to the provisions of the "Statement of Principles" on campaign financing that has been signed by 40 Senators.

The system of public financing of Presidential primaries which the Joint Amendment would establish is taken largely from the Mondale-Schweiker Presidential Campaign Financing Act (S. 2238). Each candidate who is able to raise \$100,000 in contributions of 100 or less would receive matching payments from the Treasury for those contributions, and for additional contributions of \$100 or less would receive matching payments from the Treasury for those contributions, and for additional contributions of \$100 or less.

Total Treasury matching payments to any candidate in the primaries would be limited to \$7 million, and total primary spending per candidate would be limited to \$15 million. Only \$100 of any individual's contribution or aggregate contributions would be \$100 or less.

Total individual contributions to primary candidates would be subject to the \$3000 limits in S. 372, the campaign finance reform bill passed by the Senate earlier this year.

To encourage small private contributions to candidates in the primaries (and through parties in general elections), the Joint Amendment doubles the existing tax credit and deduction for political contributions.

Our own bill deals exclusively with Presidential elections. However, the other co-sponsors of the Joint Amendment, Senators Cranston, Hart, Kennedy, Mathias, Hugh Scott, Stafford and Stevenson, all have introduced bills dealing with other aspects of public financing, particularly Senate and House races. We are privileged to work together with these Senators, to combine our various bills, and to introduce this comprehensive package for public financing of federal elections.

We urge the Committee to accept this amendment to the Debt Ceiling bill. It is vital that we act now, while the terrible abuses of Watergate are fresh in our minds. The opportunity for fundamental reform comes so rarely and fleetingly that we must seize it quickly, or it is gone.

TRIBUTES TO CONGRESSMAN LESLIE ARENDS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber were saddened when our dear friend and very distinguished colleague LES ARENDS announced that he will retire at the close of the present Congress.

It is difficult to imagine the House of Representatives without LES ARENDS, and difficult for us Republicans to imagine the loss of LES as minority whip.

The quiet announcement of his plans, made without fanfare or advance notice, brought tears to the eyes of many of us, on both sides of the aisle, and moved the Speaker of the House to say—

That applause would be substituted with tears if we were to express the emotions we feel about his departure.

It is a true measure of the stature of LES ARENDS, as statesman and as a leading partisan leader in the House, that he inspires this affection and this strong regret at his announcement not only among his fellow Republicans but among the leaders of the opposition party.

When LES leaves Capitol Hill, he will have served 40 years as a Member of Congress, three decades of that time as our Republican whip. Few Members have ever captured and held the respect and affection of so many of his colleagues for so long a time. I have served just half as long as LES. When I first came here as a freshman Congressman from Ohio, I quickly learned to turn to the gentleman from Illinois for sound advice and for absolutely selfless help in learning the ropes. I have had the privilege of working with LES on matters of the greatest importance to our Nation's defense, he as a ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I have been impressed and inspired by his indomitable courage

when the going got rough, his unflinching determination to see that our country has a strong national security system.

For many of us LES ARENDS has always personified the ideal Member of Congress: distinguished in appearance, absolutely dedicated to his constituency and his country, a resoundingly successful spokesman for our party, yet liked and admired by Members of the opposition. Throughout his years of service, LES has truly been a man for all seasons. I am sorry he has chosen to retire, for so many of us will deeply miss him and his lovely Betty, but I am glad to have this opportunity to let him know a little of the great affection and respect I, and countless others, feel for him both as a colleague and a friend.

TOLL-FREE CALLS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR KANSAS RESIDENTS

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, November 19, 1973

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, remoteness and unresponsiveness are some of the biggest complaints I hear about government from my constituents. People—particularly in rural areas—often have a hard time just getting basic information about government programs, services and benefits.

But it is encouraging to note that several agencies of the Federal Government have set up special toll-free telephone numbers for the public's use.

Under the system, if a citizen has questions or complaints about a program run by one of the participating agencies, he or she can get an immediate response by simply calling the toll-free number.

The toll-free system is particularly helpful to citizens in Kansas who are some 1,500 or more miles away from some Government agencies in Washington, D.C.

This is a most worthwhile effort to bring the Federal Government closer to the people, and I would hope that more agencies will establish toll-free numbers in the near future.

I ask unanimous consent that a listing of the toll-free numbers for Kansas residents be printed in the RECORD.

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

KANSAS TOLL-FREE NUMBERS

Civil Service Commission (Federal Job Information Center)—Wichita: 267-6361 (ext. 106). In other Kansas locations: 800-362-2693. Federal jobs: what's available, what qualifications, how to apply, etc.

Internal Revenue Service—Kansas City: 374-4324; Topeka 234-8661; Wichita 263-2161. In other Kansas locations: 800-362-2191. Tax information and assistance.

ACTION—800-424-8580. Information on Action programs (Peace Corps, Vista, Score, Ace, Foster Grandparents, etc.)

Housing and Urban Development—800-424-8590. To complain about housing discrimination.

Air Force Recruiting—800-447-4700.

Air Force Reserve Recruiting—800-525-9984.

Justice Department "Heroin Hotline"—

800-368-5363. A place where people can call to anonymously report drug pushers.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would also note that my offices in Kansas City, Kans., and Washington, D.C., are always ready to respond when citizens are in need of information or assistance. These offices do not have toll-free numbers, but they are available to anyone.

In Washington the number is (202)-225-6521.

In Kansas City the number is (913)-342-4525.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Washington have generated an unprecedented outpouring of public concern about the crises facing our National Government today. This week I am sending out my third newsletter to my constituents to report on some of these issues and on federally related local issues in which I have been involved. In addition, this newsletter contains the response of my district to the Watergate questionnaire sent out in my last newsletter, which I think will be of particular interest to my colleagues in the House.

At this time I would like to insert the full text of my newsletter:

CONGRESSWOMAN LIZ HOLTZMAN REPORTS
FROM WASHINGTON

NOVEMBER, 1973.

DEAR FRIEND: Since my last report, grave events have shaken our country.

Your letters have been very helpful to me, and I hope you continue to let me know how you feel. Meanwhile, I will try to bring you up-to-date, although events move so swiftly that reports today become outdated tomorrow.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

Being a member of the Judiciary Committee at this time is a grave responsibility. The Committee will be making recommendations to the House on impeachment, an independent special prosecutor, and the nomination of a Vice President.

I believe that the President's actions have been serious enough for an investigation into whether he has committed impeachable offenses. I will be studying the law and the evidence very carefully before deciding this historic question. It is crucial that we be fair, honest and just—so that whatever action we take will have the people's confidence.

My Judiciary Committee Subcommittee has drafted legislation to create an independent Special Prosecutor appointed by a Federal court and free from White House intimidation.

The Judiciary Committee will also be considering the nomination of Gerald Ford for the Vice Presidency. The resignation of Vice President Agnew demonstrated the need for careful scrutiny. With the cloud hanging over the presidency, we cannot risk a repetition of scandal in the Vice Presidency.

ISRAEL'S FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

On November 2, I had the great privilege of meeting with Prime Minister Golda Meir in the company of the Speaker of the House and eight congressional leaders. The Prime Minister spoke movingly of Israel's will to survive and received assurances of continuing U.S. support.

I have been working closely with other Members of Congress to ensure that the U.S. provides Israel with full military assistance and with financial aid to help her recovery from the war's burden. In that connection, I co-sponsored H. Res. 613 which accelerated delivery of military equipment, and I intend to support the proposed \$2.2 billion in additional U.S. aid.

I will continue to do everything in my power to ensure Israel's survival. There is a hopeful possibility of a real peace in the Middle East, but we must realize the enormous suffering Israel bore as a result of the unprovoked and treacherous Arab attack. We must also guard against anyone's bargaining away defensible borders for Israel, or Jerusalem, in the cause of a detente with Russia.

HOUSE PASSES HOLTZMAN SUBWAY SAFETY AMENDMENT

There were 7 serious subway accidents this year. In August one man died and more than 1,000 people were trapped more than an hour in heavy smoke and 115 degree heat. In October, an accident at the Eastern Parkway station of the IRS Utica line injured four people.

I am therefore pleased to report that on October 3 the House passed my Subway Safety Amendment as part of the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1973. Under my Amendment the Secretary of Transportation will no longer be able to refuse to investigate subway accidents and hazardous subway conditions. He will be required to do so.

My Amendment will also force the MTA to improve dangerous subway conditions or face the loss of federal funds for equipment and operations.

Within the next few weeks a Senate-House conference committee will recommend the final version of the Urban Mass Transit Act, and I am hopeful that my Amendment will be retained. This legislation—which will bring \$100 million in federal subsidies to New York subways—must not be vetoed by President Nixon.

DISTRICT RESPONSES TO WATERGATE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you feel that President Nixon—			
a. Had prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in.	1,709	653	459
b. Participated in the Watergate coverup.	2,180	384	169
2. Do you feel that President Nixon should be impeached—			
a. If investigation reveals he had prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in.	1,958	546	147
b. If investigation reveals he participated in the Watergate coverup.	1,799	603	175
c. Because of the alleged illegal spying, wiretapping, and other activities of his staff.	1,418	873	203
3. Do you think President Nixon should resign?	1,779	750	215
4. Do you think that the media is paying too much attention to the Watergate investigation?	554	2,250	167

Note: My last newsletter contained a Watergate questionnaire. I know you are interested in the results.

DISTRICT OFFICE REMINDER

Address: 1452 Flatbush Avenue (between Glenwood & Farragut).

Phone: 859-9111 (answered 24 hours a day).

Because of current events my schedule may change on short notice. Please check with my office before coming in for my open Sunday office hours.

BUSTING OF A DRUG HANGOUT

After receiving complaints that a Parkside Avenue candy store was an addicts hangout, I notified Cpt. Basso of the 71st Precinct who sent in undercover agents. In August the police made arrests. Cpt. Basso has promised that if the addicts return, he will send in officers again. So far the community has been well rid of a drug hangout.

HELPING THE COMMUNITY

It is gratifying that we have assisted so many of you with community problems. We are not always successful but we exert every effort possible to help. Some recent examples of what we can accomplish:

Two additional summer bus excursions for senior citizens at the East Flatbush-Rugby YMHA.

Commitment for better lighting at Vanderveer Houses.

Extra police scooter patrol for Kings Highway and Nostrand Avenue which had become a meeting place for noisy groups.

Traffic lights at Fillmore and Kimball Streets; Avenue W and Bragg Street.

Cleaning vacant lot behind Sears-Roebuck.

One way to help me help you is to send me the name, address, and telephone number of your community or block association so we can be in touch about local issues.

VISITING THE HIGH SCHOOLS

Last Spring I addressed students at high school serving our district, including some yeshivas and parochial schools.

I wanted to show our young people that public officials can respond to their ideas—honestly and sincerely.

I found that young people in our District care about our society. If we can channel their idealism and energies in participation in our government, we will have come a long way toward improving the quality of political life.

MAJOR VOTES IN CONGRESS

Override presidential vetoes on limiting President's war-making powers, on emergency medical services and minimum wage—Yes.

Restrict President's authority to impound funds appropriated by Congress—Yes.

Improved medical care and other benefits for veterans—Yes.

Unlimited entertainment expense account for the White House—No.

Drug Abuse Education Act—Yes.

Limit Farm Subsidies—Yes.

Allow House to consider further military aid for Israel—Yes.

Environmental Education Act—Yes.

Program to control lead poisoning—Yes.

Prohibit television blackouts of sporting events sold out 72 hours in advance—Yes.

Hold G. Gordon Liddy in contempt of Congress—Yes.

Regulate toxic chemical substances—Yes.

Prohibit U.S. subsidy of future wheat deals to Russia and China—Yes.

YOU CAN HELP

Recent events have reinforced the need for honesty in government. We all recognize that large contributions and conflicts of interest undermine the integrity of public officials.

I gave up my law practice because I felt strongly about this problem. My sole income, except for a few speaking dates, is my congressional salary. Yet, few people realize the expenses of being a Congresswoman. I can report that if you have no outside income but are doing a full-time honest job, the expenses are almost greater than the salary. (Congress reimburses us for only a fraction of the expenses of weekly trips to and from Washington and for running the District Office.)

It costs more than \$1,200 to address and print each issue of the newsletter. Over the year the cost of sending you newsletters on a regular basis can amount to almost \$10,000.

For this reason I would be grateful for any help you could give me with the publication of this newsletter. A dollar or two would go a long way to help me with this effort. Every penny will go toward the newsletter and will be accounted for by a non-political committee established for this purpose. Copies of the Committee's year-end financial report will be made public and available to anyone who requests it.

Yes, I would like to help. I am enclosing \$1 --; \$2 --; \$5 --; Other.

Name _____
Address _____
Telephone _____

Please make checks payable to: The Elizabeth Holtzman Newsletter Committee. Cut along broken lines and mail to: The Elizabeth Holtzman Newsletter Committee, P.O. Box 187, Ryder Station, Brooklyn, New York 11234.

I hope you will continue to write, call and visit. I look forward to being in touch with you in my next report.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

SAN BERNARDINO JAYCEES POINT
THE WAY FOR THE NATION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as an ex-Jaycee—more years ago than I like to think about—I take particular pleasure in calling to the attention of this body a decision which was made last month by the board of directors of the San Bernardino, Calif., Jaycees. I am sure that most of us here are familiar with the local, State, and National "Outstanding Young Man of the Year" awards given out by the Jaycees every year. The recipients of these awards are justifiably proud of their selection by their peers as deserving of special recognition because of their distinguished service to their communities.

Unfortunately, as San Bernardino Jaycee Robert L. Pasterski pointed out to the chapter board of directors last month, limiting the potential award-winners to young men has the effect of eliminating some of the most civic-minded and deserving people around—since there are an awful lot of young women serving their communities as well.

Mr. Speaker, I could not provide a better description of the decision made by the San Bernardino chapter board than the one written by Carl Yetzer, a reporter for the San Bernardino Sun-Telegram. At this point, therefore, I would like simply to read his article, which appeared in the Sun of November 9.

JAYCEES AWARD CONTEST YIELDS TO WOMEN'S LIB

(By Carl Yetzer)

SAN BERNARDINO.—When the San Bernardino Jaycees announce the winner of their "Outstanding Young Man of the Year" award next January, the recipient may well be wearing a dress.

In a surprising and somewhat controversial move last month, the Jaycees board of directors voted to open the competition for this year's "Distinguished Service Award" (DSA) to women—the first chapter in the country to do so.

The idea originated with Jaycee Robert L. Pasterski, chairman of the awards contest, who says he couldn't understand why the award should recognize only the achievements of young men.

"The reasoning behind it seemed to me to be something straight out of the 1950s," he said. "The award is supposed to recognize outstanding service to the community, and no one can deny that there are a lot of young women out there who are performing valuable community services as well."

"The thought occurred to me last year when I was working on the DSA awards, and when they asked me to be the chairman of the project again this year I decided to go before the board of directors."

Pasterski admits that he purposely "dropped the idea on them cold" before any organized opposition could assemble. But, he says, he was surprised by the board's unanimous acceptance of the idea.

"I didn't have the problems I thought I was going to have," he says. "There were some people who had questions about it, but there was no out-and-out opposition to the idea."

One of those with questions was Lab Blumberg, a member who says he just happened to attend that particular board meeting.

"My concern was, and still is, that once we select our winner, then he goes into competition at the state and national levels" he said. "And while the state and national bylaws do not specifically exclude women, they do state that the recipient be an outstanding 'young man.'"

"I'm not against women, and I'm not against equal opportunities for women," Blumberg says. "And I do think that it makes sense to honor the community-service achievements of women. But until the national bylaws are changed by the organization as a whole, it's going to damage our chances of having a state or national winner. And I think those kinds of changes are still a long time in coming."

Pasterski admits that if a woman is selected as this year's winner, the chances are slim of having her go on to state or national competitions. But, he says, such an occurrence could be a significant force in getting the national organization to change its view point.

"We've also eliminated another qualification for nominees this year," Pasterski says. "We've struck out a section which says that the nominee must not be a Communist or have 'Communist leanings'... whatever that means."

"Now, I'm sure that there are some chapters in the South who still tell their members to check for Communists under their beds at night. But by and large this is a holdover from the witch hunts of the McCarthy era and doesn't really belong there. And it's simply going to take the actions of a lot of chapters to change it... and it's the same with the ideas about women."

Pasterski discounts the possibility of the San Bernardino chapter's losing its charter over the two changes, although several Jaycee chapters were disaffiliated last year when they voted to accept women as members.

"We don't have to give the award to anybody," he says. "It's strictly a voluntary thing. It's our chapter's award, and we can set the qualifications for it."

Pasterski does feel, however, that the inclusion of women in the competition should stimulate more interest in the awards this year. In previous contests, he said, there have been as many as 35 to 40 nominations for the award. In recent years, however, the number of nominees has been closer to 15 or 20.

"Anyone can submit a person's name into nomination," he said. "You don't have to be a Jaycee to nominate someone, or to be a nominee. Anyone interested in nominating an outstanding young man or woman should write to me, and send it to my home at 5988 Wadsworth Ave., Highland, 92346."

"The names will be reviewed by a panel of judges, and one will probably be a woman this year. The judges will select three or four finalists, and the winner will be announced at the annual Distinguished Service Awards Dinner at the Castaway Restaurant, Jan. 15, 1974."

Robert Pasterski and his colleagues in the San Bernardino Jaycees certainly

deserve our respect for their decision to value justice over tradition. Regardless of whether January's "Distinguished Service Award" recipient is male or female, the San Bernardino Jaycees will have the satisfaction of knowing that last month's decision blazed a trail for the entire national organization, for it is inevitable that eventually the majority will come around.

THE ENERGY REPORT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, if the United States suffers an exceptionally cold winter the oil shortage could be as high as 35 percent according to a Library of Congress study which I publicly released on Sunday.

This report is a real shocker. Apparently this Nation could be headed for a major economic nose dive if this winter is very cold.

The study concludes that:

While 35 percent is the worst possible case it is unlikely that even an end to the Arab oil embargo and a relatively mild winter could reduce the shortage to 20 percent or less.

Nixon administration officials have talked of a 10- to 17-percent shortage this winter. This report raises the possibility that the Nixon administration may have underestimated the impact of the shortage. In any case, even a 20-percent shortfall could spell real economic distress for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD part I of this report. Part II will be included in tomorrow's RECORD.

Part I of the report follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

The United States has been concerned over the possibility of a winter fuel crisis for the past year. Rising demand and falling supply have created a situation in which a shortage was extremely likely. The Arab oil cutoff has made that shortage inevitable and threatens to produce economic dislocations as well as personal inconvenience and discomfort. The factors behind the shortage, its impact on the Nation, and possible corrective measures are

complex and subject to extensive analysis. This report, however, is a brief overview which is intended to place these actions and reactions in perspective.

II. DOMESTIC DEMAND

For the past several years, shortages of fuel oil have occurred during the winter months. Part of the recent shortages can be attributed to the appearance of new users who were unable to obtain natural gas because of curtailments starting in 1971 and were not permitted to burn high-sulfur fuels because of air-quality regulations. The shortage was particularly acute during last winter (1972-1973) because demand rose much more rapidly than did supply. The shortage could have been much worse, however, had it not been for the unusually mild weather experienced by many parts of the country.

Fuel oil demand for the winter of 1973-1974 is expected to be higher than for last year. The Department of the Interior has estimated that distillate demand this winter will increase 10.4% over last year (4,048,000 b/d in 1973/1974 compared to 3,668,000 b/d in 1972/1973).¹ If temperatures are colder than normal and increase demand by 3.9%, an extra 120,000 b/d would be required to prevent a shortage.² The effect of cold weather on the demand for distillate fuel oil can be seen in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—MONTHLY CONSUMPTION OF DISTILLATE FUEL OIL UNDER DIFFERENT ASSUMPTIONS OF WINTER WEATHER

(Consumption in millions of barrels)

	October	November	December	January	February	March
Case A. 6-percent increase over last winter.....	87.2	102.0	131.3	132.0	115.6	109.7
Case B. Warm winter.....	75.2	87.0	115.6	118.1	101.1	97.0
Case C. Cold winter.....	89.9	110.3	148.1	153.7	131.1	119.5
Case D. Warm early/cold late winter.....	79.6	93.9	126.8	144.4	121.7	113.0
Case E. Increase over last winter.....	90.5	105.9	136.3	137.0	120.0	113.8

Source: Winter Heating Outlook, P. K. Verleger, Jr., and S. Haltmaier, "DRI Review," Oct. 10, 1973, p. 3.

In addition to the normal growth rate in heating oil demand and the possible effects of unseasonably cold weather, an increase of 130,000 b/d may result from the curtailment of natural gas sales because of shortages.³ The combined total of these demand factors indicates a distillate demand of 4,048,000 b/d over last year's figure of 3,668,000 b/d. This increase of 380,000 b/d, shown in Table 2, does not include crude oil or other refined products which would increase the total demand to over 17,000,000 b/d.

TABLE 2.—U.S. DISTILLATE DEMAND BY QUARTERS AND WINTER SEASON, 1971 THROUGH 1974

(Millions of barrels daily)

	1971	1972	1973	1974
1st quarter.....	3,695	3,788	3,885	4,570
2d quarter.....	2,258	2,406	2,500	2,630
3d quarter.....	1,866	2,011	2,150	2,264
4th quarter.....	2,955	3,458	3,538	3,680

Winter season	Millions of barrels daily	Percent increase
1971-72.....	3,369	3.7
1972-73.....	3,668	8.9
1973-74.....	4,048	10.4

¹ Estimated.

² Forecast thereafter.

Source: The Distillate Fuel Oil Situation Winter 1973-74, Department of the Interior, Sept. 15, 1973.

The U.S. demand for petroleum products of all types is estimated by the Bureau of Mines at 17,455,000 b/d in 1973. The demand in 1974 is predicted by the Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) to rise to 18,525,000 b/d.⁴ Much of this increase can be at-

tributed to the greater use of fuel oil, but demand for other petroleum derivatives is also expected to grow at comparable rates. The requirements for gasoline, propane, and petrochemical feedstocks are unprecedented, and shortages are likely to recur for those products as well as for fuel oil.

III. DOMESTIC SUPPLY

The United States currently produces less than 70% of the petroleum it needs to meet domestic demands. With the exception of the addition of the Alaskan North Slope fields, productive capacity has been dropping as has actual production. During the shortage of last winter, it was apparent that the oil industry no longer had the capability of increasing production to match the peak demand.

This trend is likely to continue indefinitely. Domestic production of petroleum for 1973 has been estimated by the Bureau of Mines to be 10,961,000 b/d, compared to a demand of 17,455,000 b/d. Of the 6,494,000 b/d shortfall between domestic demand and supply, 6,251,000 b/d were expected to be made up by imports, leaving a shortage of 223,000 b/d. The IPAA predicted that domestic production would drop to 10,788,000 b/d, even though demand is likely to rise over 1,000,000 b/d compared to last year.⁵ Of the 7,737,000 b/d deficit forecast between supply and demand, 7,435,000 b/d were expected, before the Arab oil cutoff, to be made up with imported oil, leaving a net shortage of 302,000 b/d.

The most immediate supply problem is for fuel oil because of the onset of the heating season. Stocks of distillate fuel in November (203,656,000 bbl) are only slightly higher than they were a year ago (197,750,000 bbl).⁶ The gain in supply (3%) has been more than offset by increased demand (10%) with the net effect being a shortage of 7% worse than last year.

The shortage of residual fuel oil, which is used primarily by electric utilities and heavy industry as a boiler fuel, is even more acute. Stocks of residual fuel oil on Oct. 26, 1973 were only 56,891,000 bbl, in contrast with 63,990,000 bbl, a year ago.⁷ With greatly increased demand pressures and lower stocks, a serious residual shortage appears inevitable. A further complication is that most of the residual fuel oil used in the U.S. is imported, and reductions in foreign production may worsen the supply situation here.

IV. IMPORTS

A. Requirements

As has already been indicated, imports figure prominently in the supply/demand situation for petroleum. U.S. dependence on foreign sources of oil has grown rapidly in recent years, and it would now be impossible to prevent severe shortages without substantial imports. In 1972 imports accounted for 18.8% of the U.S. crude oil supply (see Table 3).⁸ Imports now constitute over one-third of our petroleum consumption, and the trend is toward even greater dependence on foreign producers. By 1980 the U.S. may be importing over 50% of its oil. Most of that increase was expected to come from the Middle East because of its extensive reserves. The supply of some products such as residual fuel oil is already dependent on foreign production. The demand for residual oil in 1972, for example, was 925,647,000 bbl. Of this, 637,401,000 bbl. was imported, amounting to over two-thirds of the total.⁹

Because of the drop in domestic production and the increase in demand for petroleum products, an estimated 640 million barrels of crude oil will have to be imported during the last quarter of 1973 and the first quarter of 1974 to avert a serious shortage.¹⁰ If available on the world market, this much oil would represent an increase of 50% over 1972

Footnotes at end of article.

U.S. imports. The Middle East is currently the only producing area in the world that has the proven reserves and productive ca-

capacity to meet those increasing requirements. The added cost of the incremental imports over last year's total would depend upon

the price per barrel, which is rapidly escalating upward, but would probably be near \$8 billion.¹¹

TABLE 3.—CRUDE OIL IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Country of origin	Annual total for 1972 (in 42-gallon barrels)	Posted price per barrel, Oct. 1, 1973	Posted price per barrel, Oct. 31, 1973	U.S. export embargo (percent)	Middle East monthly production cut (percent)
Canada	312,440,000				
Colombia	1,695,000				
Ecuador	5,331,000	3.600	5.250		
Venezuela	93,300,000	4.610			
Algeria	31,753,000	5.000	7.000	100	10
Egypt	3,091,000			100	5
Libya	40,069,000	4.604	8.925	100	5
Nigeria	88,887,000	5.000	5.000		
United Arab Emirates	26,873,000	3.110	5.538	100	5

Country of origin	Annual total for 1972 (in 42-gallon barrels)	Posted price per barrel, Oct. 1, 1973	Posted price per barrel, Oct. 31, 1973	U.S. export embargo (percent)	Middle East monthly production cut (percent)
Iran	49,700,000	2.995	5.091		
Iraq	1,315,000			100	10
Kuwait	13,205,000	2.884	4.903	100	10
Qatar	1,263,000	3.143	5.343		
Saudi Arabia	63,626,000	2.884	4.903	100	10
Indonesia	59,633,000	5.000	5.000	100	10
Others	18,954,000				
Combined total	81,135,000				

Note: Total does not include indirect imports of refined products made from Middle Eastern crude.

Source: API Annual Statistical Review, April 1973, pp. 9-10; Oil and Gas Journal, Oct. 29, 1973, p. 50; Oil Daily, Oct. 26, 1973, p. 6.

The level of imports needed to meet the demand for distillate fuel oil also will be substantial. The Department of Interior has estimated that if domestic refinery capacity is to be used as expected and inventories are to be maintained at a level of 100,000,000 barrels or above, then imports of distillate must average more than 650,000 b/d.¹² If the weather is exceptionally cold, imports of 800,000 b/d may be needed during the cold spells. Even in normal circumstances such quantities may not be available for the United States on world markets. During the shortage last winter, for example, distillates were imported at an average rate of 400,000 b/d. Most of that distillate (80 to 85%) came from refineries in the Caribbean, with the remainder imported from Europe. Most of the European distillate and a substantial amount of the Caribbean distillate was made from Middle Eastern crude oil.

It is unlikely that as much distillate fuel oil will be available from Europe as that obtained last winter. Europe imports more distillate than it exports, and was able to provide extra distillate last year only because of mild weather. The largest quantity of distillate that the U.S. could reasonably expect to obtain from Europe this season is 165,000 b/d.¹³ A cold winter would reduce that amount considerably.

B. THE OIL PRODUCER'S BOYCOTT

The availability of oil to import into the United States has been drastically reduced as a result of renewed hostilities in the Middle East. The Arab countries that export oil have agreed to boycott the U.S. market in an attempt to influence U.S. policy towards Israel and generally to modify its Middle-Eastern policy. The use of oil as an instrument of diplomacy is not new, but it has never been applied as effectively or on as large a scale as at present. The U.S. has been wholly cutoff from Middle Eastern oil, as has the Netherlands, because of its pro-Israeli policies. Canada has also been denied Arab oil for fear that it would send part of it to the U.S. The Arab states have also reduced production 10 percent initially for European customers and plan to cut it 5-10 percent each month thereafter. Additional cuts have been threatened and may be implemented. These actions are of vital concern to Europe and Japan where imports from the Middle East comprise 85 percent of their petroleum supply (Fig. 1).

The Arab oil cutoff is certain to have a serious impact on the Nation's petroleum supply and upon the winter distillate inventories in particular. As Table 4 indicates, the 1972 shipments to the United States totaled 887,900 b/d, which amounted to 5 percent of the U.S. demand of 16,300,000 b/d. The level of imports in 1973, prior to the war, was much higher with Saudi Arabia exporting in July as much crude oil as all the Arab countries combined had ex-

ported in July of 1972. As Table 4 shows, imports of Arab crude oil in July were 2 1/2 times the rate a year earlier.

TABLE 4.—U.S. IMPORTS OF ARAB CRUDE OIL, JULY 1973 VERSUS JUNE 1973
[Barrels per month]

Producing country	June 1972	July 1973
Algeria	2,380,000	4,595,000
Egypt		653,000
Iraq		
Kuwait	1,012,000	482,000
Libya	3,192,000	3,599,000
Qatar		185,000
Saudi Arabia	5,145,000	19,958,000
Tunisia		205,000
United Arab Emirates	1,452,000	3,169,000
Total	13,181,000	32,661,000

Source: "Oil and Gas Journal," Oct. 15, 1973, p. 40.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The Distillate Fuel Oil Situation, Winter 1973-74, Dept. of the Interior, Sept. 15, 1973, p. 3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³ The Distillate Fuel Oil Situation, p. 4.

⁴ Report of the Supply and Demand Committee, IPAA Houston Meeting, Oct. 21-23, 1973, p. 7.

⁵ Report of the Supply and Demand Committee, p. 7.

⁶ API Weekly Statistical Bulletin, Oct. 26, 1973, p. 2.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁸ The Distillate Fuel Oil Situation, p. 4.

⁹ API Annual Statistical Review, April 1973, p. 45.

¹⁰ Winter Heating Outlook, P. K. Verleger, Jr., and S. Haltmaier, *DRI Review*, Oct. 10, 1973, p. 6.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹² The Distillate Fuel Oil Situation, p. 1.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

HEARINGS ON REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT COSTS

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Housing will hold 2 days of public hearings on the bill, H.R. 9989, a bill to further the national housing goal of encouraging homeownership by regu-

lating certain lending practices and closing and settlement procedures in federally related mortgage transactions to the end that unnecessary costs and difficulties of purchasing housing are minimized, and for other purposes, on December 4 and 5, 1973, in room 2128 in the Rayburn House Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of whether the Federal Government should be involved in the setting of certain standards and charges in a real estate transaction is a matter that was considered by the Housing Subcommittee and the full Committee on Banking and Currency during its consideration of the 1972 housing and urban development bill. Since the 1972 housing and urban development bill, H.R. 16704, was not granted a rule, this matter was not brought to a resolution. I believe it is necessary at this time that we reconsider this whole matter before the Subcommittee on Housing commences its markup early next year on housing and community development legislation.

Our distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Housing, Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, has introduced a real estate settlement cost bill for himself and 18 other members on the Committee on Banking and Currency. This bill is basically the same provision that was contained in chapter IX of the committee-reported bill, H.R. 16704, which was last year's omnibus housing and urban development bill.

Since the subcommittee is limited in the amount of time it can hold on this set of hearings, we only have 2 days available for witnesses to testify. Anyone interested in testifying before the subcommittee can contact the staff of the Housing Subcommittee on 225-7054 in room 2129 of the Rayburn House Office Building.

TRIBUTE TO LES ARENDS FROM CONGRESSMAN EARL F. LANDGREBE

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great personal privilege to serve

in the U.S. House of Representatives for almost 5 years with the dynamic gentleman, LES ARENDS.

During those 5 years Les has been known as our Republican whip, a title he has held for some 30 years. While I am sure he has experienced great satisfaction as he so skillfully carried out the duties of this leadership position, I am quite familiar with the heartache and disappointment he has suffered as he has gone about the task of trying to solidify the minority side of the House on a vast range of important issues.

Not only has he displayed at all times a total dedication to our Republican Party, but has been in my opinion, a faithful, patriotic American unwavering in his dedication to a strong free America. Because of his loyal and uncompromised support of President Nixon in his foreign and domestic policies, he has truly stood out amongst his Republican colleagues.

In conclusion, I extend to Les and Mrs. Arends my most humble and sincere thanks and appreciation for their many years of dedicated service to our great nation, and pray that God will continue to shed his blessings upon them.

ADM. ERNEST M. ELLER WRITES ON
SEAPOWERS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. Ernest McNeill Eller, former Director of the Naval History Division, retired from the Navy in 1970, ending a distinguished 48-year career. Currently he is serving his second year as National Historian of the Navy League. He is author of the book "The Soviet Challenge" and has been an anxious observer of the Soviet Union's expanding military might, especially in the oceans of the world. There follows Admiral Eller's views on seapower as carried in the November issue of the magazine Seapower:

SEA POWER: THE ANCHOR OF FREEDOM THREATENED BY SOVIET DRIVE FOR OCEANIC SUPREMACY

(By Ernest M. Eller)

Some three years ago, shortly before his death, Mendel Rivers gravely warned Congress: "All Americans have been given the blessed and priceless heritage of freedom—a freedom which . . . is in terrible jeopardy. The Soviet Union is now one of the world's two leading sea powers . . . possibly the leading power . . . I can only warn the members of this House that we are on the brink of disaster and I have never before been as concerned in all the years I have served in the Congress."

Conditions have worsened dreadfully since then. In the face of phenomenal Soviet gains at sea that some observers, such as Captain John Moore, editor of "Jane's Fighting Ships," believe make the USSR the number

one sea power in the world, and despite the fact the gap between Soviet and U.S. strength widens daily, the United States continues to cut back its defense spending. In late August the Navy Department announced it would slash deep into muscle once again, dropping the fleet to 518 active ships by the end of the fiscal year.

The United States is already weaker, in a relative sense, than in 1939 when unpreparedness in the West helped bring on the catastrophe of World War II. Friend and foe recognize this. Consequently, the latest shift of the balance of power at sea to the USSR has already brought her far-reaching political gains which highlight with frightening import the deterioration of U.S. influence abroad following her decline afloat.

Today the shadow of the Bear looms over the Caribbean, no longer a safe sea frontier. Cuba, long considered critical to U.S. security, becomes, despite occasional signs of independence, more and more a Soviet political and military outpost. According to underground reports Cienfuegos is not the only Cuban port under development as a potential Soviet naval base, and the Kremlin continues to add guided missile vessels to the Cuban fleet.

Communist agents fan out from Cuba throughout Latin America, where in recent years leftist parties have increased in numbers and aggressiveness. When they gain power—as they had in Chile (once, like Cuba, a close friend of the United States)—they scream "Yankee go home," confiscate American property, and embrace the Soviets.

FROM ICELAND TO EGYPT

Iceland, a keystone of North Atlantic defense, tells a similar sad story. Her present government is seeking withdrawal of American forces—primarily U.S. Navy aviation units conducting surveillance flights over the adjacent waters through which the Soviet submarine fleet debouches into the Atlantic. Nor are her relations with her NATO neighbor to the south more harmonious. For several months Iceland and Britain have been engaged in a "Cod War" over fishing rights. If the dispute is not resolved to Iceland's liking, it will not be surprising if she moves further from the Western alliance.

The Sixth Fleet once defended freedom uncontested in the Mediterranean. Now the Soviet "Sixth Fleet" often outnumbers it. Most of North Africa leans toward Moscow and is closed to visiting American warships. Where once the Stars and Stripes waved, the hammer and sickle dominates. As one example of what this change means, Libya last summer expropriated all foreign oil corporations, taking majority ownership. Most of the oil and natural gas for an energy-hungry world that would founder without it lies in Muslim North Africa and the Middle East. The leaders there well know this, as does the USSR, now the leading "outside" power in that part of the world.

The eastern Mediterranean south of Turkey is almost a Soviet lake. Seeing which way the wind blows, Turkey also has made accommodations with Moscow. Long under British protection, Egypt now welcomes Soviet assistance. Because of internal intrigue, President Sadat in July 1972 ordered Soviet "advisers" and troops to leave the country. But this was only a temporary squall, no doubt in part for political effect. Egypt is still in the Bear's claws, as October's events made clear, and depends on the USSR for arms, economic strength, and her own military viability. The Kremlin has gained what Peter the Great vigorously sought long ago, a foothold in the Middle East.

Just as the Russian Bear has the Suez

Canal within reach, so does he grasp for control of the southern approaches to the Red Sea. Britain's departure from Aden left a vacuum the Soviets eagerly filled. Through military and economic aid they have gained predominance in countries on both flanks of the Gulf of Aden. They seek the same influence in the Persian Gulf area, from which an ever-increasing stream of tankers flows to feed the insatiable economies of the West and Japan. For centuries the tsars sought control of the Middle East. Now, almost overnight, it seems, Soviet influence flows by air and sea through this area of overwhelming economic and strategic value.

THE LOST VACUUM

Perceptive men long ago urged the United States to increase her own small Middle East Force to fill the Indian Ocean vacuum—a vacuum which, of course, no longer exists. When England began to withdraw her forces from east of Suez, the United States dallied, and Soviet warships sailed in. Besides their own Indian Ocean fleet, USSR combatants serve in India's Navy, and the Kremlin has helped "neutral" India build a submarine base. In summer 1971 Moscow and Delhi signed a mutual assistance security pact. It seems to some observers no coincidence that not long afterwards Indian troops invaded East Pakistan to "liberate" the natives. Russian backing of the venture may well have prompted India's attack; gifts of Russian arms undoubtedly insured its success. With fleets in the Mediterranean and Indian Ocean, and with the mounting dependence of many nations upon Iron Curtain aid, the USSR has become the leading force in the whole seething area.

Admiral Sergei Gorshkov, Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy, and members of the Politburo have heeded facts that America has ignored. Perceiving the immense gains resulting from deployment of their fleets around the world, Soviet leaders continue to expand their worldwide capabilities. The recent addition of aircraft carriers to the Soviet fleet is only a small part of the buildup, but indicates how the Soviets have learned their lessons.

Yet, even as the USSR builds carriers in her furious expansion of sea power, the U.S. fleet dwindles. In fiscal year 1974 scheduled slashes will drop the U.S. Navy to 518 ships, some 45 per cent less than in January 1969. Even the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor did not reduce the U.S. fleet to the low levels now projected.

Had a powerful foe decimated America's naval strength in battle, the nation would have risen in a frenzy of anger and fear. Instead, Americans, heedless that national survival is at stake, complacently accept their Navy's new status as number two sea power. There are those who rationalize, saying the addition of new ships gives the smaller fleet a lower average age with more modern equipment. This is true. The fleet will be younger—but still much older than the Soviet fleet.

But these sophists are playing ostrich. The Navy was stretched to the elastic limit in 1968 trying to carry out her world duties. Except for the Vietnam war (in which many smaller vessels were deployed), obligations have not lessened. Furthermore, if, as has actually happened, an opponent openly bent on outdistancing the United States adds two or three new ships for every new ship built for the dwindling U.S. Navy, whose annual losses (through retirement of older ships) have consistently outnumbered gains in recent years, there is no way the U.S. fleet could be growing stronger in comparison with the Soviet Navy.

Nearly two years ago, Admiral Elmo R.

Zumwalt, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, responding to a question from Congress, spelled it out quite clearly: "The U.S. Navy has lost strength in the last year both absolutely and relatively to the Soviet Union." His warning was unheeded. At the close of 1973, Admiral Zumwalt's assessment of the military situation would have to be: "We have disastrously lost more ground at a faster pace. The Soviets have passed the U.S. Navy in strength—and continue to build furiously to widen the lead."

THE LIFE PRESERVER

U.S. naval strength has declined, moreover, despite constant proof that maritime strategy is a sure preserver of democracy. America grew to greatness under the umbrella of *Pax Britannica*, which allowed other nations to prosper under the various forms of government they preferred. Then, with uncontested superiority afloat after VJ Day, the United States carried on this live-and-let-live policy, helping less fortunate peoples to resist aggression in Korea, in Vietnam, and in the Middle East. Today, in 1973, however, the short-lived *Pax Americana* swiftly wanes, and is being succeeded by the graveyard peace of *Pax Sovietica*.

There never, at any time in world history, has been peace without strength. Nor is there any reason to believe the present generation can reverse this iron rule of history. America's present relative weakness at sea may very well encourage the Soviets to act more boldly. It certainly weakens the resolution of America's friends and, if unchecked, will inevitably undermine U.S. will and wisdom in foreign policy decisions—if it has not done so already. It could, in short, lead to another Munich with loud proclamation of "Peace in our time."

U.S. weakness at sea also could lead to another Korea, because lack of power might once again result in America's drawing a perimeter of defense, as in 1950, that clearly left defenseless a people threatened by communist aggression. The United States still, of course, has a vast reservoir of goodwill in South Korea, whose people understand the sacrifices this country made in order that they might have control of their own destiny and attain the peace denied for generations by aggressive neighbors. On that beleaguered Asian peninsula, as elsewhere, the United States alone of the great powers has given much of herself and asked for nothing in return.

GENERATION GAP

But the record of the past generation notwithstanding, there are today some Korean leaders in the South who fear the United States will not, for lack of capability if not for lack of will, be as strong an ally in the future, and for this reason have reluctantly assented to the recent unification talks with North Korea. Their fears may be well-founded. For the next confrontation between East and West could very well be set in a climate of nuclear blackmail, making it impossible for America's inferior naval strength to be stretched to a foreign shore.

History's bitter lesson, repeated time after time throughout the ages, is that it costs far less to prevent war by keeping strong than to fight it. And the reason the lesson is so often repeated is that it is apparently a most difficult lesson for good men to learn—they either never learn it at all, or they quickly forget it.

Tens of thousands of American servicemen gave their lives in the grim hills of Korea. The money "saved" by the budget cuts of the late 1940s was exacted a thousandfold. The United States managed to ultimately save South Korea but only because no Russian navy of consequence then existed. Would the outcome be the same today? Could the

other dozens of brilliant U.S. peacekeeping operations—Lebanon and the Cuban missile crisis, to cite two examples—be repeated in the 1970s?

Future generations will wonder how the American public could shut its eyes to history's warnings on unilateral disarmament. No weapons race in itself causes war; a one-country "race" by an aggressor, with the peacekeeper idly watching, does. Such a race is taking place today, and the consequences are frightening to contemplate. The fearful shift in relative maritime strength to the Soviet Union, if unchecked, could mean an early eclipse of the United States as world leader.

The richest nation, the most generous, idealistic, and philanthropic, the leader of freedom—but a freedom which depends irrevocably upon superior sea power—seems prepared, in short, to abandon her leadership. America's friends throughout the world, and they are still quite numerous, are puzzled. They ask if a nation much less capable than the United States, under tyranny and with half the U.S. economic capability, can make such great gains, what is wrong with the American system? Why cannot Americans understand that when an expanding empire gains control of the oceans it also gains control of nations which border those oceans? Surely, it would seem, if a weaker government can concentrate resources to dominate the great waters that join all shores, the United States should be able to mount wisdom and resolution enough to match the effort. And surely some luxuries and domestic social experiments, however desirable in themselves, could be postponed for essentials to save the future.

Every American may well heed the words of former Representative Durward Hall of the House Armed Services Committee: "I'm scared to death. . . . The Soviets will have a military force, and particularly strategic forces, strong enough . . . to checkmate the United States. . . . The crucial question is what the American people will do when the communists say: 'We've got you checkmated. Now dance to our tune.'"

There may still be time for the United States to reverse the downward trend, but the opportunity is fading more swiftly than the setting sun. In the English-French wars of the 18th century the sea-girt isles did reverse their decline in naval strength in time to meet Napoleon's threat. Thus, possibly, history might be saying, the United States has a chance. Even the term "possibly" may be too hopeful, however, because the point of no return may already have passed. Today's margin for action, and for error, is but a slim fraction of what it was two centuries ago when men did not have to deal with aircraft, ICBMs, submarine missiles streaking over the horizon bearing nuclear warheads. There will be no time this time to rebuild neglected strength. Today's warships take years to construct, but only minutes to destroy—by enemy action or, more often, by legislative fiat.

LATE MEANS NEVER

If the United States is not ready at sea when the crisis comes, there will not be time to get ready. U.S. military forces are far weaker, compared to the forces of the Soviet Union, than at any time since the Bolsheviks came to power. Already the U.S. Navy faces an almost impossible job of coping with the huge Russian submarine force. As the Soviets achieve superiority in the number of nuclear ballistic missiles deployed in submarines (and that superiority is inevitable, given the present shipbuilding programs of the two countries) nuclear blackmail of the most vicious type would be easy to contemplate.

To illustrate: in one not altogether fanciful

scenario suggested by think-tank strategists, whose job it is to think the unthinkable, Moscow would once again—as she apparently started to do in late October—dispatch air, ground, and naval forces to intervene in the Middle East. Simultaneously, a "hands off" ultimatum would flash from the Kremlin. With it would come notice that Soviet submarine missiles and ICBMs were zeroed in on U.S. cities, and any move to intervene would trigger them. The United States would not, it is generally believed, initiate a nuclear exchange. Indeed, the real question is whether she would even risk the possibility of such an exchange, even though much of the future of the Free World depends upon the Middle East.

American idealists, and there are many of them, scoff at such a possibility. The reasoning seems to be that, because the United States would not resort to such blackmail, neither would the enemies of the United States. This is much like saying that because good citizens would not break the law, neither would criminals. It is extremely important to recognize the fallacy of such idealistic and well intentioned theories. Because, unless the United States acts promptly and with vigor to reverse course, the possibility for such blackmail, which already exists, will become almost irresistible.

The Soviets drive with unmistakable purpose to achieve ascendancy at sea; peaceful reversal will require "blood, sweat, and tears" from the American people, and a high order of leadership on the part of the President as well as Congress. Each day a solution to the problem becomes more difficult. Unless the United States quickly goes beyond the steps now underway—which are in the right direction, but halting and slow—she soon will have passed the last turning point.

Survival of the American way of life depends upon the will of the American people to preserve it. It depends upon the wisdom and integrity of national political leaders. Preservation demands superior strength, especially at sea. There is no alternative, and "detente" is no substitute.

Man has moved far since few were masters and most were slaves. He has farther yet to go if the United States and allies have but the sagacity to choose the right course and the fortitude to steer it. Charts marking the course clearly read: "Be strong at sea or die."

SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, chaired by Representative HUNGATE, for their action in reporting favorably H.R. 11401, the Special Prosecutor Act of 1973.

I urge your support for this bill when it comes before us after the Thanksgiving recess. The need for legislation has been made clear, I feel, by the unprecedented outpouring of concern we have all witnessed over the firing of Prosecutor Cox. The countless telephone calls, letters, and personal visits to our offices by citizens deeply troubled by the President's

actions should signal a clear message that the public is not going to accept a solution that does not guarantee total independence for the new special prosecutor.

The problems inherent in having a Presidentially appointed prosecutor were well documented in the testimony before our subcommittee. Mr. Bork acknowledged that the White House staff actively participated in the selection of Mr. Jaworski. Mr. Jaworski himself testified that General Haig had initiated the conversations leading to his selection and that he had met with a number of the White House staff members and had extensive discussions with General Haig. While I do not mean to suggest that any improper agreements were struck, I think total independence—the kind of independence that will restore the already badly shaken confidence of the American public—necessarily requires that the recruitment and appointment of the special prosecutor should be free of any White House participation.

Furthermore, real independence must be founded on more than palliative assurances of "total cooperation." It must include the freedom to pursue all necessary documents, tapes, notes, and so forth, without the intimidating specter of removal hanging over the prosecutor's head. We know there are no such guarantees in writing. And Mr. Jaworski admitted to the committee that he never asked the White House the crucial question of whether continued pursuit of Presidential documents would result in his removal. If anyone needed more proof of the history of noncooperation by the White House, it can be found in Professor Cox's startling revelations this week that President Nixon had specifically ordered him to stay away from the Ellsberg and milk deal matters.

The committee bill, H.R. 11401, solves these questions by vesting the appointive and removal powers in the hands of a special three-judge panel composed of members of the District Court for the District of Columbia. Removal will be permitted only for gross dereliction of duty, gross impropriety, or physical inability. The bill provides for full prosecutorial and investigative powers and assures adequate funding and staffing.

Finally, let me add that there is no doubt in my mind that this bill as drafted will withstand constitutional attack. The overwhelming weight of opinion received from the legal community agreed that the bill was on sound constitutional footing. In fact only one of the many constitutional scholars that testified argued that the bill was unconstitutional, and he acknowledged that he thought it was a close question. The text of the Constitution explicitly grants Congress the power to confer the appointive powers on the Federal courts:

... the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of Departments. (Art. II, Sec. 2).

In addition, there is considerable case law that has upheld the power of Congress to confer in the courts power of appointment in a number of areas: the temporary appointment of U.S. attorneys—who perform prosecutorial functions—election supervisors, and school board officials.

At one time or another, virtually every member of the committee expressed support for a guarantee of independence for the new special prosecutor. The Federal court ruling yesterday that the firing of Professor Cox was illegal underscores the need for legislation that will take both legal and actual power of control out of the executive branch.

Failure to enact this bill will be more than just another example of a Congress too timid to challenge the executive branch. It would be an implicit sanction of the President's abuse of power in firing Professor Cox and a betrayal of our own responsibilities to preserve in actuality and appearance the fairness, impartiality, and thoroughness of the administration of justice in this country.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LESLIE ARENDS

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished minority whip, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, who has announced his retirement from the Congress at the conclusion of the 93d Congress.

Those of us who are newcomers to the House of Representatives will forever appreciate the time and counsel which LES ARENDS gave to make our job easier. I met him when I first came to Congress last January and called upon him with reference to my choice of a committee assignment. He was very gracious and I continue to appreciate his advice and counsel. The people of Illinois and throughout the entire Nation are losing an effective and influential statesman. The Congress will miss him, but above all America will miss him.

I extend to LES ARENDS and to his lovely wife my sincere best wishes for all the good things of life in their retirement.

AY, THERE'S THE RUB

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Science and As-

tronautics Subcommittee on Energy, I have been very interested in America's response to the President's energy message of last week. One of the most frequently voiced criticisms I have heard is the complaint that Mr. Nixon is asking the average citizen to turn her thermostat down 6 degrees, cut driving speeds, and make various other sacrifices; while he uses immense quantities of energy himself for such purposes as flying about the country to examine the various real estate holdings which the American people have so generously improved for him.

In the interest of fairness, however, I must admit that this is not a universal complaint. In the letters to the editor column of the San Bernardino, Calif., Sun of November 10 there appears a letter from a Mr. Riley Miller, who expressed the following dissenting view:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

NOVEMBER 10, 1973.

As a taxpayer I don't really mind sharing the expense of the President's frequent flights to San Clemente and Key Biscayne. It's the cost of those continuing return flights to Washington that I object to.

Sincerely,

RILEY MILLER.

NEWS MEDIA AND THE PRESIDENT

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 19, 1973

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, last Friday I inserted in the RECORD a number of letters, articles, and editorials I have received from around the country in support of President Nixon. I would like to add to that sampling a resolution which I received from a Republican precinct committeemen meeting in my State. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD:

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

RESOLUTION

Resolved that we as precinct committeemen of District 18 in Maricopa County, Arizona do hereby unanimously express our support of President Richard M. Nixon.

We recognize and gratefully acknowledge that President Nixon has done more for the cause of world peace than any other President in history. We particularly appreciate that he has achieved peace with honor in Vietnam.

We pray that our President will retain his basic faith in himself and also in the long-range sense of justice that exists in the average American. We further ask that the news media will soon come to the realization that Mr. Nixon has not even been accused, much less found guilty, of any crime.

We hereby further resolve and affirm that it is our conviction that if President Nixon is allowed to freely exercise his rightful position as the leader of our country, that his past and future accomplishments will ultimately brand him as one of the truly great presidents in the history of America.